

and still leaving them a duty on their financial products.

To do that is simply to give the manufacturers protection at both ends, which, of course, means double protection to them. In view of the fact that the whole system of protection was devised for and has been supported by the manufacturers, it would be singularly inconsistent for the democratic party to advocate giving them free trade in what they buy, while leaving them with the power to tax American consumers on what they sell.

I am aware, of course, that some of the democratic senators who voted for free iron ore were actuated by a belief that they were thus helping what are called independent steel companies, to better compete against the steel trust; but that argument does not appeal with any force to me.

Instead of levying taxes or remitting taxes to help one group of manufacturers to compete against another group, my desire is to compel both groups to compete for the patronage of the American people. There never was anything more fallacious than to suppose that the steel trust can be injured by free trade in iron ore, because they always possess a large part of their supply on that material.

With their material already bought and paid for, it makes no particular difference to them whether a tariff is levied on it or not, and their sole concern is as to the price which they can obtain for their finished products. In other words, they do not sell the raw material, and, consequently, the price of it is of no moment to them; but their prosperity and profits are determined by the labor and their cost of production as compared with the price at which they can sell their finished products. The proposition to exempt some millionaires from their just taxation, in order to strengthen them in their competition with other millionaires, does not commend itself to my judgment; because it leaves the consumers of this country wholly out of the calculation.

I have no doubt of the honesty of the men who think that they could in some way injure the steel trust by putting iron ore on the free list; but I do very gravely doubt their wisdom in that particular respect.

While the lumber question involves to some extent the theory of free raw material, it does not involve it to such an extent as to be decided according to it; and I voted against putting lumber on the free list for the very good and sufficient reason that the present duty on that article is less than 12 per cent, and raises more than \$1,700,000 in revenues. I am not exactly able to see how a democrat who believes in a tariff for revenue only can justify himself in surrendering that \$1,700,000 collected under a duty of less than 12 per cent. While it sounds very well to declare that we are in favor of giving the people cheap homes, we should not mislead the public by such a declaration.

Upon the average, lumber constitutes about 20 per cent of the cost of a building, and we could hardly be asked to take the duty off lumber, and still leave the duty on anything else that enters into the construction of a house. The average duty on every other material required in a building is about 36 per cent as against 12 per cent on lumber; and surely a democrat must hesitate before he removes a 12 per cent duty from the product of the forest while leaving a 36 per cent duty on the products of the factory. When the government can dispense with the revenue, I shall be more than glad to put upon the free list every article which enters into the construction of a home; but I shall never agree to discriminate, even within purely

revenue duties, against the lumber mill and in favor of the factory.

As to very much the larger portion of this country, free lumber could not affect its price in the slightest degree, because freight charges make it impossible to sell Canadian lumber in eight-tenths of our country. It would doubtless be of some benefit to the states which lie along the Canadian border, but I am not willing to surrender a revenue which the government needs in order to give free trade in lumber to those communities which support the policy of protection.

MR. TOMLINSON'S OPINION

Commenting on the address of Dr. Dabney of Ohio, made during the commencement exercises at the University of Alabama, on the "Solid South and the Nation," John W. Tomlinson, member of the democratic national committee for Alabama, says:

"Dr. Dabney, in his plea for breaking the solid south, stated 'with the first establishment of the rights of the states and with the passing of the fear of ignorant negro domination, the chief incentive, the imperative need of a solid south has thus been removed forever;' and he continues, 'there can be no question that the removal of the fundamental reasons for the existence of the solid south clears the way for independent political action.' He further points as evidence 'of the fact that a part of the south has already abandoned some of its traditional doctrines,' that 'southern democratic congressmen are hanging around the tariff table trying to pick up a few crumbs of protection.'

"Dr. Dabney errs when he assumes that we have been held together in the south by reason of the fear of negro domination. The south is democratic from principle. Furthermore, is it fair for him to assume that the fact that some of our southern representatives are favorable to so adjusting the tariff as to give revenue and at the same time afford incidental protection, that they have abandoned the traditional doctrines of their party? Again Dr. Dabney is in error in assuming that because the supreme court of the United States has rendered some decisions favorable to state rights, that there is no longer necessity for the south remaining solidly on guard for local self-government? What democratic principle does he want the south to abandon? What democratic principle is hurtful to the south, or any other section of the country? Why not break up the republican strongholds of the north and west? The solid south today stands as a bulwark against tendencies and methods which prevail in other parts of the nation, and is the great conservative influence on which we can confidently rely to preserve in fact, as well as in name, our republican form of government."—Birmingham (Ala.) Age-Herald.

THE JOHN E. LAMB INTERVIEW

Widespread attention has been attracted to an interview given to the newspapers by Hon John E. Lamb of Terre Haute, Ind. The interview follows:

"I have noticed with much regret and some surprise the conduct of a number of democratic United States senators who, upon many important questions, are voting with the republican majority in the senate upon questions involving a revision of the present tariff schedules. Having served on the committee on resolutions in the democratic national convention at Denver last year with Senator Simmons of North Carolina, Senator Daniel of Virginia and Senator Newlands of Nevada, I was not surprised to see them lining up on this great question with republicans

in the senate, as they had led the fight in the committee on resolutions against the tariff reform planks which we adopted. The contest in the committee on the question of placing articles which enter into competition with trust controlled products upon the free list was warmly contested, and was only carried in the committee by a few votes after a strenuous contest, but the plank in the democratic platform demanding 'the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs,' and that these articles be placed upon the free list was carried by a vote practically unanimous, and this was afterwards ratified by more than one thousand delegates in convention assembled without a dissenting vote. There is consequently no excuse for any man who pretends to be a democrat to cast his vote against free wood pulp, print paper, lumber, timber and logs, all of which articles are of prime necessity in every day life. If party platforms are to be ignored upon vital questions by representatives and senators without rebuke from the people, then the organization of parties becomes a sham and a delusion, and a long step has already been taken in the direction of dissolution of parties and an appeal to the rabble.

"The attempt of the administration to avoid an income tax by placing a 2 per cent tax upon the profits of corporations I trust will not succeed. Why a widow who chances to have her few thousand dollars in-

vested in a corporation should be subject to a special tax is pretty difficult to explain. While this might and probably would in a great many cases work great hardship, the imposition of a 2 per cent tax upon all incomes of over \$5,000 could harm no one, and a large sum of money could thus be gathered for the federal treasury to take the place of some of the many millions now collected upon the necessities of life from the pockets of those who can ill afford to spare the money.

"As a member of the democratic organization in Indiana I earnestly hope that every democrat in the United States senate will line up in favor of the Bailey-Cummins income tax amendment. The democratic senator who fails to do this should not hereafter be considered as a party man by his associates and should not, in my judgment, be permitted to take part in a caucus of the democratic minority. The fact that the United States supreme court some years ago decided the income tax law unconstitutional furnishes no excuse for voting against this tax at the present time. The opinion then rendered by the supreme court was by a bare majority of one vote. The personnel of the court has since changed, and it is much better to present this question again to the supreme court of the United States as at present organized than to try to remedy things by a constitutional amendment which would require at least six years for its adoption and ratification by the people."

Soda Cracker Logic

Any baker can make an ordinary soda cracker — but to produce Uneda Biscuit requires the specially fitted bakeries of the

**NATIONAL
BISCUIT
COMPANY**

All soda crackers are food. But there is only *one* soda cracker highest in food value as well as best in freshness. Of course, *that* soda cracker is

**Uneda
Biscuit 5¢**