

## THE TARIFF IN THE SENATE

Senator Carter of Montana, protesting against free hides, said: "If the conference committee on this tariff bill decides finally to place hides on the free list there will be found twenty-two republican senators who will vote to put boots and shoes, harness and all leather products on the free list. It is also certain that this extraordinary session will be greatly prolonged."

When the vote was taken on hides the amendment offered by Mr. Aldrich and fixing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem was agreed to by a vote of 46 to 30.

This is the rate under the present law, but under the rulings of the treasury department is applicable only to hides weighing more than twenty-five pounds. The house placed all hides on the free list, but the senate committee restored the Dingley policy, and now the senate has sustained its committee.

Senator McLaurin undertook to have the provision amended so as to make the duty applicable to hides weighing less than twenty-five pounds, but failed, his amendment being voted down, 31 to 48. An amendment by Mr. Stone placing not only hides but many of their products on the free list was also lost.

Declaring that he had voted with McKinley for free hides in 1890, Senator Burton said that the subject had been very carefully considered on that occasion. The "beef trust," he said, probably tans 60 to 70 per cent of the hides and the whole tanning industry was threatened by the operations of these packers. "I think," said Mr. Burton, "it requires a great deal of ingenuity to show that the farmer is benefited by this duty on hides."

By an aye and nay vote an amendment by Mr. Cummins fixing the duty on hides at 10 per cent ad valorem was rejected. The finance committee's amendment re-enacting the Dingley rate of 15 per cent ad valorem was then adopted, 46 to 30.

The democrats voting with the majority were: Bailey, Culberson, Fletcher, Foster, Hughes, McEnery, Newlands, Smith of Maryland, Stone and Taliaferro.

The republicans who voted against the amendment were: Briggs, Burnham, Burrows, Burton, Clapp, Crane, Cullom, Dupont, Frye, Johnston, LaFollette, Lodge, Nelson, Page, Root and Smith of Michigan.

Reverting to the leather schedule, Senator Dolliver offered an amendment which was accepted by Chairman Aldrich, placing a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem in addition to the rate provided for the leather in them, on leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles.

Mr. Aldrich then reported from the committee an amendment increasing the duty on lumber to \$1.50 per thousand, and additional rates of from 37½ to 50 cents, according to the number of sides upon which it was planed.

These rates, Mr. Aldrich explained, are a reduction of 25 per cent on rough and finished lumber below the Dingley rates, except lumber planed on one side, which retains the duty of the present law.

An amendment increasing the duty on shingles from 30 to 50 cents a thousand was also reported.

The senate made short work of the lumber schedule. An Associated Press dispatch said:

The first vote was on an amendment by Senator McCumber proposing the rate of \$1 per 1,000 on sawed lumber instead of the rate decided upon by the finance committee, which was \$1.50 per 1,000. The committee was sustained, 44 to 24.

From the beginning of the session there has been a decided contest over the lumber rate and one of the hardest fights made by the northwestern senators had been for free lumber. In the house the reformers succeeded in reducing the Dingley law rate from \$2 to \$1. They continued their efforts in the senate, but finding themselves unable to make any impression there they would have been willing to accept the house rate. So stiff, however, was the sentiment against them that they succeeded only in getting a reduction of 25 per cent from the Dingley duties and the majority against any reduction as shown by today's vote indicates that not only the committee's schedule will remain unchanged in the senate, but that the sentiment for a pronounced duty is so strong there that it will be difficult to change the senate rates in conference.

The air in the senate chamber was close and sultry when, at 10 o'clock, President Pro Tem-

pore Frye rapped for order. There were comparatively few senators in their seats and a call for a quorum was made as soon as Mr. Aldrich had indicated his desire to have the senate proceed with the consideration of the lumber schedule. A quorum once obtained, Mr. McCumber took the floor and presented his amendment. To the surprise of all no one rose to speak, and Senator Frye, always especially prompt in the chair, immediately put the question to a vote. There was a demand for the ayes and noes and the ballot resulted in the defeat of the amendment, 44 to 24.

Of the affirmative votes only ten were cast by democrats as follows: Bankhead, Clay, Davis, Gore, Hughes, Johnston, McLaurin, Overman, Paynter and Tillman.

The republicans who cast their votes in support of the amendment were: Beveridge, Bristow, Brown, Burkett, Burton, Carter, Clapp, Crawford, Cummins, Curtis, Gamble, LaFollette, McCumber and Nelson.

The democrats voting against the amendment were Bacon, Bailey, Chamberlain, Fletcher, Foster, Martin, Money, Simmons, Smith of Maryland, Taliaferro and Taylor.

Insisting that the differentials on planed or finished lumber provided by the finance committee were unnecessarily high, Mr. McCumber offered an amendment reducing them 33 1-3 per cent and reducing the duty on sawed lumber to \$1.25 a thousand feet. Action on this amendment was not so prompt as on the preceding.

Mr. McCumber's amendment was rejected by 30 to 49. On this vote Senators Dolliver, Dupont and Johnson, republicans, who had voted no on the former ballot, changed to the affirmative, as did Senators Bacon, Owen, Rayner and Stone, democrats. This was a gain of seven, but as Senator Bankhead, who had cast his vote in the affirmative on the previous ballot, failed to vote on the second ballot, this reduced the net gain to six. The additions to the negative vote were due largely to the arrival of senators who had not previously been in the chamber. Senator Lorimer was among them. He stood by the committee.

Without loss of time the vote was then taken on the main proposition, the finance committee's amendment placing a duty of \$1.50 on sawed lumber with differential on finished lumber. This won by the large majority of 50 to 28.

On the day following the vote on the lumber schedule the time was given over by senators to speeches. Beveridge made an attack on the tobacco trust. Bailey talked upon his favorite subject—free raw material. He declared that previous to the Cleveland administration the established democratic policy was in opposition to the free admission of raw material, and undertook to show that such a policy was really a part of the republican school of high protection.

Mr. Newlands gave his attention to the income tax question, devoting especial consideration to the president's recommendation for a corporation tax. He discussed at length the legislation of 1898, providing for a tax upon the gross receipts of oil refiners, on which the Spreckles case was decided by the supreme court and which is relied upon by the president as a precedent for the proposed corporation tax. He pointed out that the law of 1898 was applicable, not to corporations alone, but to every person, firm, company and corporation carrying on such business, and suggested that a tax applying only to corporations might violate the constitutional requirements of uniformity.

Reading a list of administrative items in the tariff bill that have not been reported upon by the finance committee, Mr. Money, in the senate appealed to the chairman of the committee to bring in a report upon all of them. He said he could form no idea of the time necessary to complete the measure until he knew what is to be considered. Mr. Aldrich said he could not see why before the present week closed the senate would not be able to dispose of all the dutiable list, and added that he would endeavor to promptly report all of the administrative items mentioned.

Beginning one day's session with an increase of 5 per cent over the house rate of 35 per cent ad valorem on harness, the senate marched steadily along throughout the nine hours of its sitting, indulging in little speech-making, and acting upon many important provisions. Among the changes made were:

An increase of the duty on scrap iron from 50 cents to \$2.50 per ton, thus placing it on the same level as pig iron; an increase of one-fourth of a cent per pound over the house rates on wire nails; an increase of from 4 to 6 cents

per pound on monazite sand and thorite and other articles used in the manufacture of gas mantels and the substitution of specific for ad valorem rates on files, rasps, etc. Toward the close of the day Senator Penrose of the finance committee presented an amendment fixing a duty of one-half cent per gallon on crude oil and after considerable debate it was defeated. During the day the linoleum and oil cloth schedule was recast so as to meet apparently the demands of the insurgents and was adopted with the understanding that if it should not be satisfactory upon inspection in the record the schedule could be reopened tomorrow.

The principal debate of the day was on the petroleum, linoleum and scrap iron provisions. Speaking of the provision for a high rate on scrap iron, Mr. Crawford declared it was "protection gone mad." The provision was also criticised by Senators Cummins and Beveridge. It, however, found defenders in Senators Oliver, Dick and Aldrich.

There were many efforts to amend the scrap iron provision, but it was adopted without change. Senator Penrose spoke at length in support of his oil amendment, declaring it met with the approval of the independent producers and refiners. The oil fields of Mexico figured extensively in this discussion. Senator Gore declared they were a myth.

## "MR. BRYAN AND THE SENATORS"

Indianapolis, Ind., June 10.—Editor The Commoner: I am sending you a clipping from the Indianapolis News, of June 9, 1909, which is indorsed by the democrats of Indiana. It is good, and I appreciate what you said about the democratic United States senators, running after strange gods, and abandoning our national platform for a "mess of pottage" in their home states. I believe in a tariff for "revenue only," and believe the time has now come for the democratic party to make that the paramount issue. And our party should send men to the United States senate and to congress who will stand by and for the people, in favor of true tariff reform and on a basis for revenue sufficient to run our government only. And as this editorial fully indorses your stand, I want you to read it. We democrats indorse you, because we know you are absolutely right, and it is refreshing to have a republican paper also endorse you. WINFIELD S. JOHNSON.

## MR BRYAN AND THE SENATORS

The democratic senators whom Mr. Bryan has very properly been criticising seem to have forgotten that Mr. Bryan is simply a private citizen and an editor, with the same right to criticise them that is possessed by other private citizens and editors. Therefore, their suggestion that he is trying to "dictate," to impose his will on the party, is unreasonable. If Mr. Bryan had not condemned them for their vote for taxed lumber he would have failed in his duty as a citizen, an editor and a democrat. Here is what the editor of The Commoner said:

"The democrats who voted against free lumber have: Voted to repudiate the national platform of the democratic party; voted to encourage the destruction of our forests; voted to raise the price of the chief necessities of life; voted to tax a material that enters into a multitude of industries and thus to place an unnecessary burden upon these industries; voted to tax the people of the whole country for the benefit of a comparatively few owners of timber lands, and voted to tax a majority of their constituents for the benefit of a minority of those constituents."

These things are precisely what these democratic senators have done. Mr. Bryan has simply put their record clearly before the country. He has not sought to dictate. He has not sought to impose his will, but the will of the party on these men. We do not wonder that they resent the remarks of the late candidate, for their application is painfully direct. So we have Simmons of North Carolina, who voted for a \$2 tax on lumber, saying that though he had followed Bryan for twelve years, he does not see "what right he has to dictate to us in the senate, who are attempting to put the party before the people in a manner which will enable it to recover from the effects of his leadership." And Simmons is going to do this by "considering the interest and the will of the people of my state, just as Mr. Bryan did." "I have," he says, "to answer only to the people of North Carolina, and care nothing as to what Bryan thinks or writes." In other words, Simmons is going to commend the democratic party to the people, according to his own state-