

sixty or seventy in all, and ask Brother Aldrich to go over them with me and ascertain what the people wanted in each case, and if there were any cases where the committee had not already done exactly what the petitioners desired or had not inflexibly passed upon the question, I could have a hearing before you, but I find in every instance the action of the Committee, as Mr. Aldrich thinks it likely to be, is entirely satisfactory to the interests I represent, with the exception of one or two, and the papers in regard to those cases I have handed to Mr. Aldrich."

Mr. Miles, whom I have before quoted, says, in American Industries of April of this year:

"People asking a government representative for relief on another schedule were by that representative referred to a New England manufacturer, the official agreeing to act in accordance with the protected manufacturer's wishes. Said the manufacturer: 'I wrote that schedule myself. I did not intend that it should be interpreted as severely as it has been, but having been so interpreted, I will not consent to a modification of it.' And this man's will remains the law."

We would not expect a jury to do justice to the defendant if it was composed entirely of the relatives of the plaintiff; neither can we expect a congress to do justice to the masses if it is composed of men who are in sympathy with, and obligated to, the corporations which have for a generation been enjoying special privileges.

There is no prospect of relief from a Republican President and Congress. The Democratic party, if entrusted with power, can and will reduce the tariff.

The Democratic platform not only demands a reduction of the tariff, but it plainly outlines the course to be pursued in securing the reduction. It begins by proposing that articles which come into competition with articles controlled by a trust be placed on the free list. What better place to begin? Years ago Mr. Havemeyer, the head of the Sugar Trust, said that the tariff was the mother of trusts—and her children are many. Secretary Taft, in his notification speech, says that an excessive tariff serves no useful purpose "but offers a temptation to those who would monopolize the production and the sale of such articles in this country, to profit by the excessive rate."

Now suppose the manufacturers, who have been favored by legislation, do conspire against the public and enter into a monopoly. ~~What penalty do the Republicans suggest? None whatever.~~ These men are to be consulted about proposed changes, and if the next Republican tariff is made like former Republican tariffs, nothing will be done without the unanimous consent of the beneficiaries.

What would be the effect of the remedy proposed by the Democratic platform? Simply this:—a law goes into effect at some fixed date in the future, and if the Democrats pass a law, putting upon the free list articles coming into competition with those controlled by a trust, the trust will have until that date to dissolve. If the trust considers the law too drastic, it can avoid it by giving up its monopoly.

Secretary Taft calls this remedy "utterly destructive" and in his anxiety to prevent it overlooks the fact that the Democratic party has other remedies for the trusts. If we can succeed in dissolving existing trusts, and in preventing the organization of new ones, there will be no trusts against which to use the remedy of which he complains. There is now a law against trusts, but it has not been sufficiently enforced to prevent trusts. The Democrats demand its enforcement; if its enforcement rids the country of trusts, then this policy which Mr. Taft so much fears will become perfectly harmless. If the Democrats secure control of both the House and the Senate, they are pledged to legislation which will make a private monopoly impossible. If the Republicans retain control of part of the legislative machinery of the government and refuse to join in the effort to make a private monopoly impossible, they are not in a position to complain of tariff legislation aimed at trusts. If they refuse to assist us in exterminating the principle of private monopoly, they cannot well object to legislation necessary to protect the people from trust extortion.

Mr. Taft did not refer to the platform demand that wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs be placed upon the free list. Why? Because the President vainly besought Congress to enact a law embodying part of this demand. It is absurd to complain of the exhaustion of our forests while we encourage their destruction by a tariff on the products of foreign forests. But such legislation becomes not only a folly but a crime when it is remembered that a handful of men monopolize the benefits flowing from the tariff on these things, while the whole country bears the burden of the tax. Hon. R. F. Pettigrew, of South Dakota, in a speech made in the United States Senate, referred to an important statement, which appeared in The North-western Lumberman, February 27, 1897. Senator Burrows of Michigan had referred to a Mr. Winchester as a man of great reliability and truthfulness, and Senator Pettigrew quoted Mr. Winchester as saying in the North-western Lumberman:

"There were a lot of gentlemen from the Northwest, up Minne-

sota way, in Washington the other day, and they were sitting in Senator Burrows's room. An interesting incident occurred there. Senator Burrows is chairman of the committee. The committee had not had a meeting for a long time. They happened to be seated in that room, and one of the gentlemen from Minnesota had an envelope and lead pencil. He walked around the room and ciphered up a little bit, and he said:

"Mr. Burrows, do you know what \$1 a thousand would mean to this crowd of men in here?"

"There were not as many in the room as there are here. He said:

"An advance of \$1 a thousand on lumber would mean \$6,125,000 on last year's product."

Could more conclusive proof be desired? And the Senator Burrows mentioned is the same Senator Burrows who acted as Temporary Chairman of the last Republican National Convention, and sounded the key-note of the campaign.

How long will the Republican farmers, merchants and laboring men permit a few men to make the tariff laws for their own pecuniary advantage and at the expense of the rest of the country?

The second step in the reduction of the tariff is a "material reduction upon the necessities of life, especially upon goods competing with such American manufactures as are sold abroad more cheaply than at home." At present the articles used by the poor bear a higher rate, ad valorem, than the articles used by the rich. This statement can be verified by an examination of any of the schedules. A tax upon consumption, even when laid with absolute impartiality, bears heaviest upon the poor, because our necessities are much more uniform than our possessions. People do not eat in proportion to their income; they do not wear clothing in proportion to their income; they do not use taxed goods in proportion to their income. As all taxes must come out of one's income, no matter through what system levied or collected, they are, in effect, income taxes, and taxes on consumption are really graduated income taxes, the largest per cent being collected from those with the smallest income and the smallest per cent from those with the largest income. It is only fair, therefore, that in an attempt to relieve the people from the iniquities of a high tariff, the poor, who are overburdened, should be given first consideration. Then, too, a reduction in the tariff on the necessities of life brings a benefit to all the people, while a reduction in the tax upon luxuries would benefit but a portion of the people.

Surely no one will object to a reduction being made upon articles which come into competition with American manufactures which are sold abroad more cheaply than at home. The American manufacturer who sends his goods to foreign lands and there, without any protection whatever, competes successfully with the manufacturers of all the world, does not need a high tariff to meet competition in the home market. And there are enough articles sold abroad at a low price to assure a large advantage to the American consumers through the carrying out of this one plank.

Mr. Taft, however, finds the greatest alarm in the following clause in our platform:

"Gradual reductions should be made in such other schedules as may be necessary to restore the tariff to a revenue basis."

He regards this threatened departure from the protective system as fatal. We are here brought face to face with the theoretical difference between the positions of the two parties on the subject of tariff. The Democratic party regards a tariff law as a revenue law, the protection it gives being incidental; the Republican party regards a tariff law as framed primarily for protection, the revenue being incidental. As the effect of a given rate on a particular article is the same, whether levied for the purpose of revenue or for the purpose of protection, it may be well to define the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff. A revenue tariff is so framed as to collect a revenue and stop when you get enough; a protective tariff may be so framed as to collect but little revenue, and yet lay a heavy burden upon the people—and you never know when to stop. To illustrate: a tariff may be made so high as to absolutely prohibit importation. In such a case, the manufacturers yield to the temptation mentioned by Mr. Taft and combine to take advantage of the duty, the consumers will be heavily taxed, and yet none of the money will reach the treasury.

Let us suppose another case: If we import one-tenth of a certain kind of merchandise and produce at home nine-tenths, and the imported and domestic articles sell at the same price, then the treasury receives duty on the foreign article and the manufacturers collect nine times as much on the domestic article as the treasury collects on the one-tenth imported. It becomes a matter of great importance, therefore, to the people at large, whether the tariff is intended to raise a revenue or is framed in the interest of the manufacturers and for the purpose of protection. No one would think of employing in a city, a county or a state, a tax system under which the bulk of the tax would go to the collectors, and yet the Republican leaders demand the continuance of a system under which the protected interests receive far more than half the money collected from the people through the operation of a high tariff.