The Commoner.

drained of his earnings for the benefit of the manufacturer and the manufacturer now shows his ingratitude by selling abroad cheaper than at home.

Q. How has the tariff been maintained so long when it is wrong in principle, unwise in policy

and unnecessary?

A. The protected interests have contributed liberally to support literary bureaus and to campaign funds and have coerced their employes by the threat of shutting down. Advocates of protection have been able to organize, distribute literature and get out the vote, while advocates of tariff reform, as they could promise no special pecuniary benefits, have had to make their campaigns without funds. The advocates of protection have done much to corrupt public opinion by boldly teaching that the voter should use the ballot to advance his pecuniary interests. The manufacturer has been invited to vote dividends into his pocket, the wool grower has been solicited to vote himself a higher price for wool and the laboring man has been warned that a vote against protection would lower his wages.

Q. Is it true as often asserted by advocates of a high tariff that a high tariff always brings good times and that tariff reform always brings

a panic?

A. No. Prosperity followed the low tariff of 1846, and the panic of 1873 occurred under a high tariff. The panic of 1873 not only occurred under a high tariff but twelve years after the republican party came into power and eleven years before Mr. Cleveland's first election. The panic of 1893 occurred while the McKinley law was in force—a year before the Wilson bill was passed, and really began while the republican party was in power.

Q. Is there any evidence of growth in tariff

reform sentiment?

A. Yes. The farmers are no longer deceived by the home market argument, the employes no longer regard their wages as dependent upon the tariff and many manufacturers find the tariff more of an embarrassment than a benefit. Our exporters, too, are discovering that our tariff discriminations excite retaliation in other countries.

Q. When will the beneficiaries of protection

consent to tariff reduction?

A. Never. A child gets so old that it is ashamed to nurse; a calf gets so big that it will wean itself, but no beneficiary of protection ever voluntarily lets go of the public teat.

Q. When will the tariff be reformed by its friends.

A. Just after the money lenders ask for a re-

duction in the legal rate of interest—that is, just before the millenium. Q. To whom must we look for tariff reform? A. To those who suffer-no abuse was ever reformed by those who profited by the abuse to

be reformed. Q. When should tariff reform begin?

A. At once.

Q. And how? A. By putting on the free list those articles which compete with articles controlled by the trusts; second, by the reduction of the tariff on the necessaries of life, and, third, by such other changes in the tariff schedules as will put "protection for protection's sake" "in the process of ultimate extinction" with a view of restoring the tariff to a revenue basis.

WILL HISTORY REPEAT?

Mr. Roosevelt's speeches at the New York convention are examples of strength and vigor. They are probably the best illustrations of forensic oratory he has given. He had a good subject when he denounced the bosses in charge of the republican party; and a man needs a good subject for a great speech. But when Mr. Roosevelt endorses Mr. Stimson as the right man to reform New York he asks the people to accept his endorsement in lieu of a record. He did that in the case of Mr. Taft and the result is the largest revolt the republican party has known. Is he any more certain in regard to Mr. Stimson?

DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN BOOK

The democratic national congressional committee has issued its campaign book and is now distributing it. The committee has no funds save as it obtains them through contributions and is selling the book at \$1 per copy, or for 50 cents a copy in lots of ten or more.

The book is replete with valuable matter and is said to be the best campaign book ever issued. Every democrat should have it and in this year of democratic effort for supremacy should gladly contribute to the committee by purchasing the book. The committee did valiant service in

Maine with notable results, and if democrats everywhere will rise to the occasion, by their dollar contributions, the democratic sun will rise triumphantly-not to set for fifty years to come. Send your orders or contributions to F. F. Garrett, treasurer, democratic campaign committee, 821 Fifteenth street, Northwest, Washington, District Columbia.

ADDRESS OYSTER BAY

E. S. Richardson, M. D., Read City, Mich .-Relative to the inquiry of Dr. D. L. Cowden in last week's Commoner: I am pleased to say that information as to the construction of an Aeolian harp might be furnished by the contributing editor of the Outlook. The weird strains of music from this harp no longer has its charm on the public ear, and the bombastic musician will soon consign it to the republican political junk shop. Doctor, you can purchase it cheaply after election.

ROOSEVELT AND LAFOLLETTE PLATFORMS COMPARED

(From the Denver News)

The platforms of LaFollette and Roosevelt adopted yesterday by the republican state conventions of Wisconsin and New York, respectively, show many points of dissimilarity. The most notable lack of agreement between the progressives of Wisconsin and New York is seen in the Taft and tariff planks. Wisconsin mentions Taft only to disparage, and condemns the Payne-Aldrich tariff, while New York fulsomely praises both Taft and the tariff. Wisconsin demands the initiative, referendum and recall.

The salient features of the two platforms are shown below:

WISCONSIN

pernicious activity of

breweries in primary

Taft administration ex-

cept to disparage it.

tariff condemned.

elections.

mission.

praised.

10.

11.

primaries.

5.

1. Condemnation of

2. No mention of

3. Pavne - Aldrich

4. Special interests

Services of LaFol-

9. National control

12. Second choice

13. Physical valua-

19. Advalorem tax

tion of railroads and

more stringent regula-

lette in congress is

7. Regulation

women and children.

of natural resources.

working hours

in congress condemned

for suppressing inquir-

ies by country life com-

NEW YORK

1. War against graft.

2. Taft administration fulsomely praised.

3. Payne - Aldrich tariff praised as revision downward.

4. Congress commended. -

5. Courts praised. 6. Hughes' adminis-

tration praised.

7. Improving condition of laborers.

8. Encouragement of agriculture.

9. Conservation of rivers resources.

10. Prevention and cure of tuberculosis. 11. Prevention of

primary frauds. 12. Direct primaries.

13. 14.

19.

tion. 14. Federal ownership of Alaskan railroads. 15. Initiative, refer-15. endum and recall. 16. 16. Anti-lobby law. 17. Graduated in-17.

come tax. 18. 18. Home rule in liquor traffic.

on corporations. 20. 20. Employers' liability law.

00000000000000000000000

The American Homestead, a monthly 0 farm journal of national scope, will be sent to all Commoner subscribers, without additional cost, who renew their subscriptions during the month of Octo-0 ber. Take advantage of this offer at once and send in your renewal. 0

Practical Tariff Talks

In order to placate the public, angered over the iniquities of tariff schedules, the information is being disseminated that the president intends to force a revision of the woolen schedule at the coming session of congress, and will be buttressed in his stand for a reduction by facts and figures furnished him by his tariff commission. Just what guarantee the president can give the voters that the senate, after having this information in its possession, will act as he desires is not apparent. Practically all of the information that the tariff commission can give was laid before the senate by two eminent republican senators, Dolliver and LaFollette. The records of senate proceedings for the second and third weeks in June of 1909 contain many pages of facts and figures presented by these two protectionists, entirely justifying their demand for a lowering of the duties and a readjustment of the rates contained in the woolen schedule. Yet scarcely a paragraph therein was changed. The vote in each instance was decisive. The information presented by the two senators was comprehensive and authoritative. It might be supplemented by the work of the tariff commissioners, but their facts are incontrovertible.

The figures presented by Mr. LaFollette were gathered by a special agent of the department of commerce and labor, a bureau that, in fact, has a large mass of similar information relating to manufacturing costs that render unnecessary and duplicatory much of the work of the commission. The expert in this instance was W. Graham Clark, and his researches are printed in a comprehensive bulletin which anyone may get from the department named. Mr. Graham is a graduate of Harvard, and supplemented his general education with technical courses in textile schools, followed by actual experience as a mill manager. He traveled, in quest of this information, in all of the principal foreign countries where the textile industry is established. He was selected for the work on the recommendation of the textile manufacturers of this country, woolen and cotton both. His work, says Senator LaFoilette, was deemed highly satisfactory until he reported on the labor and other production costs of the woolen industry. After that he was a target for many attacks.

Mr. Clark gives a detailed analysis of the cost of production of eight typical samples of worsted and woolen cloths, and these Mr. La-Follette presented in detail to the senate-and they didn't change a single vote. Mr. Clark's tables show the wages in all countries and he gave as his deliberate opinion that the highest efficiency of labor was found in the United States. In presenting the matter to the senate Mr. LaFollette said that he would base his calculations on the theory that labor efficiency was the same in England as the United States. He worked out the cost of labor in England in each instance, and taking the figures of Mr. Clark that the average wage in the United States was twice as much as in England, he found the difference in labor cost to be 21.3 per cent on a high grade fancy worsted suiting, and approximately the same on the other samples. He added to this the compensatory duty allowed for shrinkage when the wool is imported by the American manufacturer, and found that the total duty ought to be, if the difference in cost of labor is to be the measure, 42.5 per cent, whereas the tariff law carries a protection of more than double, or 97 per cent.

The figures submitted by the Wisconsin senator as to the remaining seven samples showed the following to be the excess duty in each instance: No. 2, 52 per cent; No. 3, 54 per cent; No. 4, 56 per cent; No. 5, 49 per cent; No. 6, 44 per cent; No. 7, 63 per cent; No. 8, 55 per cent, an average for the eight of 53.8 per cent excessive duty. This was not the testimony of a man employed to bolster up any theory, nor from any prejudiced or biased person, but of a disinterested man employed by the government to secure truthful and trustworthy information. In view of the fact that this testimony was ignored and flouted by the senate majority and the old schedules re-enacted, with all of their excessive duties, may it not be pertinently asked, what will the same senate do with the information that the tariff commission presents?

C. Q. D.