

WHY YOUR BURDEN IS HEAVY

By Oscar W. Underwood, Democratic Leader of the House

THE House has passed tariff bills at this session which would save the people of this country approximately \$650,000,000 annually if they had become laws.

The farmers' free list bill which passed the House, it is estimated, would have saved the people of this country \$390,000,000 annually. The first articles placed on the free list by this bill were agricultural implements. Our domestic production of agricultural implements amounts to over \$111,000,000 annually, our imports are less than \$165,000, and our exports during the last fiscal year were nearly \$36,000,000.

The bill placed sewing machines on the free list, meeting the requirements of the poor seamstress. The measure met the wishes of the farmers with free agricultural implements and free fence wire; the cotton grower with free bagging and ties; the builder with free lumber, laths and shingles; the great masses of city folk, pressed for food and clothing, with free meats, free leather and shoes, and free salt.

Under our tariff law a barrel of flour valued at \$4 abroad is taxed 25 per cent. ad valorem at our ports, or \$1 on the barrel. This bill removed the entire tax.

Beef valued at \$5.30 per 100 pounds abroad pays a tariff tax equivalent to 25.88 per cent., or \$1.50 per 100 pounds. This bill proposed to remove this entire tax.

Five times within practically a year the Democrats have passed a bill revising the wool schedule—their own bill at the first session of this Congress and then the compromise measure reported by the conferees of the two houses. The same two measures were passed at this session, and in addition to this the President's veto of the compromise bill was overridden. The Democratic bill vetoed by the President reduced the average rate of duty on wool manufactures from 90.10 per cent. to 48.36 per cent.

President Taft's veto of this measure means that the American people WILL PAY \$50,000,000 MORE FOR THEIR CLOTHES THIS YEAR than they would have if President Taft had signed it.

A wool hat valued at \$1 abroad and taxed 78 cents upon its entry into the United States, under the present tariff law, would have been taxed only 49 cents.

Flannel underwear valued at \$27 per dozen suits is taxed under the present law at the equivalent ad valorem rate of about 106 per cent. The Democratic bill proposed to reduce this to 49 per cent. A suit of ready-made woolen clothing worth in Europe \$10 is taxed under the present law at the equivalent ad valorem rate of 75 per cent., or \$7.50. The Democratic bill proposed to reduce

Mr. and Mrs. Consumer

SINCE JANUARY 1, 1912, A DEMOCRATIC HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HAS PASSED TARIFF BILLS WHICH WOULD HAVE REDUCED

**The High Cost of Living
\$650,000,000 a Year.**

President Taft Vetoed

EVERY TARIFF MEASURE PRESENTED TO HIM WHICH IN THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE PROVIDED RELIEF FOR THE MANY FROM EXTORTION. HE USED HIS POWER TO PERPETUATE

Prohibitive Protection and THE TRUSTS

this tax from 75 to 49 per cent. and save the consumer \$2.60 per suit.

The cotton bill reduced the duties on cotton manufactures from 48.12 per cent. to 27.06 per cent., a reduction of the tariff burdens under this schedule from not less than \$200,000,000 to about \$112,000,000 for a year, or a saving of about \$88,000,000 for a twelve-month period.

Men's cotton half hose valued at eighty cents per dozen pairs wholesale are taxed under the present law at the equivalent ad valorem rate of about 92 per cent. The Democratic cotton bill proposed to reduce this to 40 per cent.

It proposed to reduce the tax on cotton thread from an equivalent rate of 34 per cent. to 15 per cent. A suit of ready-made cotton clothing valued at the foreign port at \$6 is taxed under our present law 50 per cent. ad valorem, or \$3 a suit. This Democratic bill proposed to reduce this tax to 30 per cent. and save the consumer \$1.20 per suit.

The bill revising the metal schedule reduced the average rate of duty on the entire schedule from 33.35 per cent. (imports of 1910), to 22.42 per cent. This revision, it is estimated, would have saved the American consumers in a twelve-month period more than \$80,000,000.

The revision of the chemical schedule would have effected a saving to American consumers of about \$17,000,000 by reducing the price of all chemicals, and at the same time the revenue to the Government would have been increased.

The bill placing sugar on the free list would have saved during a year not less than \$115,000,000 to the consumer. The tariff tax on sugar amounts to about 1½ cents per pound. The amount of sugar consumed in continental United States in 1911 was about 7,663,000,000 pounds, and the application of 1½ cents per pound to this consumption affords the estimate of \$115,000,000 as representing the saving to the people.

The House passed a bill providing for an excise tax on incomes, thereby transferring a considerable portion of the tax burdens to the wealthy, which are escaping their proper proportion.

The Excise Tax bill passed by the House provides for the extension of the Corporation Tax law so as to include individuals, firms and copartnerships. It accomplishes the very desirable purpose of transferring tax burdens from those less able to carry them to the shoulders of the wealthy, who have heretofore escaped from a proper share of taxation for the support of the Government.

The present burden of indirect taxation falls upon people having incomes of less than \$2,000 per year. A man whose net earnings amount to but \$5,000 per year would under this bill pay no tax. A man earning \$10,000 per year would pay nothing on the first \$5,000 and \$50 per year on the second \$5,000.

To Mr. Consumer:

The above is a matter of history; it is recorded in detail in the proceedings of the last session of Congress, and published in the *Congressional Record*. These facts are simply compiled from that source; there can be no quibble over them.

Mr. Consumer, you well know the cost of living is mounting higher and higher, while your salary or income does not keep pace with it. The result is, you can not buy as much as formerly, and in consequence you must deny yourself and family many comforts of life formerly enjoyed. You must wear plainer clothes, eat fewer delicacies, and in every way limit your expenditures to make ends meet.

You work just as hard, but get less for it—less comforts of life. The product of your toil no doubt is greater, but your share grows less—is there not SOMETHING RADICALLY WRONG with our industrial and economic conditions?

When you see private individuals squander over \$144,000 on a primary election in this State; others over a quarter of a million for a similar purpose, and then refer to it as a mere trifling political incident, should it not set you to thinking seriously before you vote in November?

Mr. Voter, did you ever discard your political prejudices, forget your party zeal, and like a plain, honest, sensible, practical man think these things over real seriously with yourself?

If you never did you should do so, out of regard for your wife and children, at least, before you vote in November. Have you been voting right, or are you only getting what you voted for—high tariffs and high cost of living?

Now is the time to think it over.
IN NOVEMBER DO YOUR DUTY
BY VOTING RIGHT.