

Brief Facts About the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Law

This law, which has been in force for a little over three years, was prepared by Sereno M. Payne of New York, floor leader of the republicans in the house and chairman of the ways and means committee, with the assistance of John Dalzell, representing the Pittsburgh steel district, S. W. McCall, from manufacturing Massachusetts, E. J. Hill, spokesman for the Connecticut tariff beneficiaries, Joseph W. Fordney of Michigan, representing the beet sugar interests, and other republican statesmen of similar affiliations.

After it had passed the house, Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, representing the cotton and woolen manufacturers, called to his aid Boies Penrose of Pennsylvania and Reed Smoot of Utah, and together they rewrote many of the schedules, increasing the general average of duties about 2 per cent over that of the original bill. Democratic members of the finance committee, which had the bill in charge in the senate, were not allowed to sit with Aldrich and his confederates, and the bill was molded exactly as Aldrich and the trusts he represented desired. It was forced through congress by a system of trades against the opposition of the democratic members and a half dozen republican insurgents. It was approved by President Taft, after some grumbling over one or two schedules. Afterwards the president declared it to be the best tariff bill ever passed, and lauded Aldrich and Payne as defenders of the great protective system. Here are some of the features of that bill:

In almost every schedule it places the higher duty on the cheapest goods and the lowest rate of duty on the highest priced goods, or, in other words, the heaviest burden is placed on those least able to bear it.

On the pretense that it was redeeming a solemn promise to give a substantial reduction in duties, it reduced the duty on sugar, one of the great necessities of life, from \$1.95 a hundred pounds to \$1.90. Every time you eat a hundred pounds you save a nickel, and every time you swallow a ton you have saved a dollar.

The house bill carried a duty of 20 per cent on manufactures of rubber. Aldrich caused it to be increased to 35 per cent. Senator Brewster is authority for the statement that towards the close of the session Aldrich's son with the Guggenheims and Ryan, formed the rubber trust, that has paid big dividends on inflated capitalization.

The white lead trust has so greatly increased prices that paint consumers have been looking about for a substitute. They found it in barytes, a white product of stone. The Payne-Aldrich law put a crimp in this business by doubling the duty on crude barytes, at the instigation of the trust representatives.

It admits the diamonds of the rich at 10 per cent, while it exacts 20 per cent tax on imitation jewelry of the poor.

It carries a 25 per cent increase in the tax on cheap watches, and made no change in the duties on the fifteen and seventeen-jeweled watches.

Woolen blankets of the cheapest sort carry a tariff tax of 165.42 per cent; woolen flannels 143.67 per cent, and woolen fabrics 141 per cent. Clothing carries a 95 per cent tax. Not a single change was effected in the woolen schedule, although this is notoriously high, and gives the woolen manufacturer full and free opportunity to demand almost what price he pleases of the wearers of fabrics, men, women and children.

The cotton schedule was increased from an average rate of 45 per cent under the Dingley law to 51 per cent under the existing law. This was accomplished by stealth, by reclassification that concealed the actual increase.

At the demand of manufacturers it increased the tariff tax on gloves and stockings of the cheaper and more popular grades. It also increased the tax on cutlery and razors. It cut the rate on steel rails and a number of articles on the steel schedule, but not one of these reductions is represented by reduced prices to the consumer, for the reason that it was merely scaling done the protection given an excessively-protected trust.

It seriously injured not one of the many trusts, and in many instances strengthened their holds by jokers and tricks.

SOME ODIIOUS COMPARISONS

The rankly discriminatory character of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law, which the republicans are called upon to defend in this campaign, is

shown in concrete form in the following comparisons, the figures being the rate of duty levied on the various articles in that law:

Sugar	70	Diamonds	10
Salt	35	Steel rails	19
Rice	63	Statuary	15
Eggs	44	Fine Paintings ...	15
Razors	95	Automobiles	45
Cheapest Candy ..	67	Dearest Candy ...	40
Steel pens	48	Gold pens	25
Marble tombstones	42	Onyx	8
Window glass ...	60	Plate glass	42
Prune juice	118	Champagne	67
Cherry juice	104	Still wine	78
Bay rum	387	Vermouth	70
Handkerchiefs,		Furs	20
cotton	55	Dearest hats	47
Cheapest hats	77	17-jeweled	
Cheap watches ...	82	watches	40
Steel trousers'		Finest buttons ...	36
buttons	127	Sewing silk	37
Cotton thread	47	Dearest dress	
Cheapest dress		goods	87
goods	109	Dearest flannels...	86
Cheapest flannels	165	Dearest knit	
Cheapest knit		fabrics	95
fabrics	141	Dearest woolen	
Cheapest woolen		cloth	94
cloth	135	Dearest blankets,	104
Cheapest blankets	165	Dearest mattings,	24
Cheapest mattings,	42	Pianos	45
Suspenders	80	Ivory fans	50
Wool shawls	93	Embossed sta-	
Onions	48	tionery	36
Stockings, cotton,	88	Yachts	35
Furniture	35	Orchids	25
Wool hats	87	Lace curtains ...	60
Ingrain carpets...	67	Velvet carpets ...	59
Children's toys...	35	Pearls	10
Pipes for smokers	60	Rubies	10
Imitation stones...	20	Emeralds	10
Cabbages	30	Chocolate	17
Table knives	52	Anchovies	30
Cheapest men's		Dearest men's	
gloves	66	gloves	15
Cheapest buckles	77	Costliest buckles	26
Bone-handled		Fancy table knives	57
knives	70	Costliest velvets...	50
Cheapest velvets...	105		

AT HIS OLD TRICKS

Mr. Roosevelt, in a recent speech, says: "The big trusts cordially approve of both platforms," (democratic and republican.) "Some of them are supporting the republican candidate, more of them are supporting the democratic candidate, for every big financial magnate connected with a crooked trust knows that neither the democrats nor the republicans menace him or his interests in the slightest degree." Isn't that strong? Yet, it is not only untrue, so far as the democratic party is concerned, but it is almost exactly the same charge he made four years ago against the democratic party when he was urging Mr. Taft as the embodiment of civic virtue and political perfection.

He even insisted in 1908 that Mr. Rockefeller was supporting the democratic ticket and he did not take the trouble to retract the statement when Mr. Rockefeller later came out in an interview advocating Mr. Taft.

The democratic party is the only party that is trying to restore competition—the only one that declares a private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. The trusts oppose the democratic party; they are divided between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, but Mr. Roosevelt is even more outspoken than Mr. Taft in favor of the trusts and he is the only candidate who has a trust magnate as a financial backer and daily advisor. Mr. Roosevelt reflects upon the intelligence of the reading public when he assumes that the voters do not understand why Mr. Perkins supports him and his policies.

CANNIBALS OF FINANCE

Arthur E. Stillwell, one of the great railroad builders of the century, has written a book detailing his experience with the money trust. Every democratic campaign speaker should have a copy. It will help to show the people what the democratic party has had to fight and will emphasize the importance of electing Wilson. Democratic voters should read the book and then loan it to their republican neighbors. The book can be secured direct from the publishers, the Farnum Publishing company, First National Bank Bld., Chicago, Ill.

Governor Wilson is striking harder and harder every day, and his blows are counting.

SOME QUESTIONS FOR MR. ROOSEVELT'S FOLLOWERS

A Vilas, Colo., reader of The Commoner submits the following questions to the followers of Theodore Roosevelt.

1. What did Roosevelt, as president, do to the trusts more than Taft has done to them? In fact, hasn't Taft prosecuted more of them than Roosevelt did?

2. Does Roosevelt still believe in "good trusts and bad trusts," and what is your own idea of a "good" trust?

3. At the time Roosevelt wrote his Outlook article condemning Taft for keeping big business in a state of turmoil and doubt, Roosevelt had a few over him in the number of "big-business prosecutions." Why didn't Roosevelt condemn himself?

4. If Roosevelt really wanted to "bust the trusts," why didn't he try the criminal clause of the law?

5. What do you think of "the Morgan interests that have been so friendly to us," and what would you be saying if Wilson in his letter of acceptance had suggested the advisability of getting solid with the Morgan interests?

6. What do you think of a president calling in the Morgans, Harrimans and other trust magnates, to edit his messages for him?

7. While Roosevelt was president the trusts increased several fold. Have we any reason to believe that it won't be so again if he should again become president?

8. How are we to have any confidence in a man's "trust-busting" whose campaign is financed by the trusts—by the Morgans, the Perkinses, the McCormicks, and all other trusts and bosses "going my way?"

9. How did it happen that Roosevelt made the discovery that a good man can do nothing at the head of either of the old parties, only after the steam roller had run over him at Chicago?

10. Why didn't Roosevelt back a real progressive in 1908, and do you not think that he would have stood a better chance in forcing a real progressive on the party than in forcing himself on it, this year?

11. It has been the protective tariff that has financed the republican campaigns. It was largely the protective tariff that caused the insurgent bolt. Could it be possible that the desire to get the protective-tariff support had anything to do with the Roosevelt bull-moose protective plank, and how can the insurgents swallow the dose?

12. All the principal bull moose planks were offered in the 1908 convention, and turned down by Theodore Roosevelt, "because," he explained, "the convention indorsed 'my policies,' and that nothing more was necessary." If that was all that was necessary when another man was going to do the work, why wasn't it all that was necessary this year when he proposes to do the work himself? Why not, as in 1908, simply have said, "we indorse the Roosevelt policies," and let it go at that?

13. Do you think that the efforts of the progressive party would be nil if it were to come into power with La Follette, Cummins, Hadley, Stubbs, or any leader other than Roosevelt, at its head?

14. How many times would you favor electing Roosevelt president in case those various reforms for which he professes now to stand, should require it?—seven times, or unto seventy times seven?

15. An old attorney, upon retiring, turned his business over to his son, and one day the son, on returning from court, asked what there was so complicated about that blank case that he had had on his hands for three years. "Why," he remarked, "I straightened that up today in about two hours." "You little fool," the old man exclaimed, "that case was bringing me \$3,000 a year."

Do you think it possible that there might be a parallel between this case and the Roosevelt presidential office-tenure case? Might it not just drag along from one term of office to another—indefinitely?

These questions are by A PROGRESSIVE.

If any one doubts the need of the law requiring all advertising matter to be plainly marked, let him read Collier's recent exposure of the West Virginia editors who were trapped into putting a price on their editorial columns as well as on the columns devoted to "pure reading matter." The people are coming into their own.

Mr. Roosevelt's skin is pretty thick, but Governor Marshall seems to have pierced it.