THOUSANDS CHEER FOR DEMOCRACY

(Continued from Page One.)

tions fixed in the law, the maximum to be available to meet discriminations by foreign countries against American goods entering their markets and the minimum to represent the normal measure of protection at home, serve without excessive duties, that security against foreign competition to which American manufacturers, farmers and producers are entitled, but also to maintain the high standard of living of the wage-earners of this country, who are the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system.

"Between the United States and the Philippines, we believe in a free interchange of products, with such limitations as to sugar and tobacco as will afford adequate protection to domestic interests."

G. O. P. Scared, Yet Evasive.

Secretary Taft refers to this subject briefly in his notification speech—only briefly—but as I shall quote such passages from his speech as are pertinent to this discussion, it is not necessary to read his remarks in full.

It will be noticed that the Republican party has abandoned the earlier arguments advanced in support of a high tariff. We hear no more of the "Infant Industries," that must be tenderly cared for "until they can stand upon their feet"; there is no suggestion that the "foreigner pay the tariff," and nothing about the "home market." These catch phrases have had their day—they are worn out and cast aside. The Republican leaders are no longer arrogant and insolent; they cannot longer defy tariff reform. Their plan now is to seem to yield without really yielding.

I submit that the Democratic platform accurately described the Republican position when it refers to "the belated promise" made by the Republican leaders as "a tardy recognition of the righteousness of the Democratic position on this question." The Democratic party in its platforms and through its representatives in congress has for years pointed out that the tariff schedules are excessively high and ought to be reduced, but the Republicans have, until recently, refused to admit that there was any necessity for reduction. They now confess, through their platform and through their presidential candidate, that the need for revision is so great as to justify the party in declaring "unequivocally for a revision of the tariff" and the need is so urgent that the work is to be undertaken at "a special session of congress immediately following the inauguration of the next president." The use of the word "unequivocally" indicates that those who wrote the platform recognize that they are under suspicion. They want to distinguish this promise from the unkept promises of the past by adding as emphatic an adjective as could be found in the dictionary. If former Republican promises had been conscientiously fulfilled, it might not have been necessary to thus strengthen the promise made this year. The use of the words "immediately after the inauguration" is evidence that the Republican leaders are conscious that the patience of the public has been strained to the point of breaking, and it is almost pathetic to note the solicitude which they now feel about doing a thing which, but for wilful neglect might have been done at any time during the last ten years.

The Tariff's Appeal to Cupidity.

Are we not justified in saying that "the people can not safely entrust the execution of this important work to a party which is so deeply obligated to the highly protected interests as is the Republican party?" The "fat frying" process has become familiar to the American people. Pressure has been brought to bear upon the protected interests every four years—and to a less extent in the congressional campaign between presidential elections—to compel contributions to the campaign fund in return for former favors and in anticipation of favors yet to come. It is difficult to overestimate the corrupting influences introduced into the political life of the nation by this partnership between the government and the favored industries. The literature circulated in support of a protective tariff has studiously cultivated the idea that suffrage should be employed to secure pecuniary returns, and the appeal made by the Republican leaders has come to be more and more a selfish one. Every man engaged in a protected industry has been approached with the proposition that it is dollars in his pocket to maintain the system, while those who could not possibly trace any tangible benefits to themselves have been beguiled with the assurance that it was all a matter of public spirit, and that they ought to support the system out of patriotic love of country. If attention was called to the fact that the farmer was taxed for the benefit of the manufacturer, the triple answer was that it would come back to him indirectly; that it did not amount to much for each farmer anyhow; and that a man was small minded who would begrudge so insignificant a contribution to the nation's prosperity. The plan has been to keep the taxpayers quiet by keeping them in the dark as to the operation of the law, and then to concentrate the votes and influence of the taxeaters in favor of a continuation of high tariff legislation. If a tariff of 50 per cent was imposed upon a given article of merchandise it was assumed that those engaged in the production of the article would contribute liberally to keep up the tariff. It was also assumed that the employes would vote with their employers to keep from having their wages reduced, and it was expected that the business men of the town would also join for the tariff because of the business brought to the community by the protected industry. Those who are acquainted with the tariff fight know to what an extent the pecuniary argument has been used. The recent Republican platform is a bugle call to every beneficiary of special privilege to enlist again under the Republican banner, and when the election is over and the Republican committee publishes the list of contributors—too late to make the information valuable—it will be found that the Republican party has again obligated itself to the protected interests as to be unable to make a revision in the interests of the consumers.

Responsibility for Failure to Act.

With a president who, toward the close of his term, admitted the necessity for tariff revision, with a two-thirds majority in the senate and nearly 60 majority in the house, the Republican party has refused to permit any revision whatever. Mr. Williams, the leader of the minority in the house, introduced a bill providing for a reduction of the tariff to [illegible] per cent wherever it is now more than [illegible] per cent. It would look like the Republican party might have taken this step toward tariff revision had it been deeply in earnest; but no, the bill was not even reported from the committee. Whenever attention was called to an indefensible schedule, the answer was that they could not afford to open the subject for debate just before a campaign; but there is no force in this objection, because the house rules are so framed that the majority can cut off debate, prevent amendment and silence opposition.

The administration has claimed credit for the fine against the Standard Oil company in the case which was lately reversed, but no effort has been made to relieve the people from the fine which is imposed upon them every day by the Standard Oil company through the operation of the tariff law which gives that company more than [illegible] per cent protection against its chief rival, Russia. What faith can a real tariff reformer, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, repose in the Republican leaders, when they deliberately put off all reduction until after election, and then call for contributions with the understanding that the public shall not know the names of the contributors until after the polls are closed?

A Challenge to the Fat Fryer.

The Republican platform says that the tariff is intended for the American manufacturers, farmers and producers and especially for the wage earners. If the farmer and the wage earner are really the chief beneficiaries of the protective system, will the Republican candidate explain why the farmer and the wage earner have contributed so little to the Republican campaign fund? Is he willing to publish a list of contributors on the 1st day of next October and allow the relative advantage of protection to the manufacturer, the farmer and the wage earner to be measured by the contributions received from each class? Why is it that the manufacturers are expected to furnish so large a proportion of the money to run the campaign, if, as the Republicans claim, the farmers and the laborers enjoy so large a proportion in the benefits of the system? Is it not a significant fact that the farmers and wage earners who are always put in the foreground when the blessings of a high tariff are being enumerated are in the background when the collections are being made? Is it not significant that the manufacturers, who furnish the funds are so little advertised as beneficiaries? Is it not significant also that the wage earners, instead of the manufacturers, are always described as "the most direct beneficiaries of the protective system?"

Shall Satan Rebuke Sin?

But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Republican party sincerely repents of its delay in beginning tariff reform, repudiates its obligations to the contributing manufacturers and honestly begins a "revision." What rule is to govern the revision? The Republican platform says:

"In all tariff legislation, the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, together with a reasonable profit to American industries."

Mr. Taft indorses this rule and says that "in a number of schedules the tariff now exceeds this difference and that the excess offers a temptation to those who would monopolize the production and sale of such articles in this country." He adds, however, that "there are some few articles on which the tariff is not sufficiently high to give them the measure of protection they should receive."

Will he explain upon what rule the present tariff was framed? When have the Republicans claimed more protection than enough to cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad? The "reasonable profit to American industries" is an addition to the rule, and is likely to be used as an excuse for raising the tariff. And, by the way, to what other business does the government guarantee a "reasonable profit"? To the farmer or the merchant or the laborer? To none of these. If in revising the tariff the Republican party is to work upon exactly the same plan (or a plan contemplating a higher rate), what hope have we that the new tariff will be lower than the present one? Are the present leaders more honest than the ones who framed the existing tariff? Are they not, in fact, the same men who are responsible for tariff extortion during the last decade? If this new-born zeal for revision were an hundred times greater than his notification speech indicates, what chance would the Republican candidate have of securing any real tariff reform at the hands of such Republicans as now represent that party in the senate and house, the very men who represented it in the recent national convention? Speaker Cannon who has suppressed tariff legislation in the present congress, was a dominating factor in the convention and, if the Republicans retain control of the house, will be the speaker of the next congress. Does his prominence afford tariff reformers any assurance of a reduction of the tariff in the interest of the consumers? In case of a Republican victory, Congressman Sherman will become the presiding officer of the senate. He has been the confidential companion of Speaker Cannon and in the convention it was Speaker Cannon who vouched for him. But as a matter of fact, Mr. Sherman's standpatism needed no indorsement; his record is a guaranty that no beneficiary of special privileges will be disturbed. It was Congressman Sherman who, in a speech in the house on the 18th of last April boastfully declared, "We recognize the fact that we have a Republican majority in this house, that is ready to resort to every legal, every proper constitutional right to enact such legislation as it deems for the best interest for the greatest number of our people, and which is willing and ready to accept full responsibility for all those measures which are introduced here and which are not enacted into law."

False to Blaine and McKinley.

The Republican platform suggests that there should be a maximum tariff and a minimum, the maximum to be used in retaliation and the minimum in ordinary cases. This is merely adding delusion to procrastination and uncertainty. We have prominent Republican authority, Senator Dolliver and Senator Hanna, to prove that in the present law the rates were knowingly made higher than necessary with the understanding that reductions would be made to secure foreign trade. Mr. Dolliver said in the senate on January 12, 1903: "It is true that in the bill which he (Mr. Dingley) reported from the committee on ways and means he did put duties up for the express purpose of having them traded down."

Mr. Dolliver insisted that the reciprocity provision in the Dingley act was as distinctly a part of the tariff policy as the coal schedule and complained that "not one line of the wisdom of James G. Blaine remained on the statute books," and that "not a step had been taken to fulfill the purpose of the last Buffalo address of President McKinley." And yet the very men who present this new plan prevented the carrying out of the old plan.

"Interests" Write Tariff Laws.

The schemes resorted to by the men who have grown rich by laying tariff burdens upon the country are more numerous than novel. Tariff measures which embody the principles of protection are not drawn by legislators, although as a matter of courtesy they generally bear the names of legislators. They are really drawn by the representatives of the interests which demand protection. These representatives claim to be the guardians of the [illegible] men, and yet they carefully avoid writing into the law anything that would require the guardians to execute the trust. [illegible]

The Parable of the Will.

In ordinary affairs there is no difference [illegible] business [illegible] they apply the same [illegible] rules. This similarity [illegible] life and up to the very hour of death. If a protectionist makes a will he makes it upon the same plan that the tariff reformer follows. As death approaches he estimates the value of his property, leaves to his wife and children what he wishes them to have, and then makes such bequests as he likes to public institutions and to friends. [illegible] No, he would not trust his own flesh and blood to deal fairly with [illegible] reared at the same fireside with him; and he is wise in [illegible] this temptation between one of his family. But when a protectionist comes to make a tariff law he acts on an entirely different plan. He votes millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to manufacturers whom he has never seen, and trusts them to be just in the distribution of the trust fund among their employes. And what has been the result? Just what might have been expected—the manufacturers have appropriated the trust fund to their own use and have paid their employes only such wages as trade conditions compelled.

Tariff's Relation to Wages.

The Homestead strike occurred after the Republican convention of 1892 but before the Republican candidate wrote his letter of acceptance. He could not ignore the strike, for it presented an object lesson which even a high tariff Republican could not fail to see. So Mr. Harrison, the candidate, referring to the strike, said:

"I regret that all employers of labor are not just and considerate and that capital sometimes takes too large a share of the profits."

Too large a share of the profits? Yes, more than that. The protected manufacturers have secured in many cases a tariff of more than twice the percentage paid to workmen in wages. The net profits of the steel trust last year were just about equal to the entire amount paid in wages, and the wages constituted less than 25 per cent of the total value of the product. According to this statement, each working man employed by the steel trust earned, on an average, not only the amount paid to him, but 100 per cent profit besides for his employer. And, I may add, while these beneficiaries of protection have been pretending to make the tariff laws for the direct benefit of the employes, these same employes have, as a rule, been kept close to the hunger line, while many of the employers have become the possessors of the "swollen fortunes" which now menace the nation's morals as well as its business.

And yet the Republican party was not willing that a single item on the steel schedule should be touched and the Republican campaign committee will not dare to publish, before the election, the contributions that have been made or will be made to the Republican campaign fund by the men most largely interested in the steel trust.

Confession of a Trust Magnate.

Let me show you how the tariff operates. I have here a statement made by H. E. Miles, chairman of the tariff committee of the National Association of Manufacturers and head of the agricultural implement trust. The statement appears in the American Industries of November 15, 1907, a paper which is now supporting the Republican ticket and making a special fight against the labor plank of the Democratic platform. Here is what Mr. Miles says:

"I have made money every year out of the tariff graft. Not much, but still a little.

"The tariff barons raised their price $50,000 to me. I made a charge against the jobber of $60,000 and I know that he charged more than $70,000 for the $60,000 he paid me. Before reaching the consumer the $50,000 charge became about $100,000 to be paid by the agricultural consumer.

"The manufacturer who would prosper must make a double profit, one by the shrewd management of his business and another by still shrewder manipulation in Washington.

"We have no great difficulty in shopping abroad for we could get as high prices as at home. We are so held up, however, by our supply people that to most of us there is very scant profit in foreign business.

"When congress gave us 45 per cent, we needing only 25 per cent, they gave us a congressional permit, if not an invitation, to consolidate, form one great trust and advance our prices 25 per cent, being the difference between the 20 per cent needed and the 45 per cent given."

Mr. Miles shows how the tariff raises prices to those who, in manufacturing, have to buy other manufactured products. This expense is transferred to the next purchaser. The jobber charges a profit on the tariff as well as on the cost of the article, and each person who handles the product collects a profit, so that, according to Mr. Miles, the first charge of $50,000 becomes $100,000 by the time it reaches the consumer.

Mr. Miles in another article estimates the total loss to the people at $500,000,000 annually. The statement of Mr. Miles also shows that the tariff law is an invitation to consolidate, and that having been given the tariff on the theory that it is needed, the manufacturers naturally assume that it is intended that they shall take advantage of it, even if they have to combine to do so.

How will Mr. Taft explain to the average man the benefits of protection? He can easily convince a trust that it profits by the tariff, but what about the victim of the trust?

"Reform by Its Friends."

No Republican leader will now deny that reductions ought to be made, but who is to make the reductions? The only answer given by the Republicans is that the tariff ought to be reformed by its friends that is, that those who made the last tariff law should be entrusted with the making of a new tariff law. But suppose the people adopt the Republican idea and entrust the making of the tariff law to Republican congressmen; what will be the method of procedure? Fortunately for the voter Mr. Miles explains this also. In the April, 1908, number of American Industries Mr. Miles says: "The people instruct and trust congress to grant just, equitable and ample protection."

The Trusts' O. K. on Everything.

Is not that just what the Republican leaders claim to favor? They want you to "instruct and trust congress to grant just, equitable and ample protection." And what does that mean? Mr. Miles says that congress "trusts the ways and means committee." And a Republican leader will tell you that this is also proper. Then what? Mr. Miles says that "this committee trusts such persons as Mr. Dalzell," and that "they—they trust the trusts."

The method of procedure is simple. It is a case of confidence. The voters have confidence in Republican leaders; the leaders have confidence in a Republican congress, a Republican congress has confidence in the ways and means committee, the ways and means committee has confidence in the men who represent the trusts, and the trusts write the tariff law and thus secure to themselves the right to levy tribute upon the public. So accustomed have Republican leaders become to allowing the protected interests to write the tariff schedules that so eminent and [illegible] a man as Senator Hoar of Massachusetts said, in discussing the McKinley bill, then before the senate: "Instead of coming before your committee for a formal hearing on our Massachusetts industries, I thought the best way was to carefully prepare [illegible] the various industries [illegible] some 50 or 70 in all, and ask [illegible] to go over them with [illegible]

[illegible]

Trust Articles on Free List.

There is no prospect of relief from a Republican president and congress. The Democratic party [illegible]

The Democratic platform [illegible] demands a reduction of the tariff [illegible] It begins by promising 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.

Riddance of Trusts Is Meant.

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, 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.

The Colossal Timber Graft.

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 Minnesota way, in Washington the other day, and they were sitting in Senator Burrows' 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 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?

Reduction On Necessaries.

The second step in the reduction of the tariff is a "material reduction upon the necessaries 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 valorum, 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 over-burdened, 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 with the manufacturers of [illegible] does not need a high tariff to meet competition in the home market, and there are enough articles sold abroad at a lower price to assure a large advantage to the American consumer through the carrying out of this plank.

Graduation at Revenue Basis.

[illegible]

Bulk of Tax to the Collector.

[illegible] 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.

Paying Industries Support Nonpaying.

As a tariff law interferes with the natural laws of trade, one who proposes a protective tariff takes upon himself the burden of proof to show, first, that a protective tariff is right in principle; second, that it is wise as a public policy, and, third, that it is necessary. And, yet, what protectionist attempts to present an argument in support of any one of these propositions.

Is it right to tax all of the people for the benefit of a few? Where a community has attempted to collect taxes for the aid of an industry, even when the industry was to be located in the community, the highest court in the land has declared such a tax to be larceny in the form of law. If a city government can not rightfully tax all the people to bring an industry into the city, where such benefits as are conferred are more easily seen and more universally enjoyed, who will say that a farmer in the Missouri valley can be rightfully taxed to support an industry in a distant state.

As a matter of public policy, is it wise that the industries that do pay should be compelled to carry upon their backs industries which, according to the arguments made by their representatives, could not live without aid? Have we not seen this system introducing corruption into politics, and is it not building business upon an unsubstantial basis? Having secured a tariff from one party, the beneficiaries loudly declare that the country will be ruined if any other party obtains control of the government.

The Employment Bribe.

"Manufacturers have intimidated their employes and threatened them with a reduction in wages unless a party favorable to the system was continued in power. This is an old device, and there are indications that it is being resorted to again. The New York Leather Belting company has sent out a number of letters to companies with which it has business dealings, asking them to post in their factories a notice saying:

"Believing that the election of Taft and Sherman means a safe and conservative administration, the day following the election we shall start this plant on full time and keep going."

Here is a direct attempt to influence the election by a bribe. It is virtually a promise of wages if the Republican ticket is successful and an implied threat in case of Democratic success; but the offer is so made that it gives the employes no guaranty of its fulfillment. The same kind of promises were made in 1896, and yet for six months after the election times were worse than they were before. There were business failures and bankruptcies, and many institutions that promised their employes steady work and good wages, shut down or reduced wages. If any factory posts up the sign which the Leather Belting company is sending out, the employes ought to get together and ask for a guaranty as to the amount of the wages they are to receive and as to the length of time during which the guaranty is to extend. If the votes are to be bought, the purchase price, at least, should be made secure. If the employes' heritage—citizenship—is to be sold, he ought at least to be sure of his mess of pottage.

Business on Its Own Basis.

But the whole system is vicious. Business should not be built upon legislation. It should stand upon its own merit, and when it does stand upon its own merit we shall not only have purer politics, but we shall have less fluctuation in business conditions and a more equitable distribution of the proceeds of toil.

I can not pass from this part of my subject without calling attention to the fact that Secretary Taft has allowed himself to be drawn into the use of an argument which the beneficiaries of protection have been employing for a generation. Speaking of the gradual substitution of a revenue tariff for the protective system, he says in his notification speech:

"The introduction in power of a party with this avowed purpose cannot but halt the gradual recovery from our recent financial depression and produce business disaster, compared with which our recent panic and depression will seem small indeed."

Here is a threat of a panic if the Republican party is not retained in power. This panic argument was worked overtime in 1896, but I am surprised that a Republican refers to it in the present campaign.

The Panics Considered.

We have had three panics since the Republican party was born: the panic of 1873, the panic of 1893 and the panic of 1907. The panic of 1873 came after the Republican party had been in complete control of the federal government for 12 years, and 11 years before our party succeeded in securing control of the executive branch of the government. The startling "panic and depression" of 1873 occurred in the very midst of Republican rule, just after a Republican victory, and under a high tariff. Is it not strange that Secretary Taft should forget this panic when he warns us to beware of any departure from the protective system?

The panic of 1907 came after the Republicans had been in complete control of the federal government for more than 10 years. They had had an opportunity to do everything that they wanted to do and to undo everything that needed to be undone, and we were under such a high tariff that even Secretary Taft admitted the necessity of revision. This panic was so bad that banks felt it necessary to do something that they had never done before, namely, arbitrarily limit the amount of money that depositors could draw on their own accounts. Ex-Secretary Shaw says that the stringency of 1907 was "the severest the world has ever witnessed." With this [illegible] in his mind, is it not strange that [illegible] argue that his election is [illegible] to prevent a panic?"

Really a Republican Panic.

[illegible]

Is the Tariff Necessary?

[illegible] and the list could be extended indefinitely.

For 25 years the American working man has been told that he receives higher wages than the English workman solely because of protection, but our wage earners now know that this cannot be due to protection, because the English workman receives higher wages than the German workman, although the German tariff is higher than the tariff of Great Britain.

Protection does not make good wages. Our better wages are due to the greater intelligence and skill of our workmen, to the greater hope which free institutions give them, to improved machinery, to the better conditions that surround them, and to the organizations which have been formed among the wage earners.

No Panic in Revenue Tariff.

A revenue tariff will not bring a panic. It will not inaugurate industrial depression; it will not reduce wages; on the contrary, it will stimulate business and give more employment, and a larger demand for labor will be a guaranty against the reduction of wages. A reduction of the tariff will reduce the extortion that is now practiced because of the high schedules, a reduction in price will enable more people to buy, and this larger demand for the goods will put more people to work and increase the number of industries. A lower price will greatly stimulate exportation, and manufacturers who are now crippled by a tariff upon what they use will be better prepared to enter the contest for supremacy in the world's trade.

We cannot hope to invade foreign markets to the extent we should, until we relieve our manufacturers of the handicap that protection places upon them in the purchase of materials they have to use. Neither can we hope to continually increase our exports without increasing our imports. Trade must be mutual if it is to be permanent. President McKinley recognized this, and in the last speech that he made he pointed out that we must buy from other nations if we expect to sell to other nations.

No Cessation of Prosperity.

The Democratic plan does not contemplate an immediate change from one system to the other; it expressly declares that the change shall be gradual, and a gradual change is only possible where the country is satisfied with the results of each step taken.

(Continued on Page Three.)

BEWARE OF IMITATIONS

Cheap Substitutes and "Just As Good As"

Unscrupulous dealers, mindful only of profit and caring nothing for the health of their patrons, are offering for sale low-grade, impure whiskey, which they tell you is as "good as Duffy's."

It is a cheap concoction and fraud, intended to deceive the people. Of course, when a remedy has been before the public so long, has been prescribed and used by the best doctors and in all the prominent hospitals, and has carried the blessing of health into so many thousands of homes as Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey has, imitations are bound to arise. But they can imitate the bottle and label only—no one can imitate the contents.

Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey is an absolutely pure distillation of malted grain; great care being used to have every kernel thoroughly malted, thus destroying the germ and producing a predigested liquid food in the form of a malt essence, which is the most effective tonic stimulant and invigorator known to science; softened by warmth and moisture, its palatability and freedom from injurious substances render it so that it can be retained by the most sensitive stomach.

Any firm that will sell imitation or substitution goods will sell impure goods. The firm that is dishonest in one thing would not hesitate to be dishonest in another. Whenever you see imitation and substitution goods offered for sale by a firm, beware of anything and everything put up by that firm. You endanger your own life and the lives of your family and friends by dealing with them.

BEWARE OF FRAUDS!

Duffy's Pure Malt Whiskey

is sold in sealed bottles only—never in bulk. A facsimile of the genuine bottle is printed here so that you may easily recognize it. It is our own patented bottle—round, amber colored and with the name "Duffy Malt Whiskey Company" blown in the glass. The trademark—the Old Chemist's Head—is on the label, and over the cork there is an engraved paper seal. Be certain this seal is not broken.

It is the only whiskey recognized by doctors everywhere as a family medicine. At all druggists, grocers, dealers, or direct. $1 a bottle.

Write Consulting Physician, Duffy Malt Whiskey Co., Rochester, N. Y., for free illustrated medical booklet and free advice.

PORTLAND RAILWAY, LIGHT & POWER COMPANY

BULLETIN NO. 11

INCANDESCENT LAMPS—THEIR USE AND ABUSE

"The value of electrical energy, as furnished to a consumer, is not proportional alone to the amount of energy as measured by an electric meter, but is dependent upon various other factors, including the efficiency with which the electrical energy can be transformed or translated into other useful forms. The consumer uses electrical energy for securing light, heat and mechanical power, and for the transformation into these more directly useful forms various translating devices are employed. The adequacy of the service is dependent in large measure upon the efficiency of these translating devices.

"For the production of illumination, translating devices include various forms of lamps, such as the carbon filiment incandescent lamps, the tantalum and tungsten incandescent lamps, Nernst lamps, mercury vapor lamps and the numerous types of arc lamps. For the production of mechanical power, motors of various kinds are employed, and for electrical heating, the translating devices comprise various forms of resistances.

"The amount of illumination which can be secured from a given amount of electrical energy consumed in the ordinary type of incandescent lamp depends upon the design of the lamp and the materials and processes used in its manufacture, upon the voltage at which it is designed to operate, the voltage at which current is supplied to it, its period of service, the cleanliness of the outer surface of the glass bulb, as well as upon various other factors.

"The ultimate life of an incandescent lamp may be expressed as the number of hours during which it will continue to give illumination, this period being unusually terminated by a burning away or rupture of the filament. It is recognized as exceedingly bad practice to allow lamps to remain on circuit until this point has been reached, since the deterioration in efficiency will have become such as to make it uneconomical of operation. It is better practice, and one more commonly prevailing, to express the life of a lamp as the number of hours at which it will operate at normal voltage before its efficiency falls to a value below 80 per cent of the efficiency of the lamp when new. This length of life, as commonly attained in the better grades of carbon filament lamps now manufactured, is in the neighborhood of 600 hours, and to allow a lamp to burn longer than that period usually results in what might be termed inadequate or uneconomical service due to excessive deterioration.

"One of the most common causes of poor service is due to the operation of incandescent lamps after they have depreciated below 80 per cent of their original efficiency.

"It is a fact not sufficiently recognized that the accumulation of dust, oil and dirt on the outer surface of an incandescent lamp will materially reduce its efficiency, and many instances exist where the illumination may be increased from 5 to 10 per cent by cleaning the globes.

"One of the most serious causes of inadequate service is insufficient size of the wires installed in buildings, causing a reduction of the voltage. This may result from poor design or false economy in the original installation, but in many instances is due to the growing demand for more current than the original installation of wiring was intended to provide for. Poor electric service may result from such inadequate wiring, even though the company may supply a satisfactory voltage to the inlet of the building. It appears to be universally true that the electric company is not directly responsible for such interior wiring."

From Report of Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, July, 1908.