

POLITICAL

DEMOCRATS DISCOURAGE "MADE-IN-AMERICA" POLICY

Washington, Aug. 24.—(Special Correspondence.)—How one industry in this country has been walloped, due to the lack of plain American horse sense on the part of those gentlemen whom the country, in 1912, inadvertently empowered to dynamite our protective tariff wall, is aptly illustrated in an article appearing in a report published by the Department of Commerce. It is the tartaric acid and cream of tartar industry—products extensively used in the manufacture of baking powders, effervescent drinks, Seidlitz powders, etc. New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and California are largely interested in that industry.

Quoting from this article: "Imports of tartaric acid for the fiscal year 1914, amounted to 848,575 pounds, an dof cream of tartar to 812,857 pounds, figures that reveal a remarkable increase over the 78,942 pounds and 66,718 pounds, respectively, recorded for the previous year. This increased importation followed the tariff reduction that became effective in October, 1913."

Those figures may not look very startling to the layman, but a pound of such material goes a long way, and when it is said that the estimated manufacture in this country of tartaric acid is 3,000,000 pounds, the ratio of importation can be appreciated. This is what Mr. Underwood would call a "competing article."

The Harshaw Fuller & Goodwin Co., Cleveland, Ohio, testified that, according to their report, who for fifteen years was superintendent of the largest factory in Europe, the cost of building and equipping their factory was almost double that of a similar plant in France. And, further: "Our minimum wage is \$2 per day, and the average wage paid is \$2.80 per day. In the French factory, of which our superintendent had charge, the minimum wage paid was 3½ francs per day; the average was 4 francs, or a little less than 80 cents per day American money. In other words, the average daily wage in the French factory is less than one-third of the average wage in our factory. We would not object to a reduction of the present tariff on the finished goods, provided a corresponding reduction were made on the raw materials, but the parity between the two must be maintained."

A pertinent suggestion was offered by several California firms, who said: "No doubt you will agree with us that tariff provisions should not be enacted which, at best, can procure but a very slight reduction in cost for the ultimate consumer by destroying a domestic manufacturing industry, and with it the market for a domestic raw material, with consequent loss to American labor interested in both."

Did the ways and means committee heed this advice? Nary a heed. A bunch of Italian importers from New York City, subsidized by the Italian government and designed to promote the industries of Italy, called the Italian Chamber of Commerce, got in their good work, and the thirteen Democratic legal lights, whose oil came from the White House and whose wicks were trimmed by Oscar Underwood, adopted practically all the recommendations of this chamber. Our manufacturers were required to pay the old duty, 5 per cent, on the crude product, argol, the duty on cream of tartar was cut 50 per cent, tartaric acid, 30 per cent, and Rochelle salts, 17 per cent—the Democratic idea of a duty on crude materials for manufacture, and a tariff for revenue only, with resultant competition, on the manufactured product.

But the man who cuddles his Red Raven split the next morning, and the housewife who tempts his appetite with a batch of baking powder bis-

cuit, reap no benefit from the tariff law which handicapped a legitimate industry.

POSE AS FRIENDS OF TARIFF COMMISSION

With remarkable facility, Democratic leaders change front on important governmental questions and endeavor to delude the American people into the notion that they have always been advocates of the doctrines to the support of which they have been driven by public opinion. Preparedness is one instance and creation of a tariff commission is another.

After refusing to make adequate appropriations for the national defense and after declaring that the military branch of the government had not been neglected, the administration suddenly reverses its attitude and proclaims its intention to make preparedness an issue. If they are seeking for some one to quarrel with on that question, they must quarrel with their own past record. Now they announce an intention to make the creation of a tariff commission an issue. They forget that their own party has been the only opponent of a tariff commission and that such a commission would now be in existence but for their negative votes.

The Democratic party, with control of both houses of congress and the presidency, passed a tariff act in 1913. It had every opportunity to place in that act a provision for a tariff commission of any form or kind it might choose. The Democratic congress not only failed to incorporate in that law any provision for a tariff commission, but when, on September 6, 1913, Senator Works of California, Republican, offered an amendment providing for a tariff commission, that amendment was defeated, every vote for it being cast by a Republican and every vote against it cast by a Democrat. Later in the same day Senator Poin-dexter of Washington, Progressive Republican, offered a different amendment for the creation of a tariff commission, but it also was defeated. The roll call shows that every vote for the amendment was cast by a Republican and every vote against it was cast by a Democrat.

Not one of the Democratic senators offered a word of objection to the form or language of the amendment. The opposition was to a tariff commission in any form. Senator John Sharp Williams of Mississippi voiced what was apparently the opinion of the Democrats of the senate when he said:

"Mr. President, I wish to express briefly my opposition to a tariff commission. I think, in short meter, it is simply protection reduced to a science. Therefore, I do not see how Democrats can support it."

The unsatisfactory consequences of their tariff legislation may have convinced them that scientific protection would help restore the broken or ruined industries of this country, but their belated acknowledgment of their past ignorance will not inspire confidence in their future actions. A tariff commission created by them would be formed for the purpose of defeating rather than establishing protection to American labor and capital.

The Democratic party, both in its platform and its performances, is against either protection or a tariff commission. The Republican party has always stood for protection and in the tariff act of 1909 made an initial step in the direction of a tariff commission by creating a tariff board which the Democratic party discontinued.

There is need for a tariff commission as a board of intelligent ascertainment, but not clothed with such powers as may hamper, retard and destroy general business in this country. The members of such a commission should not be subservient to the president or any other one man. The commission should not have powers which could be used to favor one section of the country

or to reward friends or punish enemies. The powers of the board should be definitely prescribed and it should submit its reports to congress and through congress to the people of the country.

The net balance in the general fund of the national treasury dropped to \$58,431,490 during the week ending Saturday, August 14, compared with over \$130,000,000 two years ago. The deficit from July 1 to August 14 was \$24,711,866.

Imports entered at thirteen principal customs districts of the United States for the week ending August 7, 1915, were valued at \$34,294,000; duty collected thereon, \$3,432,000, an average ad valorem duty of 10 per cent, compared with an annual average ad valorem of 17.6 per cent for 1913, under Republican law.

The New York Times Annalist index number on wholesale prices of twenty-five leading articles of food for the first week in August, 1915, was 145.17, compared with 138.7 for the first week in August, 1913, under Republican law. The Index Number for the year 1914 was 146.7 compared with 139.98 for the year 1913.

Men and women of an earlier generation have a clear recollection of "blackstrap" molasses, a by-product of the manufacture of cane sugar. It was a common article of food half a century ago, but the children of today scarcely know it even by name. But the European war has suddenly created a large demand for it for use in making denatured alcohol, which, in turn, is used in making smokeless powder. A fifty per cent increase in the price of blackstrap has been a great help to cane sugar producers and has further impressed upon their minds the fact that the European war alone has saved them from the disastrous consequences of a Democratic tariff law.

'TWO SOULS WITH BUT A SINGLE THOUGHT'

"Mr. Carranza and the persons who co-operate with him are of the profound conviction that if the American government would know the true situation in Mexico it would understand that the only possible, just and acceptable solution would be to leave the revolution to follow its natural course until the complete victory of the party representing greater necessities and popularity."—Carranza's note to the Latin American conference.

"I hold it as a fundamental principle, and so do you, that every people has the right to determine its own form of government; and * * * 80 per cent of the people of Mexico never had a 'look-in' in determining who should be their governor or what their government should be. * * * It is none of my business, and it is none of your business, how long they take in determining it. It is none of my business, and it is none of yours, how they go about the business. The country is theirs. The government is theirs. The liberty, if they can get it—and God speed them in getting it—is theirs. And so far as my influence goes, while I am president, nobody shall interfere with them * * *. Have not European nations taken as long as they wanted and spilt as much blood as they pleased in settling their affairs? And shall we deny that to Mexico because she is weak? No, I say!"—Woodrow Wilson's speech at Indianapolis.

George W. Perkins has written a letter to the New York Evening Post denouncing what he calls "the Wilson tariff." But Mr. Perkins, by his plan to maintain the Progressive party organization, is the most potent support "the Wilson tariff" has. Which, however, is not saying much.