

How Did That Coal Tariff Get In?

Secretary Moody Says It was Smuggled into the Dingley Law, but the Congressional Record Shows that it was Placed there after Warm Debate.

On the evening of October 10 at Madison, Wis., Secretary of the Navy Moody delivered a speech in which he apologized for the tariff on coal by saying that the coal barons "felt secure in their independence as a result of the duty of 67 cents per ton on anthracite coal which had been covertly and in a cowardly manner smuggled into the Dingley bill."

It was necessary for republican leaders to make some defense for the tariff on coal at this time when the popular resentment against the coal trust is so strong; but it is amazing that a member of the president's cabinet should go so far as to actually misrepresent the facts.

The Dingley bill was passed in 1897. Mr. Moody, now secretary of the navy, was at that time a member of the lower house of congress.

If any one will take the trouble to look into the Congressional Record for June 30, 1897, and read from page 2144 to page 2151, he will discover that rather than being "smuggled" into the Dingley bill the tariff on coal was placed in that bill after a very earnest discussion in which the proposed tariff was defended by republican senators and in which it was bitterly condemned by democrats and populists.

The Record shows that while the Dingley bill was under consideration on June 30 Senator Allison, republican of Iowa, proposed an amendment to the bill, which amendment was as follows:

"Coal, bituminous, and all coals containing less than 92 per cent of fixed carbon and shale 67 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half inch screen, 15 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel; coke, 20 cents ad valorem."

The presiding officer announced that the question was on the amendment submitted by Mr. Allison. A discussion then ensued, reference to which covers nearly seven pages of the Congressional Record.

William V. Allen was then a senator from Nebraska, and after Mr. Allison had presented this amendment Senator Allen asked: "I should like to ask the senator from Iowa what reason there is for taxing coal?"

"What is the necessity for that tax?" inquired Mr. Allison.

Senator Allen repeated: "What is the necessity for taxing coal?"

Senator Allison replied: "The same necessity that there is for a tariff bill to protect and care for coal producers of our own country and provide revenue from duties on the coal imported."

Senator Allen then said:

"Mr. President, I call attention of the senator from Iowa and the senate to the fact that duty on coal does not protect; that is, it does not protect the class of people who are supposed to be protected by tariffs of this kind. Why exclude coal from elsewhere and levy upon the poor people of the Atlantic seaboard and other portions of the United States a tariff in addition to the original cost of the coal and compel every fireside in the thirteen million and a half homes of the United States to pay tribute to the few owners of the coal mines? There is no sense in it. There is no excuse for it. There is no reason for supporting it except the bare reason that its friends are to be rewarded in a bill of this kind."

Mr. Kyle, then a senator from South Dakota, asked: "Is it not true that the soft coal, bituminous coal, is placed on board the cars for about 90 cents or \$1 a ton at our eastern mines and sold in our section of the country at from \$7 to \$10 a ton?"

Mr. Allen replied:

"I think that it is true, but that is simply a part and parcel of the scheme by which the people are to be fleeced; because the transportation companies overcharge the people living in the interior of the United States for transporting coal is no reason why the man who owns the mine should be awarded a higher price for his coal by reason of the tariff taxation under the false pretense that he wants it to protect the man who does the work. We do not protect him at all. . . . Yet my good friend from Iowa says all this is done because the coal industry of the United States, or the coal laborers of the United States must be protected. God help the laborers and their children from that kind of protection!"

Senator Jones of Arkansas made a speech protesting against the proposed tariff on coal and presented protests against the proposed tariff.

Other senators participated in the discussion. The roll being called the vote stood 31 in favor of adopting the tariff on coal and 24 against it.

The thirty-one who voted for this bill were as follows: Allison, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Davis, Deboe, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Frye, Gallinger, Gear, Hanna, Hawley, Hoar, Jones (Nev.), Lodge, McEnery, McMillan, Mantle, Nelson, Perkins, Platt (Conn.), Pritchard, Quay, Sewell, Shoup, Teller, Wellington, Wetmore and Wilson.

The 24 who voted against this bill were democrats and populists, as follows: Allen, Bacon, Bate, Berry, Butler, Chilton, Clay, Cockrell, Faulkner, Gray, Heitfeld, Jones (Ark.), Kenney, Kyle, Lindsay, McLaurin, Mills, Mitchell, Morgan, Pasco, Pettus, Rawlins, Turpie and Vest.

Thirty-four senators were paired and did not vote.

After this amendment had been adopted Senator White of California made an effort to cut down the advantage which the coal barons were to enjoy by republican favor and he moved to strike out the 67 cents and insert in lieu thereof 40 cents. Senator White's amendment was read and submitted, but was rejected by republican votes.

In August, 1897, it became necessary for the New York board of appraisers to pass upon the question as to whether an importation of Welsh coal must bear a burden of 67 cents per ton. The importers of this coal refused to pay the duty, but the board of appraisers held that the duty must be paid and in justification of its ruling the board made this entry:

"By reference to the Congressional Record, under date of July 30, 1897, it will be seen that the proposition to impose the duty of 67 cents per ton on all coals containing 92 per cent of fixed carbon was expressly intended to cover anthracite coal."

Thus it will be seen that the tariff on coal instead of being "smuggled" into the Dingley bill was deliberately placed there by republican votes, and the only reason for it, as Senator Allen said, was that in return for the political favor of the coal barons the republican party would "compel every fireside in the thirteen million and a half homes of the United States to pay tribute to the few owners of the coal mines." As Senator Allen also said, "There is no sense in it. There is no excuse for it," and yet the republican party deliberately assumed the responsibility, and if the people expect their representatives to give any concern for public interests in the future they must hold the republican party rigidly to account for its wrongdoing.

The New York Situation.

An enquirer asks whether I approve of the fight which is being made by various democratic organizations in New York, some calling themselves "Bryan democrats," against the democratic state ticket headed by Mr. Coler.

The question can best be answered by a general statement of my position in all such cases. When the campaign of 1900 was over I asked all "Bryan clubs" to drop my name and take some name indicating adhesion to democratic principles rather than to any person. I stated that my reasons for doing so were, first, that I did not want the clubs to be embarrassed by anything I might do, and second, that I did not want to be embarrassed myself by anything the clubs might feel called upon to do. Events have justified my fears, and it has sometimes become necessary for me to explain that no person or association is authorized to speak for me, either in indorsing or in opposing any ticket. This applies to all other states as well as to New York. What I desire to say I say for myself, and what I do not say myself, I do not care to have said for me.

Believing the Kansas City platform is sound and that its principles must be applied to public questions, believing that the contest between the money changers and the common people is an unending one, and that the money question in one form or another will be before every congress (in the first session of the present congress a bill passed the house of representatives giving the secretary discretion to coin all the full legal tender silver dollars into subsidiary coin of limited legal tender, and the Fowler bill is set for consideration at the next session) and also believing that those who can be frightened away from the money ques-

tion can also be frightened away from any other question by the same influences—believing thus, I have felt it my duty to criticize those conventions which have refused to indorse the Kansas City platform. I have pointed out that they not only weaken the party in the state but destroy the unity and enthusiasm of the party in the nation. But having done this, my duty has been performed and where good men have been nominated on a bad platform, as in New York and some of the other states, I have not as a rule felt it incumbent on me to urge either the support of the ticket or the defeat of the ticket. I recognize that the voters in each state have to meet local conditions of which I can not fully inform myself, and I am willing to trust the intelligence as well as the fidelity of those who have been loyal to the national creed of the party. Being on the ground they can judge whether for state reasons they should support good men nominated on platforms which are bad on national questions or whether for national reasons they should refuse to support even good men who are willing to compromise on national issues. Whether state issues should be sacrificed to national ones or national issues sacrificed for state issues is a question so largely determined by the relative importance of the issues at the time in the state that ordinarily no outsider can assume to give advice. But this one thing is certain, that the democrats who live in the states where the national platform has been ignored must organize to protect the party from any more cowardly evasions. Our party is weak in the east because eastern conventions have been running away from the party platform, and the republicans have taken advantage of the silence to misrepresent the democratic position and vilify those stand for democratic principles.

That Constitutional Amendment.

Republicans are circulating under the frank of Congressman J. W. Babcock a tract entitled "Records of the republican and democratic votes on the anti-trust legislation in the United States house of representatives." In this tract it is pointed out that in the house on May 21, 1900, the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution relating to trusts and monopolies was called up. Mr. Ray of New York asked unanimous consent that this resolution be made a special order. It is pointed out that "Mr. Richardson, the democratic leader, interposed an objection and thus defeated the attempt to fix the time for the consideration of this measure."

A reader of The Commoner encloses this tract and asks for an explanation of the action of the democrats. The resolution referred to proposed an amendment to the constitution which instead of being intended to injure the trusts was intended to take away from the states all authority over trusts and monopolies and place that authority exclusively in the federal government.

The resolution was as follows:

Section 1. All powers conferred by this article shall extend in the several states, the territories, the District of Columbia, and all territories under the sovereignty and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to define, regulate, control, prohibit, or dissolve trusts, monopolies or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise.

The several states may continue to exer-
(Continued on Page Five.)