DENTON JOURNAL
PAGE 4
HOWARD MELVIN BENJ. H. JOHNSON
MELVIN & JOHNSON,
PUBLISHERS.
SATURDAY MORNING, OCT. 26, 1912

UNMASKING THE TARIFF DELUSION

Franklin Pierce Shows That Labor Is Not Benefited by Unjust Tax.

MANUFACTURER KEEPS PROFIT

Proof of Democratic Platform's Soundness Cited In Reports of Wage Investigations.

By FRANKLIN PIERCE.

For a hundred years of our history the manufacturers, believing that they received a benefit from the protective tariffs, have ingeniously devised plausible pretexts for imposing increased prices upon the necessaries of life. At first they said that industry in our country was in its infancy and needed protection. When those industries had become strong and needed no aid the manufacturers invented the theory that the foreigner paid the duty. This theory was exploded, and they declared that cheap clothing meant cheap men and was not a blessing.

Driven from every one of these indefensible positions, their final and only argument left today is that the tariff is imposed upon foreign imports to enable the manufacturer to increase his profits and pay higher wages.

The Democratic platform declares that:

"In the most highly protected industries, such as cotton and wool, steel and iron, the wages of the laborers are the lowest paid in any of our industries."

Wages In Cotton Industry.

Under the existing Payne-Aldrich tariff law actual imports of cotton cloth paid in 1910 average duties of 56.4 per cent.

In 1905, when work and wage conditions in the cotton industry were exceptionally good, the wages of 202,211 cotton mill operatives in the United States—men, women and children—averaged only $6.47 a week. The average wage for men was but $7.71 a week, for women $6.30 and for children, $3.21.

As to the profits, seventeen leading cotton mills, with total capitalization of $25,110,000 and total surplus of $21,363,501, paid in nine years dividends averaging 22 per cent.

The cotton manufacturers turned out in 1905 $442,451,218 worth of goods and paid in wages therefor $94,337,695, or 21 per cent of the value of the finished product.

Extortion of Wool Tariff.

Outside of the duties on two or three commodities of comparatively little importance, the duties on woolen cloth are the highest of any in the tariff schedules. According to Senator Reed Smoot, owner of a woolen mill at Prevost, Utah, and chairman of the finance committee in charge of tariff legislation in the senate, wearing apparel valued at 30 cents a pound now pays 206 2-3 per cent duty.

This and other correspondingly high duties on the manufactures of wool are made to enable the manufacturer to pay his labor an increased wage over those of foreign countries. But the duty on woolen goods is nearly five times the entire labor cost, while the American manufacturers in 1905 paid in wages only 18 per cent of the total value of their production.

At Lawrence in this most highly protected industry the laborers were obliged to strike even for a living wage. Thousands of adult males were receiving only from $6 to $9 a week and many only $5 to $6 a week. As a result of the strike the American Woolen company gave its employees slight increases in wages.

The wool tariff bill vetoed by President Taft reduced the duties on raw wool from 42.20 to 29 per cent and on manufactures of wool from 87.65 to 48.36 per cent. Mr. Taft said he vetoed it because the proposed rates did not comply with the findings of the tariff board. Senator La Follette contradicted the president, saying that the proposed rates varied from 1 per cent lower to 11.6 higher than the tariff board's findings justified.

Low Wages In Steel.

Manufacturers of iron and steel in 1905 paid in wages only 15 per cent of the total value of their production, while the duty then would average about 45 to 47 per cent, and on all metals it now averages 34.51 per cent.

American wages are really the cheapest wages in the world when you take into account the amount of production per man.

An illustration of this appears in the Stanley report, investigating the steel trust, as follows:

"The labor cost of producing pig iron in Pennsylvania fell from $1.25 a ton in 1902 to 82 cents a ton in 1909, yet the realized value of the pig iron output was $15.64 in 1902, whereas it was $17.44 in 1909. In other words, wage-workers in 1902 got $1.25 for producing only $15.64 worth of pig iron and in 1909 only 82 cents for producing $17.44 worth."

While thus treating labor the industrial combinations that have grown up under the protection of the tariff have fixed the prices of commodities at the highest point the home market would stand.

When will the laboring men of the country cast off this delusion that the tariff is for their benefit and with their votes strike down this monstrous injustice?

A Distinction.

"Can you give my daughter all the little luxuries to which she is accustomed?" asked Mr. Slithers, as Skinflint asked for his daughter's hand.

"I can indeed," replied Skinflint. "I am worth twice as much as you are."

"Then I consent," said Mr. Slithers. "Bless you, my son!"

"Gee!" ejaculated Skinflint as he walked home later. "Suppose he had asked me if I would!"—Harper's.

The Only Way.

A person of little tact once remarked to the octogenarian Auber, "What a sad thing it is, this old business!"

"Yes," agreed the old musician, "it is sad; but," he added, with witty philosophy, "up to the present time no surer way has been discovered to live a long time."

ROOSEVELT BAIT FOR SUFFRAGISTS

Third Term Candidate Was Consistently Their Enemy Till He Needed Their Votes.

COULD HAVE CARRIED OHIO.

But Big Bull Moose Took to the Vermont Woods—Noted Woman Exposes His Change of Front.

BY IDA HUSTED HARPER.

The Progressive party had its first opportunity to show its loyalty to the woman suffrage plank in its platform when the vote was taken in Ohio on a new constitution. Forty-two amendments were on the ballot, and all were adopted except the one for woman suffrage!

Ohio is one of the "banner" Progressive states, and Mr. Roosevelt expects to secure its electoral vote. In order to do this a plurality of the electors must be Progressives, and they could therefore have easily carried the suffrage amendment if all the others had voted against it, as the vote on the constitution was very light, only a few hundred thousand out of more than a million who were eligible. Did he issue any orders to this effect? Did he say to his followers: "Now, here is our first chance to show the women that we mean business. Of course if we win in November we will give the franchise to all in the United States, but just now we can make good by giving it to those in Ohio, so let every Progressive vote for the woman suffrage amendment?" Did he do this? On the contrary, he completely ignored the matter, although he passed through Ohio the very day of the election.

A few days before, at St. Johnsbury, Vt., Mr. Roosevelt had devoted a large part of his speech to showing how strongly he believed in the ballot for women and how anxious he was for them to get it. The question was not an issue there or likely to be, but it was a vital issue in Ohio, to be settled in four days, and yet not by spoken or written word did he show to the people of Ohio that he knew of its existence.

Two days after the Progressive party in Ohio permitted the defeat of this amendment its state convention met. If any women were elected delegates the press dispatches failed to mention it, and in the platform a woman suffrage plank was conspicuous by its absence. "The Progressive party pledges itself to the task of securing equal suffrage to men and women alike," says its national platform, and Ohio has just given the first example of the way it apparently means to keep that pledge.

In Mr. Roosevelt's second term the suffragists determined to make every possible effort to secure an indorsement from him. As Miss Susan B. Anthony's most eloquent letters to him received no answer, she went in person to see him in November, 1905, just four months before her death. With all her powers of persuasion she pleaded with him to recommend in his forthcoming message some recognition of woman's claim to a voice in the government. Laying her hand on his arm, she looked up into his face and said, "I beg of you to be the emancipator of woman as Lincoln was the emancipator of the slave." He was not resembling Lincoln so much in those days as he is at present, and he remained totally unmoved by her appeals.

Scant Courtesy at White House.

Shortly before he left the White House several officers of the National Suffrage association, realizing his great influence on public opinion, made one last effort to have him speak a favorable word. He came into the outside lobby of the executive office, required them to state their business before the crowd waiting to see him and would hardly give them a chance to speak, but kept saying, "Go and get another state." He shrugged his shoulders and turned on his heel, and then they said, "If we will get up a petition of a million names will that influence you?" "No," he replied, "not one particle."

That was in 1909. The next year a letter from him was read at an anti-suffrage meeting in the Berkeley theater, New York, in which he said: "I am very tepid on woman suffrage."

The cause of woman's enfranchisement has no more implacable enemy than the Outlook, and Mr. Roosevelt is on the editorial staff. Last February he had in that magazine a ten column article entitled "Woman's Rights," but the only right considered was that of the suffrage. The article was such an excellent exposition of the attitude of women who do not wish to vote that the Anti-suffrage association ordered copies for distribution. In this article he said again, "In our western states where the suffrage has been granted to women I am unable to see that any great difference has been caused as compared with neighboring states."

And yet just four months after this publication, when Mr. Roosevelt had definitely decided to make the contest for the presidential nomination, all his scruples about forcing suffrage on a hostile and indifferent majority vanished in thin air because a million and a half already had votes and the colonel wanted them, and he knew they wouldn't stand for any nonsense about a referendum.

FACTS WORTH REMEMBERING.

John D. Archbold, for the Standard Oil company, gave $100,000 to Roosevelt's campaign fund in 1904, but refused to "come across" with $150,000 more, which was demanded.

* *

J. P. Morgan of the steel trust and other interests gave the Roosevelt fund in the same year $100,000, and did give up $50,000 more.

* *

Mr. Roosevelt furiously prosecuted the Standard Oil company, but he refused to prosecute the harvester trust and the steel trust and gave the steel trust permission to absorb its only serious rival.

* *

George W. Perkins of the steel and harvester trusts gave $48,000 of the New York Life Insurance company's money to Roosevelt's campaign fund, and refunded it when the fact became public.

Literal Surgery.

"Did the surgeon, when consulted, write that man he was going to sew up his heart with gold wire?" "No, he didn't write; he wired him."—Baltimore American.

OFFICIAL BALLOT FOR CAROLINE COUNTY

Provisions of Section 48, Article 33, of the Public General Laws of Maryland, title "Elections," and Caroline county on Tuesday, November 5th, next, is published in compliance with the

The accompanying list of nominations to be voted upon in Caroline county has been filed with this Board.

We hereby certify that the nominations printed herewith have been

HARRY B. MASON,
ALPHONSO MEREDITH,
JAMES T. SYLVESTER,
Board of Supervisors of Elections for Caroline County.

S. G. NUTTLE, Clerk.

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

TAFT AND SHERMAN. REPUBLICAN. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

SIMON S. LANCASTER, CHARLES COUNTY. AT LARGE — REPUBLICAN. ☐

ISAAC H. FORD, CECIL COUNTY. AT LARGE. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

WILLIAM H. KEMP, TALBOT COUNTY. FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

FRANK E. BAKER, ABERDEEN, MD. SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

JOHN KRONMILLER, BALTIMORE, MD. THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

CLINTON O. RICHARDSON, BALTIMORE, MD. FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

RICHARD N. RYON, PRINCE GEORGE COUNTY. FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

ABRAHAM E. ALBERT, HAGERSTOWN, MD. SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — REPUBLICAN. ☐

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

WILSON AND MARSHALL, DEMOCRATIC. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

JAMES THOMAS TRUITT, WICOMICO COUNTY. AT LARGE. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

ROBERT E. LEE, BALTIMORE, MD. AT LARGE. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

ALBERT W. SISK, CAROLINE COUNTY. FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

FRANK THOMAS SHAW, CARROLL COUNTY. SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

WILLIAM SHEPARD BRYAN, JR., BALTIMORE, MD. THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

JAMES McC. TRIPPE, BALTIMORE, MD. FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

LOUIS C. CARRICO, CHARLES COUNTY. FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

EDWIN AUSTIN BAUGHMAN, FREDERICK COUNTY. SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

CHAFIN AND WATKINS, PROHIBITION. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

FINLEY C. HENDRICKSON, ALLEGANY COUNTY. AT LARGE. — PROHIBITION. ☐

JOHN H. DULANY, WICOMICO COUNTY. AT LARGE.. — PROHIBITION. ☐

DANIEL W. MILES, SOMERSET COUNTY. FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — PROHIBITION. ☐

JOHN H. GILL, BALTIMORE COUNTY. SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — PROHIBITION. ☐

PAUL H. STEWART, BALTIMORE, MD. THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — PROHIBITION. ☐

JOHN N. PARKER, BALTIMORE, MD. FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — PROHIBITION. ☐

CLAUDE H. IGLEHART, HOWARD COUNTY. FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — PROHIBITION. ☐

THOMAS E. WATKINS, FREDERICK COUNTY. SIXTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT. — PROHIBITION. ☐

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

DEBS AND SIDEL, SOCIALIST. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

OLIVER S. HINES, HAGERSTOWN, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

HENRY MIECKEL, BALTIMORE, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

CHARLES JACKSON, BALTIMORE, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

WILLIAM KADE, BALTIMORE, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

B. W. DIFFENBAUGH, CUMBERLAND, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

WILLIAM CROCKETT, BALTIMORE, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

CHARLES B. BECKMAN, BALTIMORE, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

CHARLES F. BRAUNS, BALTIMORE, MD. — SOCIALIST. ☐

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

ROOSEVELT AND JOHNSON, PROGRESSIVE. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

F. SNOWDEN HILL, PRINCE GEORGE COUNTY. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

N. WINSLOW WILLIAMS, BALTIMORE, MD. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

R. LEE HALL, WORCESTER COUNTY. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

JOSEPH R. BALDWIN, HARFORD COUNTY. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

WILLIAM ALLEN, BALTIMORE, MD. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

CHARLES H. TORSCH, BALTIMORE, MD. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

DAVID M. NEWBOLD, JR., BALTIMORE, COUNTY. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

THOMAS H. BUCKLER, BALTIMORE, MD. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

REIMER AND GILLHAUS, LABOR. ☐

FOR ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

VOTE FOR EIGHT.

CHARLES BECKER, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

MORRIS BROWN, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

FRED. DIECKMAN, BALTIMORE COUNTY. — LABOR. ☐

FRANK N. H. LANG, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

ISRAEL MERWITZ, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

JACOB RUPP, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

HENRY SIMON, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

ROBERT W. STEVENS, BALTIMORE, MD. — LABOR. ☐

FOR REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

VOTE FOR ONE.

JAMES HARRY COVINGTON, TALBOT COUNTY. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐

CHARLES M. ELDERDICE, CAROLINE COUNTY. — PROHIBITION. ☐

ROBERT D. GRIER, WICOMICO COUNTY. — PROGRESSIVE. ☐

FOR CHIEF JUDGE OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT.

VOTE FOR ONE.

ALBERT CONSTABLE, CECIL COUNTY. — DEMOCRATIC. ☐