

on the free list, and then the republican shouters will declaim, as they are declaiming now, that the party has kept its pledges and reduced the tariff taxes. Free oil probably would mean more than any other of the four, since the price of oil for fuel and light might be affected.

The chances are many to one that there will be no free oil. Each of the three other propositions bear almost wholly upon the interests of manufacturers. The shoe men think the free hides would relieve them from the beef trust's control of the general leather industry. The free coal fight is almost entirely an affair of the desire in certain sections of the United States for reciprocal relations with Canada.

New England wants to use Nova Scotia coal. Ohio and Pennsylvania desire to sell their coal in the Ontario manufacturing district. Free iron ore is needed by the Schwab and other independent steel people, whose plants are on the Atlantic coast, and who use Cuban ore.

The tariff taxes at present on any one of the four are hardly enough to make any appreciable difference in the cost of everyday articles in the retail market. The hullabaloo about free raw material is being used palpably to obscure the main question which is present in the big schedules fixing duties which in turn fix the prices of clothing, household articles and food.

A valiant effort is being made and newspaper organs, which are subservient to the purpose of Senator Aldrich, are assisting, to show that something is being done for the "common people." Great stress is laid upon the action of the conference committee yesterday in reducing the duty on woollens and woolen cloth. This reduction merely cut the ad valorem part of the duty from 40 to 35 per cent. But this duty, in common with those prescribed throughout the woolen schedule, consists of an ad valorem tax added to a specific and accumulative duty.

The tariff import on these same women's and children's woollens is really 104 per cent. It is 104 and a fraction. The cut in the ad valorem amounts only to a 2 per cent reduction of the whole. In view of the certain enactment of the corporation tax, even this 2 per cent can hardly result in lower market prices anywhere.

The one remaining chance for a really popular reduction lies in the cotton schedule. If reports from the conference were accurate, Aldrich is determined to preserve the rates selected for cotton by debate. It may be that some jocular decreases, like that upon women's wool, will be allowed in cotton. But as for a genuine reduction—no chance.

SENATOR CULBERSON'S STATEMENT

When the senate held a brief session July 23, Senator Culberson asked for the printing of a series of tables showing the votes of the democratic members on all the more important questions before the senate in connection with the tariff, and in doing so made a brief explanation: "An impression seems to have been created in some quarters that in their action on the tariff bill, which is now in conference, the democrats of the senate have been commonly and seriously divided among themselves, and have often voted with the protectionist majority," said the Texas senator. Continuing, Mr. Culberson said:

"With the exception of the vote on iron ore, coal, lumber and hides, the democratic vote was practically a unit and on hides it was an unit when coupled with the proposition that leather, boots and shoes should also be placed on the free list. On the income tax amendment to the bill, the democratic vote was unanimous, and on oil, tea and coffee, print paper and wood pulp, it was substantially so.

"Still more significant and more important on all subjects of the bill which particularly and more directly affect the consuming masses and the cost of living, such as crockery, cutlery, glassware, sugar, household goods generally, agricultural implements, blankets, flannels and hats and leather, boots and shoes, cotton manufactures, wool and manufactures on wool, in fact all articles affected by the tariff which enter into the daily needs of the people, the democratic vote was in effect unanimous and was for much lower duties than those which were adopted.

"It was upon democratic initiative, moreover, that sulphate of ammonia, Paris green and London purple, and cotton bagging were placed on the free list in the senate bill, which are the principal benefits to farmers and fruit growers in the bill; and it was also due to democratic initiative that the tax on tea and coffee was stricken from the maximum provision of the senate measure."

HOW DEMOCRATIC SENATORS STOOD ON THE TARIFF

(From the New York World.)

Washington, July 10.—The position of the various democratic senators on tariff legislation is shown by the following analysis of their action during the consideration of the tariff bill just passed by the senate:

Senators who opposed all high tariff rates—Gore, Oklahoma; Shiveley, Indiana; Rayner, Maryland; Newlands, Nevada; Davis, Arkansas. Senator Davis was absent most of the session, but he spoke against the protective tariff theory. Senator Clark, of Arkansas, took little part in the debate or in the voting on the bill.

Simon-pure democratic protectionists—McEnery, Louisiana; Foster, Louisiana; Talliaferro and Fletcher, Florida.

Protectionists in spots—Bacon, Georgia; Bailey, Texas; Bankhead, Alabama; Chamberlain, Oregon; Clay, Georgia; Daniel, Virginia; Frazier, Tennessee; Johnston, Alabama; Martin, Virginia; Simmons, North Carolina; Stone, Missouri; Taylor, Tennessee; Tillman, South Carolina; Money, Mississippi; Smith, Maryland; Overland, North Carolina; Hughes, Colorado; Culberson, Texas; Owen, Oklahoma; McLaurin, Mississippi.

Democratic senators who made protection speeches—Simmons, Daniel, Tillman, Talliaferro and Fletcher. Protection arguments were also made by Bacon, Bailey and Foster, but were predicated on the theory of a tariff for revenue.

Protection claims supported by democratic senators—Hides, iron ore, lead, zinc, wool and woollens, print paper, pineapples, cotton cloth, tea, lumber, petroleum and many others.

Only democrat to vote for the bill—McEnery, of Louisiana.

Only democrat to vote for a duty on petroleum—Owen, Oklahoma. Both Owen and McEnery voted for the Curtis restoration of the countervailing duty on petroleum products.

Reasoning of democratic senators on the tariff questions—The point of view—

Senators who voted to put a 25 cents a ton duty on iron ore—Bacon, Bailey, Bankhead, Chamberlain, Clay, Daniel, Fletcher, Foster, Frazier, Johnson of Alabama, McEnery, Martin, Simmons, Stone, Talliaferro, Taylor, Tillman.

Senators who voted for a tax of 10 cents a pound on tea—Tillman, Bailey.

Democrats who voted against free lumber—Bacon, Bailey, Bankhead, Chamberlain, Money, Smith of Maryland, Daniel, Fletcher, Foster, Johnson of Alabama; McEnery, Martin, Overman, Simmons, Talliaferro, Taylor, Tillman.

Democratic senator who voted against Dolliver woolen reductions—McEnery.

Democrat who opposed free print paper—Bailey. He explained his vote by saying he was for a tariff for revenue.

Senators who helped raise the duty on pineapples in the interest of the Florida growers—Bailey, Chamberlain, Clay, Fletcher, Foster, McEnery, Tillman, Talliaferro, Taylor.

Democrats who helped to keep up the rates on cotton cloth—Foster, McEnery. Democratic absentees from that vote—Bankhead, Chamberlain, Clark of Arkansas, Daniel, Davis, McLaurin, Rayner, Smith of South Carolina, Talliaferro, Taylor.

CENTRALIZATION THREATENED

Beware of an attempt at national incorporation. Attorney General Wickersham is recommending it in his speeches. Both Ex-President Roosevelt and President Taft have advocated it. Its object is to deprive the states of their power to regulate. It is a step backward—not a step forward. We do not need national incorporation. Federal remedies should be ADDED TO not SUBSTITUTED FOR state remedies.

COLD BLOODED

For cold-blooded selfishness commend us to the banker who first goes into a corporation and limits his own liability, then requires all borrowers to give security and finally refuses to give security to his depositors. He ought to be ashamed to ask for deposits.

THE DEAL CONFESSED

In an editorial entitled "The Deal Confessed," the Indianapolis News says: We have had something to say of the arguments used by the twenty-three representatives who oppose free raw materials to bring the president to their way of thinking. It has also been pointed out that Aldrich consented to duties on iron ore, coal, etc., in order to get

votes for his cotton and woolen schedules. But it has remained for Mr. Langley, of Kentucky, to give the exact terms of the bargain. Here is his statement:

"When Speaker Cannon was facing a large-sized insurrection, and when it looked as though he could not get votes enough to put through the rule for the passage of the tariff bill in the house, I received a summons to the speaker's room. There I found the speaker, Ex-Representative Jim Watson and Representative Dwight, the whip of the house. At that time a number of us were 'off the reservation' because we did not like the provisions of the Payne bill for free coal, free iron ore, free hides and \$1 lumber. Mr. Dwight promised me with an emphatic oath, in the presence of the speaker and Mr. Watson, who assented, that if we would withdraw our opposition and vote for the rule the tariff on these items would be restored in the senate and would remain restored in conference. The agreement included \$1.50 lumber instead of \$1 lumber. As a result of this promise, which I accepted as a hard and fast bargain, I withdrew my opposition and called a meeting of the insurgents, who did likewise, and the rule was adopted. Without our votes it never could have been put through. When I told President Taft of this agreement he merely said that he was not a party to it and could not consent to be bound by it."

Here we have a flood of light thrown on the business of tariff making. The duties in question were fixed, or to be fixed, through a deal which was construed as "a hard and fast bargain." The bargain was made, and the price paid. Naturally the men who, for a consideration, withdrew their opposition to the rule, feel that they ought to get the consideration. They rendered an important service on the assurance that they would be paid by the imposition of taxes satisfactory to them. Now, after having carried out their part of the agreement, they are told that they are not to get what they bargained for. Here, of course, is a conflict between two obligations—the obligation to the men who permitted the vote on the tariff bill in the house, and the obligation to the American people.

Precisely as Langley and the rest were promised that certain duties "would be restored in the senate and would remain restored in conference," so the people were promised that the tariff should be revised downward. Precisely as Langley and the rest, on the strength of the assurances given to them, permitted the bill to be brought to a vote, so the people on the strength of the assurance that the tariff was to be lowered voted for Mr. Taft, and returned a republican majority to the house of representatives. So the question is whether Langley and his associates or the American people shall receive the chief consideration. In our opinion the people have the superior claim.

But the really interesting and significant thing in the Langley statement is the frank confession of the truth of the charges made by the enemies of protection—namely, that the whole business is an affair of bargain and sale. Here we have what Langley calls "a hard and fast bargain." (Confirmed by "an emphatic oath.") Certain men had the power to hold up the tariff bill and they consented not to use that power in return for concessions made to their districts. The question with those who made the agreement was, not whether the duties on raw material were right and proper, but whether by granting them they could get the bill through, could maintain other rates at the high level fixed in the bill. There was no thought, and no pretense of any thought, of the welfare of the people, or the good of the country as a whole. It was simply a trade, a deal in taxes which were to be paid by the people. Undoubtedly there are many such bargains, as there always are—and they are likely to prove most embarrassing. The president, of course, is not bound by them, but the men who made them may think that they are bound. To repudiate the agreements might have the effect of upsetting everything, might even have the effect of defeating the tariff bill. Such is the situation. It is still further complicated by the fear of Langley and his associates that if they do not get the duties on raw materials they may be defeated for reelection. Such are the perils involved in government by privilege.

We commend Langley's words to those who talk so solemnly about "honest" protection and "scientific" tariffs. The bitterest enemy of the whole system could not have framed a more formidable indictment against it than that framed—all unconsciously of course—by Langley.—Indianapolis News.