

"DOWNWARD" REVISION

Rising prices and new combinations in restraint of trade verify the warnings of the opponents of the Aldrich bill. The sham "downward" revision of the tariff is illustrated by the fact that since the bill was reported the value of the common stock of the steel trust to which the tariff privilege is a most important asset, has more than doubled. On February 1, it was worth \$210,000,000; today it is quoted at \$450,000,000. This fact shows how "hard the trust was hit." Another fact worth noting is that since the "downward" revision of the tariff began, the average price of commodities has risen 8 per cent, and the work of "protection" combinations has hardly commenced. The rise in wages has been so slight as to be negligible.—From circular issued by Tariff Reform Club, New York.

A Young Girl's Lesson

A California father showing his daughter how the high protective tariff increases the cost of living, points out that on a fifty per cent duty for every two thousand dollars worth of goods, the cost to the consumer is increased \$2,345.75. Of this amount only \$500 goes into the national treasury. In other words, the treasury gets only \$1.00 for every \$4.68 taken from the people.

Commoner readers will be deeply interested in the following letter written by Dr. L. A. Harcourt of Wheatland, California:

The Commoner of July 30, gave the tariff on thirteen different commodities, nearly all necessary to the comfort, health and happiness of every family in the land, and the duty on those thirteen articles of household necessity ranges from 58.83 to 165.42 per cent, the average being 92.61 per cent, dropping the extra decimals. This statement gives the consumer a faint, and only a faint, idea of how he is taxed for the benefit of others. The impression left on his mind is that the tax is nearly equal to the original cost of the article. This is true of the duty alone, but it is not true of the additional cost to the consumer, imposed through the duty. As a matter of fact, the price paid by the consumer is from three to six and, in some cases, ten times the original cost. A single concrete example will make this clear, and it may be said that one concrete fact will more clearly demonstrate the injustice of a protective tariff, than would a hundred, indefinite statements in the abstract.

To get that concrete fact let us take goods valued at \$1,000, purchased in any foreign country, and trace them to the consumer, showing all the additional cost that the consumer, in the last analysis, has to pay. The cost of transportation is omitted, because it can not be determined. Before submitting figures, let me make the broad statement that for every dollar a protective tariff brings to the coffers of the nation, from two to eight dollars are taken from the pockets of the people.

Some weeks ago the writer worked out the problem, not for publication, not to add to the literature of the subject, but to show his daughter how a protective tariff increases the cost of living, increases the cost of everything one eats, or drinks, or wears; of everything that one sleeps under or upon; of everything that enters into the construction of a house or barn, an agricultural implement, an automobile or a railroad, and into everything necessary for the equipment of any or all of them.

Assuming that the duty is 50 per cent—for some rate had to be assumed—the computation showed that for every one thousand dollars' worth of goods, foreign or domestic, the consumer has to pay \$3515.625, or \$1171.875 more than he would have to pay without the tariff. But as the consumption of domestic goods is equal to if not greater than that of imported goods, it follows that \$2,000 worth of goods, one foreign the other domestic, must be taken to find the ratio between the amount of duty paid and the amount of money taken from the people because of the tariff. Let it be understood that no duty is paid on domestic goods and no revenue derived from that source; but the duty on imported goods enables the manu-

facturer to increase their selling price to that extent, and the merchants have to pay it and finally the consumer with all the intervening profits added.

Under a 50 per cent tariff, the increased increment of cost to the consumer on \$2,000 worth of goods, one foreign, the other domestic, is \$2,343.75. Of this only \$500 finds its way into the national treasury, or one dollar for every \$4.68 taken from the people. A ninety-two per cent tariff would increase the cost to the consumer correspondingly, as will be shown farther on. For convenience in computation, the decimal .61 is omitted.

Cost to Consumer Under Tariff

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Rows include: First cost to importer (\$1,000), Duty, 92 per cent (920), Total cost to importer (\$1,920), Importer's profit, 20 per cent (384), Cost to jobber (\$2,304), Jobber's profit, 25 per cent (576), Cost to wholesaler, 25 per cent (\$2,880), Wholesaler's profit, 25 per cent (720), Cost to retailer (\$3,600), Retailer's profit, 25 per cent (900), Cost to consumer (\$4,500), Cost of \$1,000 worth imported goods to consumer (\$4,500), Of domestic goods (4,500), Cost of \$2,000 worth (\$9,000).

Cost to Consumer Without Tariff

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Rows include: Cost to importer (\$1,000), Importer's profit, 20 per cent (200), Cost to jobber (\$1,200), Jobber's profit, 25 per cent (300), Cost to wholesaler (\$1,500), Wholesaler's profit, 25 per cent (375), Cost to retailer (\$1,875), Retailer's profit, 25 per cent (468), Cost to consumer (\$2,343.75), Cost to consumer of \$1,000 worth imported goods (\$2,343.75), Of domestic goods (2,343.75), Cost of \$2,000 worth (\$4,687.50).

From the above figures it will be seen that, under a 92 per cent tariff, the difference in the cost of \$2,000 worth of goods to the consumer with and of \$2,000 worth without tariff, is \$4,312.50. Of this only \$500 is for revenue, or one dollar out of \$8.62 taken from the people. Do not these figures demonstrate the proposition that for every dollar of revenue a protective tariff brings into the national treasury, from two to eight are taken from the people? Any system of taxation that takes eight dollars from the consumer for one it brings into the treasury of the state, violates every principle of political economy as well as every principle of equity, honesty and fair dealing. It is a cunningly devised scheme to tax one man for the benefit of another, the many for the benefit of the few, and to enable the privileged few to appropriate to their own use the products of other men's labor without compensation. It ought to be abolished.

L. A. HARCOURT, M. D.

IOWA DEMOCRATS AND THE LIQUOR INTERESTS

This interesting editorial appeared in the Waterloo (Ia.) Times-Tribune, a democratic paper:

Coincident with the activity of the anti-saloon forces in Iowa comes the report that those who favor the saloon and regulation of it are to meet in various places in the state and give expression to their views. It may be said, therefore, that the campaign for resubmission of this great question has already begun in Iowa.

The brewers and liquor interests, through their control of the republican party in this state, have succeeded in keeping the question from going before the people up to this time. How long they can continue to hold the whip hand remains to be seen. Up to now the democrats have been counted the friends of the liquor interests. When matters which affected them were before the legislature it is recalled that those interests would count all the noses of the democratic legislators and then set about get-

ting sufficient republican support to make them secure. The democrats were counted as so many cattle. "They are all right, anyway. No use seeing them." And for a quarter of a century this has gone on.

The democrats have had, all through these years, to bear the burden. It has been known and branded as the "whisky party." It bore the odium of this in every campaign. And what did it receive? The worst of it all around. Temperance people flocked to the republican party; know ye, the democratic party could do them no good, being in the minority, therefore they saw to it that the majority party was given their help—secretly if possible, openly if necessary.

The worm is about to turn. The time has come when the democratic party must refuse to be considered under the thumb of the liquor element; the time has come when their representatives must refuse to be counted as so many cattle when there is dirty work to do. The liquor interests have been since Horace Boies' time conniving in the defeat of democrats. They defeated Claude R. Porter for governor, giving \$10,000 to the Cummins campaign fund, it is reported on good authority, in one lump, the money passing to a Cummins henchman at a meeting in Fort Dodge, and the work they did for Cummins in the campaign is known of all men who had to do with Mr. Porter's interests at that time.

The democratic party is a party of individual effort, of equal rights and opportunities, of personal liberty, and while this is true it must allow it to be known that it is not made up of a lot of cattle who can be driven about at the crack of the whip. The democratic party has always believed in majority rule. All the liquor legislation we have was given the state by the republican party. And yet the democratic is the "whisky party" While democrats believe in local option and local regulation, they want that local option by secret ballot and regulation under a police law. And right now it is the political duty of democrats to allow the liquor interests to fight out the matter of their preservation with the party they have been assisting to office. They should deal directly with their partners and close associates. The old game, the Times-Tribune hopes, is played out.—Waterloo Times-Tribune.

FAKING STUPIDITIES IN REGARD TO MR. BRYAN

That Daniel Kiefer was right when he asserted to the Cincinnati Times-Star his disbelief in the authenticity of an announcement of Mr. Bryan's candidacy for the presidency in 1912, purporting to come from Richard L. Metcalfe, associate editor of The Commoner, is shown by the unequivocal denial of the announcement which appears in The Commoner of January 28. Mr. Metcalfe quotes the candidacy announcement as it appeared in "the Cincinnati Enquirer and other newspapers," and says: "There is no truth whatever in this statement. It is a raw, unadulterated fake."—The Public, Chicago.

TWO DISCONSOLATE REPUBLICANS

"Tawney may succeed Cannon as speaker," says the New York Sun. We may safely list this among the possibilities that are by no means probable.—Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.) Then what's the answer? Champ Clark?—Sioux City, Ia., Journal (Rep.)

EVEN ON THE BIBLE!

Republican Tariff Responsible for 20 Per Cent Increase in Price of the Good Book

(Associated Press Report)

Chicago, January 30.—The price of Bibles will go up March 1, according to an announcement today by a large Bible publishing house which has branches in Cincinnati, Kansas City and San Francisco. The cause for the advance is the enforcement of the new tariff on imported leather and paper. "Bibles are now about 20 per cent higher than they have ever been before," said a member of the firm. "The materials for the best Bibles have gone up so high in price on account of the tariff that we can not afford to continue to sell our output at prices now listed."