

"Well!" ses I. "What we goin' to do about it?"

"Remonstrate," ses Tomkins. "Send a hundred carloads o' angry farmers to Washington with banners inscribed, 'No Free Trade in Meat. Let the People Eat Cake. Give Us Our Share o' Protection.' Scare the Democrats so they won't sleep for a month."

"All right, Tomy," ses I. "I'll subscribe to that if they'll label the banners, 'Give Us Our Share o' the Plunder.' An' then I'll ask them that's carryin' the banners, 'What's the matter of our live stock market now? Why have prices dropped off two dollars a hundred in the last year? Why don't your blame protection work regular like, an' not balk in the harness whenever the weather is propitious for good crops an' we have something to sell? Why don't your blame protective tariff keep prices up all the time, an' not let us down about the time we get a good lot o' stuff on hand we want to cash in?' Yes, sir! Them's some o' the things I want to ask the fellers that carry the banners. An' then I'll whisper in the ears o' them Democrats, 'Give us a little more o' that free trade. Try it on the wool an' sugar. Maybe we won't be so worse off after all.'"

Then I laughed at Tomkins agin.

GEO. V. WELLS.

* * *

KENT OF CALIFORNIA.*

First Speech in Congress of William Kent, Republican. Made in the Debate on the Farmers' Free List Bill, April 28, as Reported in the Congressional Record, pages 698-700.

Mr. Underwood. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Kent].

The Chairman. The gentleman from California [Mr. Kent] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. Kent. Mr. Chairman, we novices in the art or profession of manufacturing Federal law, subject, of course, to revision by the Senate, the President, the Supreme Court, and the powers above, have eagerly absorbed what has been said and have learned much that can not possibly be true. How could it all be true when judged by the votes on the reciprocity treaty and by the explanations given for those votes? There is no consensus of opinion on either side of the House, even amongst the most experienced and tutored, as to the causes or probable effects of that measure.

In so far as the discussion relates to the protective tariff theory, there is, however, some unanimity on one point, at least a partial agreement that the protective tariff should be regarded as a "local issue." That this particular national policy must be wrought out of the clash of class, section, district, and other special interests, and settled by a sort of mutual give-and-take, less euphemistic-

ally known as log-rolling. This makes of the tariff a sort of a grab bag, and we may reasonably expect that the more powerful get the first, last and biggest grabs.

I am a Republican, or what used to be a Republican [applause on the Republican side], because I believe in the protection of infant industries 'that stand some eventual chance of becoming self-sustaining. That many of these industries, once fostered by protection, are now self-sustaining and do not need a protective tariff is abundantly shown and notoriously confessed as to the great steel industry by Mr. Andrew Carnegie. Many industries, having outgrown the cradle, have not been required to hustle for their livelihood, but have been carried bodily to a ward in the hospital where our standpat friends advocate keeping them during all eternity, to be doctored, nursed, and nourished at the public expense.

It is argued that by taxing one industry for the benefit of another industry, and vice versa, we create a home market that is productive of wealth. This brings to mind a story told by David Starr Jordan concerning the eagle and the blue-tailed lizard. It seems that the eagle one day swooped down upon the lizard and bit off and ate the lizard's tail; whereupon the eagle acquired sufficient energy to lay an egg. The lizard climbed the tree, sucked the egg, and, through the encouragement thus afforded, grew a new tail. This process continued through many years, apparently, without much profit to either party save as it added to the interest of existence. [Laughter.]

A tale of similar import, but more profitable sequence, was related of a man who lived near the Petaluma marshes and started to raise carp. He was doing fairly well selling carp from his pond, when he suddenly conceived the idea of raising a side line of cats for the fur. He discovered that he could feed the carp to the cats and the cats to the carp, so that he increased mightily in his output of cats and carp and became wealthy. [Laughter.]

I have learned, Mr. Chairman, that it is customary to decorate the oratory of this floor with fruits, with flowers, with flags, and with farmers in various states of happiness and misery. [Laughter.] I respectfully submit a poem produced by a laureate of my district and which concerned itself with the tariff speeches of my esteemed opponent at the primaries:

I read these tariff speeches o'er—the more I read of them the more I do not know, but then I can rely upon our Congressman. Upon the very slightest hint he puts a red-hot speech in print, and when he prints that speech, you see, he has it mailed out here to me.

Mac makes it very clear just how if I pay more than I do now for socks and gloves and baby's dress—while I pay more they cost me less. And then he shows me where I lose by paying somewhat less

*See The Public of December 16, 1910, p. 1192.

for shoes, for though I pay less than before, my shoes they really cost me more.

He makes it clear to me that what I lose I gain, you see; and on such things as clothes and shoes I seem to gain but really lose. Thus, if I buy my socks too low, they'll still be higher—Dunc says so—and shoes I thought were high last fall were really low shoes after all.

[Laughter.]

Mac says if I pay less for shoes or hats, the maker has to lose. And if he loses, then, you see, he charges up the loss to me. Now, when I have to pay him more, he reckons profits to his store, and Duncan finds a share for me in all of this prosperity.

The speeches shed a radiant light upon the theme and make it bright; I merely read them o'er and o'er to find more's less and less is more. In buying hat, or coat, or vest, dear's cheap, and cheap is dear at best. High's low, low's high, far's near, near's far, white's black, black's white—and there you are.

We live in topsy-turvy land when McKinlay waves his magic wand.

[Laughter.]

Concerning the change and evolution that has come over the early Republican protective doctrine, designed to foster infant industries, I would further submit the following:

Mary had a little lamb,
Its fleece was white as snow;
It followed her to Pittsburg,
And now you ought to see the darned thing.

[Laughter and applause.]

The old idea of encouraging new industries is being destroyed by the present system, for in so far as trusts and monopolies are being encouraged, individual enterprise and individual initiative are being suppressed. A monopoly need not confine its charges to a high percentage of profit on the product, but it can charge up to the public all the graft and mismanagement that may go to make up its costs. It is not compelled to be efficient. It can afford to dispense with improvements in machinery and methods. It can put valuable patents in cold storage. Thus the tariff, in so far as it aids the trusts, throttles progress instead of fostering industry.

In song and oratory we are properly reminded of the gratitude we owe to the Providence that placed us in this land of liberty and plenty. Is there not shown a lack of appreciation when we hear the solemn assertions made by some of the gentlemen that our prosperity is not due to the natural bounties of our country, not to the genius and efficiency of our people, but to a system of taxing ourselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Whenever protest is made against the existing protective tariff an argument promptly aduced in its favor is one which was best phrased by the Hon. "Bathhouse" Coughlin in the city hall of Chicago. He asked a fellow alderman how he could advocate the creation of prohibition territory and consequent loss of revenue from saloon

licenses, when, as he stated it, "we are all of us heartily in need of funds." If either the Government or any interest happens to be "heartily in need of funds," there is always a means of raising revenue by boosting the tariff. I do not believe that it helps matters much to hold that we ought to lower the wall to such a point as to provide only for the higher wages of American labor plus a profit to the manufacturer or producer. This amendment still justifies the establishment in our country of industries that do not belong here. It would justify the raising of cocoanuts in hot-houses. It would justify a tremendous tax upon tea in order that the laborer engaged in tea culture could be recompensed at upward of a dollar a day, while he is now receiving probably less than 10 cents a day on the other side of the ocean. I am unpatriotic enough to be grateful to the heathens who in their blindness are picking tea for us at that rate of wages, and I would not advocate forcing them to adopt our standard of living by the wearing of American clothes, or even the drinking of Missouri champagne, Mr. Speaker, for I fear they might be brought to feel the necessity of charging us more for doing us this service.

No one has ever shown any fund from which can be drawn the tax levied by the tariff and paid out in subsidies to the protected interests except the fund that resides in the pockets of the people. Those who assume that the tariff is a means of creating prosperity or of creating wealth are much better at juggling and at picking coins out of the air than was Herrmann, the magician. If we can tax ourselves rich, we can prove poker to be a productive industry. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Equally, an individual may become opulent by shifting coins from one pocket to another, and the Nation can acquire wealth, if not merit, by unanimously consenting to the reciprocal picking of pockets by all the people.

Economists would doubtless urge that this universal and fairly distributed pocket-picking system would be unproductive, but we have had too much of doctrinaire teachings to listen to any more of it.

It might be surmised that should the pocket-picking system become thoroughly established it would not be equally enjoyable to all the people. There would be some more adept than others. There would probably be coteries formed in the profession that would band together in "strong-arm" or "hold-up" work, and when, if perchance through popular clamor, because of over activity, the practice were put into partial disrepute, and there arose the question of proper limitation, it would be found that the least skilled and the unorganized would first be deprived of the privilege of picking pockets. [Laughter.]

Through many of us newly elected Members the people are protesting, not against the wealth of the country, but against the present system of dis-

tribution, which fully deserves the bitter resentment it has incurred. The evils of distribution are caused by special privileges and the protective tariff creates and licenses privilege. It would not interest the men described in the Pittsburg Survey, who are worked to death and thrown on the junk pile, to figure out and to ascertain how many wives per annum a Pittsburg millionaire could afford out of the dividends of the Steel Trust. [Laughter.] Rather would he be interested in supporting one wife and some few children with less work and more pay. There would be little satisfaction to a cash girl working for the Marshall Field Co. at a weekly wage of \$3 to know that she and that corporation were jointly worth over \$50,000,000. [Laughter.] The people are not satisfied with statistics of national wealth, they want better conditions for themselves.

But after all, the greatest sin that can be laid at the door of the protective tariff is the economic waste which it encourages. The fortunes piled up by the richest men of the country amount to nothing when set against the annual loss caused by the employment of men in unjustifiable occupations.

A subsidy which supports those occupations must come from other occupations which belong on our soil and in our country, and the men engaged in either the wrong thing or the right thing in the wrong place form an army which we might call the "army of the mal-employed." They have to be supported by the well employed, just as much as every standing army is a charge upon industry.

Some day I expect to hear our standpat Republican friends making the old confession, "We have caused to be done those things that ought not to be done; we have left undone those things that ought to be done, and there is no health in us." [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The [Congressional] Record, with its vast compilation of statistics, shows a mathematical ability engaged in proving out what is logically absurd. The accuracy of the almanac does not prove the value of the nostrum it advertises, nor can questions of ethics be determined by the use of logarithms. One is rather inclined to doubt the efficacy of such figures when they are used to prove views diametrically opposed. We certainly get into "topsy-turvy land" when we try to follow the statistics. You must remember the old rhyme—

Down here below two and two make four;
Perhaps up in heaven they make six or seven.

The statement was made on this floor that the dividends paid on the stocks of the great corporations were the proof of the wealth of the country and meant prosperity. There might properly be query made as to whether dividends represent the fruit of production or extortion, whether they were produced by the use of plow and ax or spindle and loom, or whether they were "produced" at

the point of a revolver or searched for in the pockets of victims rendered unconscious by sandbag or lead pipe.

As a freshman in this course of education, I can not understand how a country can get rich by sharing its natural resources with all who choose to come, dividing our patrimony, as it were, and at the same time keeping out all possible things that can be excluded that would go to increase the size of our hoard. Privilege clamors for cheap labor and immediate development of everything. Statesmanship calls for readjustment of opportunity for ourselves and our children.

The balance of trade argument is not entirely convincing to some of us. Whenever China or Russia improve their balance of trade by exporting foodstuffs in time of famine, there seems to be something the matter with the mathematical self-sufficiency of this theory. If a freezing tramp should sell his clothes, he certainly would improve his balance of trade, although not his condition. [Laughter and applause.]

Anyone who has lived on the Pacific coast can not fail to entertain profound respect for the self-helping ability of the Japanese. They are the most remarkable self-helpers in all the world, and no one need ever again invite them to help themselves. Some two years ago, in the islands of Hawaii, just at a time when the cane-grinding season was at hand, the Japanese engaged in that industry unanimously struck. They did not appear to be satisfied with their wages nor disposed to recognize the contract they had made with the planters, which procedure was not entirely original on their part. In the course of the dispute they wrote a series of resolutions to the planters to the effect "that it was the duty of the planters, in accordance with the true American principle of protection, to get an increase in the sugar duty and thereby raise the value of sugar, and then out of the added profit they should divide with the laborers." Strange that this simple and excellent and wholly American plan was not at once adopted. [Laughter.]

Let us consider some more phases of Hawaiian sugar. The business was built up first under subsidy and then under a protective tariff. The sugar land is nearly all of it in the hands of the great corporations. These corporations are paying large dividends on inflated values. This is the upper crust of the pie. Next there comes a filling of upward of 400,000 tons of sugar, for which, together with all other sugar, imported and domestic, the American people are paying heavy taxes. The lower crust consists of oriental labor. The yellow man is everywhere displacing the white man, even in the skilled occupations. The white man of small means has little or no chance to inhabit the "Paradise of the Pacific." It is today a country of corporations and yellow men. The white men are so greatly outnumbered that there

seems danger that the pie may be turned over, to the obvious benefit of the under crust, but to the destruction of the upper crust. To prevent such an unfortunate occurrence and to protect the protected-sugar industry we are taxed for an increase in our navy. To protect the navy, which must protect the protected-sugar industry, we must be taxed to fortify Pearl Harbor. To protect Pearl Harbor, to protect the navy, to protect the protected-sugar industry, we must keep near Pearl Harbor a considerable army of men, and these must be supported out of public taxation.

This is an illustration of the "American doctrine," and the American consumer can realize as he pays his grocery bills that he is not only patriotically encouraging an American industry for the benefit of corporations and yellow labor, but that he is encouraging an indefinite increase in our navy and a probable increase in our army, always with the possibility that the navy and the army aforesaid may have to be actively used to further protect the protected-sugar industry, with all the waste of life and of property incident to war, and at a very rough estimate with four hundred and eighteen thousand millions of dollars of pensions to pay in the years to come. [Laughter.]

I can not agree with those gentlemen on the majority side who believe in a tariff for revenue. There is doubtless justification for a high tariff on certain luxuries, but there is no fairness in a revenue tariff laid upon necessities. The burden is not upon the proper shoulders. Mr. Rockefeller probably pays less Government revenue on the food he consumes than does the average hod carrier. He would doubtless like to pay as much, but he can not without eating as much. For the present we must look to the tariff for revenue. Eventually we shall provide for Government funds from income tax, from heavy taxation of community-created land values, from rentals of the public domain, all of them direct and comprehensible. We shall have internal revenue taxation on articles not necessities.

I have discussed theory without any idea that we could afford or should make any sweeping changes at once. Too many people inhabit the rickety structure to permit of its immediate demolition. A revision downward, schedule by schedule, is the beginning of the work, and a notice to make preparations to vacate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] At some time or other these patients, the "invalid industries," must leave the hospital, whether to turn their steps to self-support or to the cemetery. [Laughter.] They can not forever remain parasitic. The tariff has been too often revised upward by its friends. The people have commissioned its enemies to revise it downward. That we may have a more just system of distribution and a more equitable system of taxation, we must study the sources of our

wealth and the means whereby this wealth may be saved and increased for the benefit of the many.

There is great hope in the growing ideals and the clearing outlines of the great policies of State and National conservation. By saving the common wealth for all our people and by wiping out the great special privileges in land and other natural resources, by breaking down the extortions of monopoly and by regulation of our public utilities, we shall make this country better for the average man, and no worse for any man. [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

* * *

"USTLER JOE."

For The Public.

There is an old man named Fels,
Who skips the world over and tells
All the good folk he meets
On the highways and streets,
That "Rent's like the Game of the Shells."

He's a dandy old chap, is this Joe.
He's the friend of "The Man with the Hoe,"
And unlike all the rest,
He is doing his best
To abolish the cause of most woe.

He's a chap who is "flush" with the "change,"
And he spends it in manner quite strange.
He perused Henry George,
Now he wants to disgorge,
And the business of life rearrange.

"Tax naught save Land Values," says he;
"Twill abolish all Mon-op-o-ly,
And the sadness of earth
Will give way to sweet mirth,"
Says "The Old Man from over the Sea."

Joe's not canny like wee Andy C.
Joe's not "oily" like saintly John D.
He is "only a Jew,"
But he's white through and through,
And a lover of "real liberty."

So off with your "lids," boys, to Fels,
From Yukon to the old Dardanelles.
Give three cheers and a smile,
From the Lakes to the Nile,
And make the earth ring with your yells.

ROYD EASTWOOD MORRISON.

BOOKS

THE GRAND OLD WOMAN OF AUSTRALIA.

Catharine Helen Spence. An Autobiography,
Edited by Jeanne F. Young. Published by W. K.
Thomas, Adelaide, South Australia.

Every library of any size in the United States should place on its shelves this modest autobiography of Catherine Helen Spence, the Grand Old Woman of Australia, for the reason that in those