fault was in not doing it earlier, and doing it right.

✣

With his veto power, President Taft could at any time have forced his party in Congress to redeem the party's campaign promises, for which he himself went bond to the people; and by acting earlier he could have done it without serious party friction. In so far as the new tariff law fails to redeem the downward-revision promises which Mr. Taft made for his party last Fall, the responsibility lies with Mr. Taft himself. He would have had the support of more than a third of the membership of each House in any demand he had made for the fulfillment of those promises, and that would have given him control of the situation. How, then, can his friends say now, that he did all he could to keep faith with the voters who confided in his campaign promises?

✣ ✣

Mr. Taft's Campaign Promises.

But Mr. Taft proclaims that his campaign promises are redeemed by this tariff bill. He says that the bill "is a substantial downward revision." How much like the huckster at the county fair in the old story, Mr. Taft seems, to be sure. "Hot mince pies! Hot mince pies! Here's your hot mince pies, only five cents apiece!" barked the huckster as he pushed his way through the crowd with a basket on his arm one cold October day. A chilled and hungry and confiding youth bought a pie; and when his nickel had gone irrevocably into the huckster's pocket and the pie had come into his own eager hands, the unsalted youth exclaimed: "Ah, this pie ain't hot!" "I didn't say it was," the huckster answered. "Yes you did," replied the buyer; "you called out over and over, 'Here's your hot mince pies,' and everybody about here heard you." "Oh, is that it?" said the huckster; "Why, man alive, that's the name of the pie!" Having promised a substantial downward revision of the tariff, Mr. Taft makes good by handing out an upward revision bill with a downward revision label on it—a cold pie with "hot" for a trademark.

✣

Can Mr. Taft "get away" with this subterfuge? The opportunity is favorable, of course, for the tariff bill is so voluminous and complex that only experts will be able to tell whether the revision is up or down until prices begin to talk. On the face of the official table of alterations, nearly every item seems to be a reduction and only a few an increase. But Senator La Follette says, quoting a statement prepared by the bureau of manufactures in the Department of Commerce and Labor that 286 increases of duty do not appear in the official table, which omits only 38 decreases; and Senator Dolliver declares that the rates in the cotton schedule are increased all along the line, some of them as much as 100 per cent. Even on the face of the official table, the decreases appear to be infinitesimal, and for the most part unimportant, while the increases and retertions of old rates are significant of plutocratic contributions to campaign funds.

✣

That the bill is as much a bunco as the "hot mince pies" of the huckster in the story is likely to appear with increasing emphasis as the new tariff gets into practical operation. It is already evident, however, from such testimony as Senator Dolliver's, a good Republican, who says the American people are being duped by it with humbug and misrepresentation, and from the documents Senator La Follette has put into the Record to prove that the measure revises the tariff upward and not downward.

✣ ✣

The Free List in the New Tariff Law.

From the free trade point of view there is little or nothing in the new tariff law to approve with any approach to enthusiasm, except the placing of hides and petroleum on the free list. Neither is this very important in itself. But it is in the right direction in itself, and it has a tendency also to weaken the protection combine. The objection that the advantage will go to the manufacturers for whose industries these products are raw materials, is not valid. Except as manufacturers are buttressed by some kind of monopoly which does not depend upon protection, the benefit of freeing their material goes to consumers of the finished product. If, for instance, the price of hides falls for lack of tariff protection, the price of shoes must fall, even though they are protected by the tariff, unless by some other mode of protection the domestic competition which cheaper hides would stimulate can be strangled. Protection on the raw materials of an industry makes it easier, and free trade in those materials makes it harder, to monopolize the industry and dictate prices.

✣ ✣

The "Maximum" and "Minimum" Tariff.

We are unable to agree with our friends who object to the "maximum" and "minimum" clause of the new tariff law. Not that we approve of

Digitized by Google