

# The American Voters' Scrap Book

Valuable Contributions to Current Political Discussion by Eminent Republicans—File These Away for Future Use

## BUNKO MEN OR WELCHERS—WHICH?

There are a few favored states in the middle west (Illinois, of course, excluded) in which citizens who meet each other and casually talk about the tariff can say complimentary things about their senators and some of their congressmen.

In most of the rest of the country (Illinois, of course, included) the range of possible discussion about the average member of congress is whether he is to be classed as a bunko man or a welcher.

Except for some of the New Englanders, there is probably not a republican candidate for the lower house, and certainly not a democrat, who would have dared go before the people on the stump last fall without committing himself for honest tariff revision. President Taft had declared that the "Dingley rates have become generally excessive" and given it as his judgment that republican tariff revision was to be "on the whole a substantial revision downward." Agreement with him on these points was what the candidates knew was expected of them and what they committed themselves to.

But now we hear it loudly said by many men in congressional circles at Washington that the republican party merely promised "revision" and never promised "revision downward." The men that say this are the bunko men of congress. They have sold a gold brick and are now engaged in trying to look innocent.

Other members of congress admit the promise, but find it inexpedient to live up to it under conditions as they are. They are the welchers. They haven't the nerve to stand up and face the gaff.

Bunko men and welchers alike have this in common, that their existence ought to be reason enough for their constituents to undertake a thorough house-cleaning in the effort to put the political game "on the square" hereafter, at least so far as the tariff is concerned.—Chicago Record-Herald (Republican.)

## NO HOPE OF RELIEF

There is no tariff schedule which does so little build up domestic industry as the wool schedule. Nor is there another schedule with the exception of the one covering cotton goods which bears harder upon the consumers. The Payne bill softened in a few small particulars the harshness of the present duties in the wool schedules. The finance committee has said they must not be concurred in, and a docile majority of the senate is voting as the committee would have it. Senator Dolliver and the other courageous republican senators from the middle west who have been trying to get for the people the kind of tariff revision that was promised them have been outvoted by other republican senators who are repudiating the platform of their party.

One professed purpose of the duties on raw wool is to encourage its production in the United States. They have been a failure. The wool clip of 1907 was not so large as that of 1895. Manifestly the raising of sheep for wool is not being stimulated by the present duties and they should be reduced. Those on the coarser wools which are not grown in the United States, and will not be, should be removed altogether.

If the prosperity of an industry can be measured by its consumption of raw material the American woolen industry is not thriving under the present wool schedule. The total domestic consumption of wool in 1907 was less than in 1895, notwithstanding the growth in population. The output of the manufacturers was larger, but that was because they mixed so much more cotton with their wool. If there had been no duties on wool the manufacturers would have woven more yards of genuine woolen goods and the people would have had honester clothing.

The manufacturers would be much better off with free wool, but they have an alliance with the shepherds by which both parties to the partnership get excessive duties on their products. The government gets a little revenue out of the arrangement, but the people are deprived of the woolen clothing they ought to have.

Their per capita consumption of wool is much less than it was fourteen years ago.

Genuine tariff revision calls for a material lowering of the duties found in the wool and cotton schedules. The coffin lid can not be nailed down on the agitation for tariff revision until those schedules shall have been revised downward.—Chicago Tribune (Republican.)

## THE SUGAR TRUST

"Damnableness." That was one of the expressions used before the ways and means committee of the house of representatives in a recent examination. The methods referred to were those of the American Sugar Refining company, commonly called the "sugar trust." The word "damnableness" seems justified, too, as one disclosure after another shows the entire lack of principle behind the conduct of affairs.

"The case of the seventeen holes" will long be remembered as one of the most glaring frauds ever perpetrated against the United States government. The trust was forced to pay a large amount of money to make good the stealings effected through dishonest methods in weighing. The repayment, however, has not changed in the least the opinion of a single individual about the real character of the action itself. It was just plain thievery, as despicable as could be planned.

The disclosures in the latest affair connected with this same company bring no surprise. After the weighing frauds anything might be considered possible. The Pennsylvania sugar refinery was built in 1903. It was a model plant. It was better than any one owned by the trust. The builder, becoming involved, was forced to borrow some money. The one who offered to loan it was an unknown agent of the trust. With the loan he gained the privilege of naming the directors during the period of indebtedness. The rest was easy. Some dummy directors were chosen. They ordered the plant closed. For the comparatively small amount of \$1,250,000 the trust had put a dangerous rival out of the way. As for the methods? The old maxim, "All's fair in love and war," probably came to quiet any qualms of conscience if that monitor still spoke to those concerned.

To cap the climax, the suit for \$30,000,000 brought by the Pennsylvania Sugar Refining company against the "trust" has been settled out of court for \$750,000, the terms of adjustment being still uncertain. That makes about \$3,000,000 of ill gotten gains surrendered by the "trust" this year as a result of disclosures of its rottenness. The Washington dispatches indicate that the private settlement of this suit has stirred up greater feeling than ever, and that it may lead to the dissolution of this combine. The sooner the blow is struck the better it will be for all, for the average individual who reads of the wickedness of the sugar "trust" will have his belief strengthened that all trusts are corrupt. His sympathy will be more and more with those who attack them because of such disclosures as the ones made about the despicable methods of the American Sugar Refining company.—Chicago Tribune (Rep.)

## PROTEST SHOULD BE HEEDED

The protests made by republican senators against the passage of the senate finance committee's tariff bill in its present form should be heeded by the republican leaders in the senate. Those attacks do not represent mere individual or sectional dissatisfaction with items or schedules in the Aldrich measure. They reflect the widespread popular opinion that the senate bill, so far as the rates levied on imports are concerned, is in no material sense an improvement on the Dingley law and does not make good the promises of the republican national platform. The republican platform of 1908 promised a revision which would mean something—not a mere rewriting of the Dingley schedules, duties being lowered a shade here and advanced a shade there, the net result being the re-enactment of a law which has stood on the statute book for twelve years and was drawn to fit conditions in trade and industry which have radically changed in the interval. Twelve years is a long life for a tariff law. Most of our tariffs have been in effect for shorter periods; and it must be remembered that the progress of the United States in domestic and foreign trade has been greater in the last twelve

years than in any twenty years in our earlier history.

It argues a curious misunderstanding of the enormous strides made since 1897 to insist, as the framers of the finance committee's bill do, that nothing but a delicate reshaping of existing tariff rates is now needed. If that is all the situation demands, the business of the country has been agitated for nothing and the growth of the last twelve years has been immaterial and meaningless. The country is unprepared to accept such logic, and senators like Mr. Dolliver, Mr. Cummins and Mr. Nelson voice only the general amazement of the public at discovering that, in the opinion of the framers of the senate bill, we are no further on industrially than we were in 1897, although foreign trade has doubled since then and value of domestic manufacturers has increased over 50 per cent.

As the Tribune has said before, the logic of the situation demands a revision which can be recognized as such. The country expects to see real changes made in rates and the very liberal protection given in the Dingley law generally reduced. The house bill made a good start in the right direction, for it contained many changes pointing to a new development of the protection principle to meet new conditions. The senate bill is a disappointment in that it has gone back to the groundwork of the Dingley law and has balanced some slight reductions in rates with compensating increases and decreases. Mr. Aldrich says that 379 reductions have been made. Mr. Culberson says that only 356 reductions have been made, and that these are counter-balanced by 316 increases, leaving the Dingley rates on 1,271 items unchanged. But the point of greatest importance is that the changes either up or down in the senate bill are very slight. The Aldrich bill is the Dingley law over again. Mr. Aldrich himself has said that if the senate bill had been in force in the fiscal year 1906-'07 it would have produced \$8,000,000 more revenue than the Dingley law did—an increase of \$3,000,000 being due to heavier duties on wines and liquors and an increase of \$5,000,000 being due to stricter provisions to prevent undervaluations. The practical identity of the senate bill and the Dingley law is thus conceded.

The Tribune feels that public opinion will not be satisfied with mere nominal revision. It expects the republican party to fulfil its promises and to show capacity and courage enough to modernize the tariff schedules. These schedules should be made as simple as possible, complicated compound duties should be eliminated wherever possible, and the public should be enlightened as to the differential of cost of production here and abroad on which protection is allotted. The best way to perpetuate the protective system is to make it intelligible and rational. The people must see that it subserves national instead of personal and local interests.—New York Tribune (Republican.)

## KEEP THIS FOR REFERENCE

"I marvel at your blindness," says Cummins, of Iowa, to Aldrich, of Rhode Island. "You are subjecting our party," says Cummins to Aldrich, "to unmeasured ridicule, unlimited criticism and eventually to inevitable defeat and destruction."

"The senator from Rhode Island will not discredit us," says LaFollette to the senate. "Instead he has only discredited his own leadership before the senate and before the country."

"We will have much more trouble explaining somebody else's vote to the people than our own," is what Clapp, of Minnesota, says in reply to some of the Rhode Islander's taunts.

The copy of the Congressional Record reporting the debate in which these amenities occurred is worth filing for reference after the congressional election of next year.

If Mr. Aldrich is not riding the republican party for a fall there is no truth in prophecy. The direction in which he is trying to lead the republican party is one in which it has already said it does not wish to go. And marching close at his heels are the republican bolters of the senate who for some inscrutable reason, would rather follow him into the ditch than obey a party mandate.—St. Louis Republic.

"Doing something for the workingman" is a great fad with a lot of people who seem unable to understand that about the best thing that could be done for a workingman would be to let him have a fair opportunity to do things for himself.