

321 E. Valerio St. 7
Santa Barbara - Cal.
July 6 - 1910

~~Confidential~~

My dear Miss Tarbell -

I am in receipt of yours of the 29th ultimo regarding certain correspondence between my father and Senator Aldrich, relating to the Tariff. For certain reasons I did not care to use this matter, or anything of like nature, that might reflect upon any of our leaders in Congress, in the little résumé of my father's Tariff work, which I published as a memorial. One ~~the~~ object I had in mind in publishing the little book - was to show how our Tariff had really been made in the past, and the necessity for creating a Tariff commission. Our future Tariffs are to be scientifically built upon proper facts - instead of in accordance with the demands of

certain over-protected manufacturers
 who have practically had their own
 way in the past in fixing the tariff
 rates upon such commodities as they
 were interested in. Aldrich, as
 you are no doubt aware, always
 looked after the interests of the Sugar,
 Woolen & Cotton people - and defended
 the schedules covering these items in
 the Senate. X When the Dingley
 Bill was reported out of the Senate
 Finance Com. - it was found that
 radical changes had been made in
 the Sugar Schedule, which would
 have operated to give the Sugar Trust
 an immense advantage in Sugar
 just under 87° - polariscope test
 as the Aldrich schedule made a
 wide gap in the duties between 87° &
 88° in place of the $\frac{3}{10}$ cent between
 each degree as fixed in the Dingley
 (and present schedule). This would
 have largely increased the "refiners
 protection" or "differential" on such
 raw sugar as they could have

brought in under 87'. Of course Aldrich contended that very little if such low grade sugar was imported, that most of the imported sugars ran about 94' to 96' - but that was because previous tariffs - (as well as the present) are so framed - that it has been to the advantage of the trust to import sugars testing just under the Dutch color standard - (about 94' to 96' -) No such gap - or wide difference in duty - would have "happened" in the Aldrich schedule between 87' + 88' - now - unless there had been a reason for it - and no one can doubt for a moment that if that schedule had passed, the sugar trust would have succeeded in so fixing their sugars, and certain friendly custom officers, that most of the now sugar imported would have tested under 87'.

You will find Aldrich's explanation and defense of this schedule in the

Cong. Record of May ¹⁸⁹⁷ 1897. It was
bitterly attacked in the floor of the
Senate by Vest - and White - and Jones
I believe - and by certain Republicans
in caucus - and in the Senate Chamber
room etc. - Aldrich became (consequently)
quite ill and left Washington for
a while - leaving Allison in charge
of the Bill. (This was at the time
North - became a bit nervous
about whether he would be able
to make Allison & Platt (of Conn.)
understand the agreement between
Whitman & Aldrich regarding the
Woolen Schedule - as shown in the
now notorious North - Whitman
letters -) I believe the Sugar Schedule
was remodelled twice in its way
thru the Senate - in both cases
making it more favorable to the
Trust, than the original Dingley
Schedule - which Dingley fought for
with such good effect that it was

finally adopted in Conference. The delay however in passing the bill through the Senate, due to Aldrich's absence, (on account of illness?) and to the changes in the sugar and other schedules - gave the Trust sufficient time to bring in through raw sugar under the lower Wilson rates to last a couple of years, and to increase their profits, as I recall, about \$20,000,000. as the difference between the Wilson rate on raws. and the new Dingley rate on refined sugar was very large.

A well prepared show up of this Aldrich schedule - would make particularly interesting reading at this time I should think - I believe John Welliver understands the main points of that schedule, and Aldrich ~~confronted~~ ^{confronted} them with as he at one time talked of writing an article upon it. He did not however ever this in

his story of the Sugar Trust in
 Hampton. I regard it as
 the most daring attempt ever
 made in Congress to enlarge the
 sugar trusts tariff benefits. I could
 give you the facts and figures showing
 the exact "gap" or difference in duties
 between 87¢ & 88¢ - "raws" - and the
 increased differential which would
 have resulted therefrom. if I had
 my tariff data here - but it is
 all stored away in N.Y. at present.
 and for certain reasons I do not
 wish to make use of the Aldrich
 letter to which Mr. Gibson alluded
 at this time - Confidentially I
 can say that my father urged
 Aldrich not to introduce such a
 schedule - and was largely in-
 strumental in showing up its defects
 and defeating it - You can of
 course find the Aldrich schedule in
 the various prints of the Dingley
 Bill while in the Senate - and
 the explanation and defense thereof

are in the Cong. Record of May & June 1897. - I may add, that when Aldrich failed to obtain my father's assistance in preparing a defense for his schedule - he called in General Appraiser Shannett, a Democrat and protégé of Sumner, to assist him. Aldrich had first become acquainted with Mr. S. during the latter's work assisting Sumner to so change the Wilson Bill that Boss Cleveland refused to sign the bill - as you recall. Aldrich was so taken with Shannett's versatility as a tariff expert that he used him after this in preparing the changes in the Payne Bill - and also the arguments and defenses of such changes.

It gave me great pleasure to assist my good friend Senator Patton in showing up the Aldrich changes in the Payne Bill - as well as the inequalities and incongruities of the Ancient Woollen Schedule. While the

Progressives were unsuccessful in
 mustering enough votes to correct
 the worst features of the Tariff
 Schedules. Senator Ballinger's exposure
 thereof has met with such general
 approval, that the Taft Tariff Board
 is already at work attempting to
 get the necessary data upon which
 a more scientific revision may
 be made of these schedules.

While in Washington I had the
 pleasure of a call from your brother
 and Mr. Emery, and was interested
 in your letter, which they showed
 me. Upon the question of the duty
 on petroleum.

Trusting you will treat what
 I have written as confidential, but
 that I may have succeeded in
 pointing the way for you to obtain
 certain facts in relation to Aldrich
 work for the Sugar Trust in tariff
 legislation. believe me

Very sincerely yours
 H. M. Tichenor