

Texans Fighting for Democratic Principles

The Bryan and Bailey controversy resolved itself into one of protection and anti-protection in spite of all sophistry and hair-splitting arguments. Bryan recognizes protection as a republican doctrine and proposes to fight it all along the line, attacking its market places first. Bailey fights the general idea of protection, but insists that as others get protection, that is, are allowed to tax the masses for the benefit of a few, his few constituents who can receive the benefits of protection shall have their share of the graft.—Granbury (Texas) News.

The News has not sized up the controversy correctly. Bryan wants to raise revenue by taxing manufactured products alone and would place raw materials on the free list. Bailey insists that a low revenue tariff be laid on both manufactured products and raw materials. Both Bryan and Bailey admit that even a low tariff affords some incidental protection to the domestic manufacturer or producer. Mr. Bryan's plan would give all this incidental protection to the eastern manufacturers, while Mr. Bailey's plan would distribute it fairly between producers and manufacturers. If the people must pay a tax on shoes, why should not the manufacturer pay a tax on hides? If the wool manufacturer gets the benefit of the incidental protection of a revenue duty on woolen goods, why should not the sheep owner have the benefit of the incidental protection of a revenue duty on wool?—Fort Worth (Texas) Record.

The editor of the Granbury News will, of course, make adequate reply to the editor of the Fort Worth Record for the Record does not state Mr. Bryan's position fairly. The platform proposed by Mr. Bryan tells its own story. That platform follows:

1. A platform is a pledge, given by the candidate to the voters, and when ratified at the polls becomes a contract between the official

and his constituents. To violate it, in letter or in spirit, is not only undemocratic, but repugnant to the principles of representative government, and constitutes an embezzlement of power.

2. We denounce the despotism, known as Cannonism and favor such an amendment to the rules of the national house of representatives as will restore popular government in that body and insure the rule of the majority on every question.

3. We endorse the tariff plank of the last national democratic platform and believe that the measure carrying out the promise of that platform should, among other things, provide for:

Free wool, the abolition of the compensatory duties on woollens and a substantial reduction in the ad valorem rate on woollens.

Free lumber, free wood pulp and free paper. Free hides, leather, harness, boots and shoes.

Free oil and products of oil.

Free iron ore, free coal and low duties on all manufactures of iron and steel.

Free binding twine, cotton ties and cotton bagging.

Material reductions in the cotton schedules and in the tariff upon all other necessaries of life, especially upon articles sold abroad more cheaply than at home, the aim being to put the lowest duty on articles of necessity and the highest on articles of luxury. Articles coming into competition with trust-made articles should be placed on the free list.

No tariff rate should be above 50 per cent ad valorem, except upon liquor and tobacco, and all rates above 25 per cent, excepting those upon liquor and tobacco, should be reduced one-twentieth each year until a 25 per cent rate is reached, the purpose being to reduce the tariff gradually to a revenue basis and thereafter to collect tariff for revenue only.

An Analysis By "An Old Time Democrat"

The Houston, Texas, Chronicle prints this letter:

To the Editor of the Chronicle: A few remarks anent Senator Bailey's tariff speech, and especially from the standpoint of the consumer, might not be amiss from an "old time democrat." I was among those who listened to the senator last night, and am yet far from convinced that the strange doctrine he preaches should be accepted by the democratic party. At best, his argument is sectional, and could not in any sense be accepted as outlining a national policy.

To those who heard the senator, it was apparent that his argument was all from the standpoint of the producer of the raw material and the manufacturer of the finished product, and not in any sense from the standpoint of the consumer. He did not undertake to explain, in any satisfactory manner, the obviously irresistible conclusion that whenever a tariff is placed on raw material, the manufacturer adds it to the price of the finished product, thus making the consumer pay a double tax, being taxed first on the raw material, and then when the raw material is made up into the finished product, then paying a tax on the finished product. When it is considered that the largest per cent of our people are consumers, the eloquent plea of our junior senator for our great lumber kings, wool growers and manufacturers will carry very little weight with the great American people, who pay this tribute. The senator admits that a tax on raw material is added to the finished product, thus making double taxation, when he says that the best remedy is to take the tax off of the finished product and leave it on the raw material. This has never been done, as it would not be the best means to obtain revenue, and furthermore the senator knows that it never will be done, and therefore he advocates a fallacy as a cure for the one paramount objection to the wisdom of taxed raw material, to-wit: That such tax on raw material is added to the finished product. I can not blame a great lumber manufacturer, or an opulent wool grower, or the owners of iron ore, for thoroughly agreeing with the senator in his eloquent plea in behalf of their products, but how a plain everyday American consumer can get in that bunch will always remain a mystery to me, and when you find one doing so, if you raise his hat, you will find his head is not bigger than a south

Texas pecan. You see there are three classes: The producer, the manufacturer and the consumer. The consumer has no place in either the other two classes, and his chief interest now is to keep our senator from getting him in between them, and grinding him to death in tariff tribute to both. The interest of the consumer is necessarily diametrically opposed to a taxation for protection of either the producer or the manufacturer, and his interest insistently demands that he oppose a tax for protection of both the raw material man and the finished article man, and he can not hold out long in trying to protect both, with any regard to his own interest. The only position for the consumer to take, so long as the government's revenue is to be collected through the customs house, is to be for a tariff on the finished product for revenue only, and, at best, for incidental protection, which means unintended protection. When a consumer gets off of this ground, and goes to boasting about protecting the raw material and the manufacturer, with no regard to protecting himself and family, he is fit, as our junior senator would say, for the "witches."

The senator's argument that public servants are above instructions of the platform made by their constituents in convention assembled is a rather novel one to be made in a representative form of government, wherein the only method by which the people who enter into a contract with their representative obligating him to carry out their wishes, is by presenting him with a platform and asking him will he accept a nomination on such platform and abide by it. The senator seeks ingenuously to justify his conduct in repudiating the Denver platform on the tariff question, but his argument amounts to no more than that a public servant can carry out his own desires in the matter of legislation without regard to the instructions of his party and his constituents. This is a strange argument from the man who but a couple of years ago, when brought to the bar of public judgment before the legislature at Austin, cracked the party lash with all the force at his command, and made the air vocal with a demand that any democrat who had been elected to the legislature on a platform endorsing Senator Bailey should either vote for Senator Bailey for United States senator or go home and resign and run over again, so that the people could determine whether they would elect him when they knew

he would repudiate his platform. They even got poor Hawkins to resign in northwest Texas and then dumped enough money in his district to beat him. How treacherous is the memory of man when it is convenient to disremember!

Personally, I regret that Senator Bailey has taken this new stand as against the people, for we can no longer follow him in view of this new effort to republicanize the democratic party. He may have a fine head, and is unquestionably a man of brilliant parts, but it may be reasonably doubted that his heart is right with the people. Mr. Bryan is a man who, in intellect is the equal, if not the superior, of Senator Bailey, and it can not be doubted that his heart beats warmly and truly to the interests of the great masses of our country. Granting, therefore, that Mr. Bryan and Mr. Bailey are intellectually a standoff, it yet behooves the people to be with that one whose heart is right. Therefore, let the fight go on; with Senator Aldrich looking after the protected interests of the manufacturer of the north and east, and with Senator Bailey protecting the lumber king and the cattleman of the south and west, the great body of consumers of the American people will be willing with the utmost fidelity and trust to rest their case in the hands of their great commoner, Mr. Bryan, relying on him to do justice to all sections, without any endeavor to bestow special privileges upon one class as against the other.

OLD-TIME DEMOCRAT.

A NEW YORK PAPER'S VIEW

It is an unusual luxury for the Times to be able to praise the course of Mr. Bryan. But now that that gentleman is in Texas carrying on a brisk discussion with Senator Bailey, in which the former pleads for free raw materials and the latter contends that they are a proper subject for taxation, we acknowledge the unaccustomed luxury with gratification.

If this country employed duties on imports only for the purpose of obtaining revenue, a plausible plea could be made for the taxation of certain forms of such materials, but such taxation would have to be regarded frankly as a burden upon the industry of the country, which should be carefully apportioned with a view to distributing it fairly. And in no case could the rate of taxation justly be such as would unnecessarily increase the cost of such materials to the manufacturers for whose product they are requisite. Imported wool, for example, might, under such a system, be taxed to help meet the needs of the government, but it could not be taxed beyond the rate demanded for that purpose in order to enable the domestic wool grower to secure higher prices for his product. The tax, whatever it was, would inevitably be paid, with additions, by the wearer of woolen clothing, and there is no possible justification for burdening him in the interest of the wool manufacturer.

We understand that this simple doctrine is to the protectionist a snare and to the fattened beneficiary of tariff taxation a stumbling block. But to men of the democratic party, as Mr. Bailey pretends to be, it ought to be fundamentally sound and axiomatically clear. To Mr. Bryan it is, and in that respect Mr. Bryan is infinitely a better democrat than Mr. Bailey. Of course it is a misfortune for the party and for the country that organized opposition to the oppressive tariff should be hampered and weakened by the defection of prominent democrats like Senator Bailey and some other senators. But that is an unavoidable incident in the progressive demoralization worked by the use of the taxing power of the nation for private gain at the expense of the mass of the people. Once put the hands of the private interests in the treasury, or, worse, into the pockets of their fellow citizens, and the itching palms will keep grabbing more and more. Now when this is going on all over the country all the time it is impossible to keep the palms of democratic politicians cool. Immediate advantage is to be had from joining the tax-eaters, and their sense of higher duties, broader views, and great principles is dulled. That is what has happened in the case of Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Bryan is doing good service in combating his insidious and injurious influence. It is true that division in the ranks of the party is harmful, but when it arises from betrayal of the party principles the only remedy is the faithful maintenance of those principles by those who really believe in them until the conscience and intelligence of the party are rallied.—New York Times.