

The Tariff in Congress

The conferees on the tariff bill came to an agreement, Friday, July 30. On that day Mr. Payne of New York presented a report to the house. It is pretty well understood that the bill is by no means "downward revision," but that on the contrary it puts heavier burdens upon the consumers. A desperate effort is being made by republican leaders to make it appear that the measure is an improvement in the way of tariff legislation. Even Mr. Payne, who is chairman of the ways and means committee of the house, is posing as a "tariff reformer," and he claims the bill is a real reform measure. Mr. Payne has issued this description of the bill as reported by the conferees:

The most marked reductions are in metals, which in some instances show decreases of 50 per cent.

Lumber duties are cut over a third.

Wool is about unchanged, but the cotton schedule is reconstructed.

Glove duties are reduced.

Oilcloths and linoleums are heavily cut.

Practically no change is made in sugar and tobacco.

Hides are on the free list, and manufactures of leather reduced.

Petroleum comes in free.

There is an increase in spirits and wines.

Window glass of the common sort is given a reduction.

Wood pulp and paper are cut almost half.

Soft coal is cut down 22 cents a ton.

Binding twine remains on the free list.

There are moderate increases in some agricultural schedules.

The Washington correspondent for the Omaha World-Herald wired his paper under date of July 30 as follows:

The more the conference report is examined the worse it is found to be. Dolliver told the Iowans that the Payne statement indulges absolute misrepresentations of plain facts concerning the effect of the new cotton schedule. McCumber of North Dakota is mad because everything he wanted has been taken away from him in the conference. He is even accounted a possible insurgent against the report, despite that he is on the finance committee and was one of the leaders in making the bill as Aldrich wanted it.

Convinced that republican insurgency has spent its strength and that the time has arrived for the democrats to fight the measure, the senate democrats are forming plans for a determined effort to filibuster the bill into its grave.

So nearly as has developed thus far, the filibuster originated with Bailey of Texas. The senator found an excuse in the duty on cotton bagging. He warned the republican conferees at the session at which the democrats were permitted to see the work of the majority that he would fight this item.

"I'll stay here till December. If I can get a half dozen men to help me, before I'll let that discrimination be written into the law," he declared. Then he proceeded to explain:

"You have written in here free binding twine for the farmers of the north, but you put a duty on the cotton bagging in which the southern farmer must put his crop. Cotton is what makes the national balance of trade favorable. Year by year, that is the record; if there were no cotton to sell, the balance would be against us. In those few years when there has been a few millions against us it would have been hundreds of millions against us for the sale of cotton abroad. The discrimination against the southerner is one that can't be permitted. You must either put binding twine under a like duty or else take off the duty on cotton bagging; otherwise there will surely be a fight on the bill."

The republican conferees listened with interest, but without conviction. They didn't think Bailey would do it.

But before the conference report had got into print for the general public it became known that Bailey was feeling out the cotton senators with a view to making good his threat. Before the afternoon was half over it was known that he had seen a good share of the democrats, and that without exception they had pledged their support to him.

"Yes, it undoubtedly means a test of physical endurance," said a senator who knew the plan. "They will doubtless try the continuous session method of closure on us; but at that we can

stand it. We will make it as hard for them as they make it for us."

On the evening of Saturday, July 31 the house adopted the conference report of the tariff bill by a vote of 195 to 183.

Not enough of the insurgent republicans remained true in order to enable the democrats to defeat the measure. The way in which the standpatters won their victory is described in a special dispatch from Washington to the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal, a republican paper. That dispatch follows:

The defection of two Nebraska insurgents and two from Wisconsin who at the critical time turned their backs on their records of insurgency and joined the organization, enabled the Cannon forces to win tonight in their fight to adopt the conference report on the tariff bill. The four whose desertion made this result possible were Kinkaid and Hinshaw of Nebraska, Cooper and Morse of Wisconsin. All four of them have been almost uniformly insurgents from the beginning of the special session. Had they stayed tonight with the forces with which they have heretofore voted the house organization would have sustained a crushing defeat, and the tariff bill would have been rejected and sent back to conference for further consideration.

The outcome was a sad blow to the insurgents who stood by their fight to the end. Their chance of winning was on this vote if ever. Their defeat by reason of defection from their own ranks at a time when a number of regulars joined them in opposition to the bill, and when victory was fairly within their grasp, was the most bitter experience they have had since their fight began.

When 8 o'clock came, the hour for beginning to vote on the conference report, Mr. Mann of Illinois rose to move that the bill be recommitted to the conference, with instructions to accept no duty on print paper higher than \$2 per ton. On this motion, if he could have had the chance to make it, he would surely have won, for the votes were pledged.

But the speaker knew Mann's plan, and instead of recognizing Mann gave his recognition to Payne, who instead made the straightout motion to recommit. On this he at once moved the previous question. The position was much stronger on the Mann than on the Payne motion, and that was why Payne was recognized, only one motion to recommit being allowed. The previous question was, on roll call, ordered, and then the roll was immediately called again, on the main question, "Shall the bill be recommitted to the conference?" This was the test vote of the fight. It was rejected—ayes 186, nays 191.

Those republicans who voted with the democrats to recommit were: Carey, Lenroot and Nelson of Wisconsin; Davis, Lindbergh, Miller, Nye, Pickett, Kendall and Woods of Iowa; Madison and Murdock of Kansas; Mann of Illinois; Norris of Nebraska; Poindexter of Washington and Southwick of New York.

Those insurgent republicans who voted on this call with the regulars were: Cooper, Esch, Kopp, Kustermann and Morse of Wisconsin; Hinshaw and Kinkaid of Nebraska.

Cooper, Morse, Hinshaw and Kinkaid were the four whom the insurgents had expected would stand with them, and had they done so the bill would have been recommitted.

The organization having squeaked through this close test, the next motion was by Payne to adopt the conference report. On this the insurgents went to pieces still worse, it being apparent that they had no chance to win, and several more of them joined the army of regulars. The insurgents who still stood by their colors and voted against accepting the conference report were: Carey, Lenroot, and Nelson of Wisconsin; Davis, Lindbergh, Miller, Nye, Steenerson, Stevens and Volstead of Minnesota; Gronna of North Dakota; Haugen, Hubbard, Kendall and Woods of Iowa; Keifer of Ohio; Mann of Illinois; Murdock of Kansas; Poindexter of Washington; Southwick of New York.

Those republicans, heretofore ordinarily insurgents, who voted at this point with the regulars, were: Cooper, Esch, Kopp, Kusterman and Morse of Wisconsin; Good and Pickett of Iowa; Hinshaw, Norris and Kinkaid of Nebraska; Madison of Kansas.

The conference report was adopted 195 to 183.

The outcome was a victory for President Taft, solely and entirely.

Friday night Dwight, the republican whip of the house, went to the speaker and the president and told them that there were forty republicans who would not vote for the report

and who could not be lined up for it by any means in his power. The president then began sending for men and making the last final appeal for help and he changed enough to secure the result that the vote shows.

Mr. Payne of New York made a speech in behalf of the report and he was given an ovation by the tariff men.

CHAMP CLARK'S SPEECH

Following is the Associated Press report of Saturday's proceedings as far as they relate to Champ Clark's speech:

The democrats had their innings when Champ Clark of Missouri, their leader arose to present their view of the bill. The ovation to him was no less sincere than that accorded Mr. Payne. Recalling the story of the Brahmin who had been fooled into believing that the dog was a sheep fit for sacrifice, Mr. Clark said President Taft was a "pious Brahmin," who had been imposed on by being made to believe that the conference report was really a revision downward. Mr. Clark submitted a table which, he said, was approximately correct, showing, according to Mr. Clark, that the average rate of the report is 1.71 per cent higher than the average rate of the Dingley law.

If scores of new items in the report but not in the Dingley law were added, Mr. Clark said, the increase would be at least 20 per cent, and yet the brazen assertion is made that this is a revision downward, which is a sham, a humbug, a bald and bold perversion of the facts.

The president, he continued, had been grossly misled as to the nature of this report. He said that if "we reflect upon the fact that if he insisted upon lowering the duties upon only half a dozen items, or thereabouts when the rates have been lowered on hundreds of items, and the conference report still reeks with largess for the few and extortion of the many, his glory will experience a greater diminution than have the rates of the Dingley law.

"That the president's respect for the square deal, and his jealousy of his own fame impelled him to honestly demand a tariff law which would at least measurably redeem his own and his party's ante-election promise for a downward revision of the tariff will be readily conceded by every candid person," continued Mr. Clark. "That he has been deceived by tariff experts and near-experts as to this conference report being a downward revision in any reasonable sense of the testimony, can, I think, be mathematically demonstrated."

Mr. Clark said if the president could secure reductions on a few articles in a week, if he had begun sooner he could have accomplished far more, because it is far more easier to influence a man's opinion on any subject before he has publicly asserted it than after.

"Certainly Mr. Chairman Payne's statement is one of the most deceptive documents ever submitted to the gaze of men," said Mr. Clark. "I do not charge him with intentional deception, but he, too, has been deceived by slight-of-hand performers in arithmetic."

Mr. Clark submitted a table containing a comparison between the Dingley revenue for 1907, and the revenue that would have been derived that year under the duties of the conference bill. Under the Dingley duties, he declared, the revenue would have been \$329,109,342, and under the duties provided by the conferees, it would have been \$334,758,344, an excess in the conference report bill over the Dingley law of \$5,649,002. The conferees, he said, had increased the chemical schedule 5.63 per cent; agricultural, 6.63 per cent; spirits, 26.88 per cent; cotton, 10.80 per cent; silk, 15.48 per cent; pulp paper, etc., 10.02 per cent.

It had decreased, he said, the earthenware schedule 0.23 per cent, metals, 6.65 per cent; wood, etc., 15.56 per cent; sugar, 0.004 per cent; flax, .24 per cent; wool, .35 per cent; sundries, 11.41 per cent.

"And yet," said Mr. Clarke, "this conference report on the tariff bill is heralded and headlined in the public press as a tremendous victory for President Taft."

Quoting from newspaper reports telling of a large body of lobbyists that had been here since tariff legislation was begun, Mr. Clarke declared that the consumer had been slightly represented. They had by continuous entertaining exercised an influence, he said.

"That this great army of lobbyists," said the Missouri representative, "have influenced the schedules in this bill can not well be doubted. Those who have access to the ears of lawmakers have a better chance to carry their point than those at a distance. But no man is fit to be a lawmaker for a mighty people who yields to the