a tax, five-sixths of which goes to a protected industry!

If the Post follows its own theory and favors a tax for revenue only it would not favor giving the protected industry so large a percentage of the total amount collected because of the tax.

If instead of paying the tax out of their own pockets the manufacturers transferred the taxes on raw materials to the consumers of manufactured products, then they must have collected from the consumer at least six times as much as the government collected from the taxes on hides.

Will the Post say that such a tax is in the interests of consumers? It complains that in taking the tariff off of hides that it became necessary to put a tax on something else. Does it not know that a tariff may be so high as to be prohibitory? Does it not know that a reduction in the tariff on a given article may result in an increase in the revenue? Take the tariff on the leather goods for instance: The tariff was so high under the Dingley law that we imported practically nothing in that line, and therefore the revenue from that source was insignificant.

A reduction of one-half in the tariff might result in the multiplication of the revenue from that tax. If the decrease in the tariff on leather, harness, boots and shoes does not bring an increase in imports and thus an increase in revenue, it will be because it is still prohibitive. A tariff of 10 per cent on leather goods might bring ten times as much as was collected last year from the duty on the leather goods imported.

Free hides, free leather, free boots and free shoes would prevent the collection of any revenue at all upon hides and the products of hides, but it would be easy to make up the deficit by a decrease in the tariff on such schedules where the tariff is not prohibitive.

The Post rushes to the defense of the tariff on iron ore. As this can not be explained by any Texas deposit of iron ore—for Texas' contribution to the production of iron ore is insignificant—it is due to its readers that it explains why it thus dares to array itself against Senator Culberson on this subject. How dare it dissent from Senator Culberson on this important proposition? Does the Post not know that the iron ore tax is indefensible from the standpoint of revenue? Does it not know that the steel trust asked for the tariff and that its representatives were at Washington endeavoring to secure it? What explanation can it give of its attitude on this subject? Is it that it prefers to side with one of its senators rather than with the other, or is it because it wants a tariff on some other raw materials, and to be consistent must demand a tariff on all raw materials? If it is consistency it seeks does it demand a tariff on oil also? It ought to devote a good deal of its time to the tariff on ore—it will take a good deal to answer the arguments that must arise in the minds of the readers of the Post.

It says: "The United States steel corporation does not sell iron ore to the independents, but does import ore for some of its Atlantic coast plants." Is it not strange that the Post should know better than the trusts what is good for the trusts? It attempts to convince its readers that the tariff on iron ore does not help the steel trust—then why did the steel trust ask for the tariff?

The Post says: "If the corporation does not sell ore, then the tax could not inure to its benefit, since the protection on its finished product is so high that the trivial duty on iron ore, the repeal of which was sought, could not possibly have affected the selling price."

Again the question arises, how is it that the Post knows more about the steel trust interests than the steel trust themselves know?

How chagrined the directors of the steel trust will be when they learn from the Post that they have been hurting themselves in their fight for a tariff on iron ore.

The Post further says: "On the other hand, the lower duty on its (the steel trust's) ore imported from Cuba and elsewhere is a distinct advantage to the corporation, in addition to its high protection on iron and steel products." Here again the Post would force upon the steel trust an advantage which it tries to avoid and the value of which it does not seem to understand.

The editor of the Post does not credit his readers with a large amount of intelligence when it asks them to believe that a tax on iron ore is a blow at the trust, and that free iron ore would be a boon to it. Surely the argument bag is empty if the Post is compelled to resort to such tommyrot to support a tariff on iron ore.

But the desperation of the Post is still further manifested when it says: "Whether he (Mr. Bryan) intends it or not, his argument is for further benefits to the already highly favored manufacturer, further tax burdens upon the masses and further discrimination against producers. And the manufacturers are welcoming Mr. Bryan's assistance in the effort to obtain these further favors, just as every rockribbed republican newspaper is doing."

Now let the colonel be half fair at least. He may be blind himself, from prejudice, but some of his subordinates in his office ought to caution him against such inexcusable and eggregious perversion of the truth. Who is copying republican arguments? Who is echoing republican arguments? Not Mr. Bryan—but the Post and those who believe with the Post.

Who is standing for a tariff on wool that is a part of the Aldrich law, was a part of the Dingley law and the McKinley law?

It was the Wilson bill that provided for free wool, and that was supported by the democratic party in the house and senate. Who takes the democratic position on this subject, and who the republican position?

Mr. Bryan is for free lumber—the Post is against it. The Post is defending the Aldrich bill schedule on this subject, and repudiating the last democratic national platform, and the position taken by every Texas congressman but one, and by the democratic congressmen who received six-sevenths of the votes cast for the democratic congressmen of the present congress. Which is the democratic position?

Mr. Bryan stands in his arguing for free hides, free leather, free harness, free boots and free shoes. If the Post is against it, it is opposing a position taken by all the democrats in both the senate and the house.

In its position on iron ore, the Post has the support of eighteen out of twenty-eight United States senators, but the Post can not get the written endorsement of the majority of the Texas congressmen for a duty on iron ore.

And as to the abstract question of a tariff on raw material: If the editor of the Post will read the Congressional Record, he will find that one of the republican senators put the question to a number of republican senators, and obtained from them all the declaration that the republican party did not stand for the doctrine of free raw material, and no recent republican platform has advocated free raw material. The democratic platform of 1902 specifically endorsed the doctrine of free raw material, and no democratic platform since has repudiated the doctrine.

So far as platforms go, the Post stands for the republican platform and the republican position, while Mr. Bryan defends the democratic platform and the democratic position.

The Post need not attempt to hide behind the 1896 and the 1904 national platforms, for the language upon which it relies is so ambiguous that no one could, with fairness, construe it as binding the democratic party to a tax on raw material, or as indicating a repudiation of the party's former position.

The Post says: "It is strange, isn't it, if Mr. Bryan is expounding democratic principles, to find his most consistent and potent allies will be the republicans and his most determined dissenters among men whose democracy has never been challenged?"

Isn't it strange that the Post should make an assertion of this kind? Isn't it strange that the Post would make such a statement without any facts upon which to base it? Now that its attention is called to the fact that it is absurdly false, will it confess that it is in error or will it try to support its position by finding a high tariff republican paper which commends the platform proposed by Mr. Bryan?

If the Post will submit to the papers that call themselves republican, the platform proposed by Mr. Bryan, it will not find one single republican paper of prominence which will endorse the tariff portion of that platform.

Some of the republican papers have had the courage to oppose the duty on iron ore, because the steel trust has a monopoly on iron ore, and some of the western republican papers have demanded free leather, free harness, free boots and free shoes, if hides are to be free, but what republican paper in good standing, can the Post name which has endorsed the plank of Mr. Bryan's proposed platform favoring "free wool, the abolition of the compensatory duties on woolens and a substantial reduction in the ad valorem rate on woolens?"

There are some papers which call themselves independent, which have commended Mr. Bryan's position in general terms, but so far as has come to the attention of The Commoner, no republican paper and no independent paper that supported the republican ticket, has specifically commended the platform which Mr. Bryan has presented for the consideration of democratic candidates for congress—but it has received the endorsement of the democratic papers and of the democratic voters—in fact it is merely a condensed expression of the views of the democrats of the nation.

The Post may be ashamed of its republican company. It is on republican grounds and must become accustomed to its republican environment, for it will have no other kind of company when the issue is properly understood.

THE TARIFF ON FARM PRODUCTS

The Dallas Times-Herald, one of the most outspoken of the Texas advocates of protection, falls very naturally into the protectionists' habit of misrepresenting those who favor tariff reduction. It says:

"Bread is the staff of life. Every sweatshop slave, every mill and factory peon in the east, every soul that ekes out an existence in rookery and tenement and toils for the Gadgrinds of society, must have bread or they must starve. Canada is a great wheat-growing country. Argentina is another. But there is no cheap bread for the sons and daughters of poverty who toil from dawn until dusk. There is a duty of 25 cents a bushel on wheat. Nebraska is a wheat-growing state and the Times-Herald insists upon Mr. Bryan placing wheat on his free list. With wheat on the free list Canadian wheat and Argentina wheat will come in free and there will be a chance for cheap bread. Farmers are not the only toilers under Old Glory."

It wants its readers to believe that Mr. Bryan favors protection on wheat, a Nebraska product, while asking that Texas products be placed on the free list. The fact is that Mr. Bryan favors free wheat and free flour. He has never made a speech or presented an argument in favor of a tax on either. They were not included in the brief platform which he suggested at Dallas because we export both and it is only in exceptional cases that either wheat or flour is imported.

The tariff on wheat is of no benefit to a Nebraska farmer and he would not be entitled to protection on wheat even if it was a benefit. Mr. Bryan has never advocated a protective tariff for any one. It is only in rare cases that a tariff does or can help the average farmer. The tariff on farm products is a "delusion and a snare." It has made some farmers think they were getting a "share" of the protective tariff. It would be better if there were no tariff on farm products and then all farmers would be likely to favor a reduction of the tariff on manufactured products. The republicans have favored a tariff on wool in order to induce wool growers to favor a high tariff in woolen goods. They have used the tariff on farm products (for the most part useless to the farmer) to induce him to consent to a burdensome tariff on what he buys.

THEN AND NOW—OUR NATIONAL SLIDING SCALE

Taxation of the many for the benefit of the few is robbery under the form of law.—The Commoner, August 27, 1909.

In days of old our sires were bold,
and held their heads up high. To
despots o'er the sea, we're told, they
sent a proud defi. Oh, prompt the word
that then was heard to voice their stout
intent: 'Twas "Millions for defense,"
they said; "for tribute, not a cent."

Today our backs to tariff tax we bend
most wondrous kind, with "living" kiting
to the sky, while wages lag behind. One
dollar goes to Uncle Sam, and nine to
"Deacon John." Gadzooks! what stuff,
this tariff guff, they stuff our voters on.

Then form a band throughout the
land; give time and money too, to guard
the pocket from the hand—the many
from the few. Alas, our time the long
year through is spent to earn the pence
helps pay the tribute millions due; we've
naught for self-defense.

MONTGOMERY MARLAND,
Lemon, South Dakota.