If I thought he would repeat it, I should certainly offer an amendment and insist upon a vote. I hope and believe that not only the Senator from Connecticut, but every other Senator who may have thought that clerks who are connected with outside interests that seek special legislation could properly be paid for to change their minds, will not, as he has thought longer, so far as activity in the Senate is concerned.

To me it is the gravest kind of breach of public trust, and a still greater breach of faith with one's fellow Senators, to place upon the floor of the Senate any thing in which he and his colleagues are interested, and to make the fine discrimination the Senator from Nebraska does.

Mr. President, the whole attitude of the Senator from Connecticut is one of honesty of purpose, but even with all the considerations of a Senator's colleagues and the public in mind, he seems unable to get the viewpoint of the country and of the Senate that this act is one that is not to be tolerated in the future, at least, in this or any other public body in this country. But our duty is clear. We should pass this resolution by such a decisive majority that there will be no doubt as to what the Senate's position is as regards the actions of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to say just a word or two before the debate is closed, and I wish my friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETTE] were here. He charged in the early part of the discussion that the resolution is of a partisan nature. I want to call his attention to the fact that the debate has disclosed that his position or his character is absolutely without foundation, when we find that this man, Senator BRIGHAM, gets the most of his defense, as far as anything charging him with any personal wrong is concerned, from the other side. We have seen above partisanship. I am delighted that we have taken this high moral plane. If there has been any partisanship, it has been injected into the debate by those who have taken the course—honestly, I think—adopted by the Senator from Massachusetts in his opening speech.

Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. DIX] called attention to a proposition about which I have been thinking ever since this matter was first mentioned in the public press and even before the committee has made a report, and to me it is a discouraging feature, more discouraging than anything else that the resolution as I introduced it there was no charge of personal fraud; it was the action of the Senator that was condemned, and not the Senator himself. I think it may be that you cannot condemn the action of an individual without casting some reflection upon the individual, and, as I said in the beginning, it was a source of regret that I was unable to reach this wrong without doing that thing.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FESS. To me the difficulty is that the public will not make the fine discrimination the Senator from Nebraska does.

Mr. NORRIS. We have made no discrimination. We have gone as far as we can, as far as the amendment suggested by the Senator from Illinois, which I accepted with the modification, on the theory that it did not change the legal aspects of the resolution at all, was that it called attention to a proposition about which the Senator from Nebraska does.
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Therefore I will have to ask that the putty amendment go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will go over. The clerk will report the next amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In paragraph 28, coal-tar products, on page 14, in line 8, after the word “derivative,” the committee proposes to insert “vanillin, from whatever source obtained, derived, or manufactured.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah explain the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. Under the ruling of the Treasury Department vanillin was declared a coal-tar product, and we merely transfer to the coal-tar products paragraph.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I have no objection.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I inquire the effect of the change?

Mr. SMOOT. That will depend on whether we keep the American valuation or not.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a coal-tar product?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is a coal-tar product and the change will have very little effect. I think it is satisfactory to everyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

Mr. SMOOT. The next amendment passed over is on the same page, beginning with line 17.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 16, the committee proposes to insert:

(b) Synthet Indigo, “Colour Index No. 1177,” and sulphur black, “Colour Index No. 978,” 3 cents per pound and 20 cents per ad valorem.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, this is a great decrease. It is synthetic Indigo. I think there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. It cuts the present rate in half.

Mr. SMOOT. It is more than half. It reduces it from 7 cents to 3 cents.

Mr. HARRISON. Some of us think it should go still further down, but that is a pretty good result as there are no imports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair inquire if the Senate has acted on the amendment striking out lines 13, 14, 15, and 16?

Mr. SMOOT. That has been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment in lines 17, 18, and 19, page 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 19, the committee proposes to insert:

(c) The ad valorem rates provided in this paragraph shall be based upon the selling price (as defined in subdivision (f) of section 402, Title IV), of any similar competitive article manufactured or produced in the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. That makes no change in the law. It takes the language from one section and puts it in another.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Under the Chair.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that, but it raises a question concerning the American selling price for coal-tar products and intermediates.

Mr. SMOOT. That will have to come up later.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it the purpose of the Senator to take up following the adoption of the pending amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. No; we can not take it up because there is no amendment to the paragraph itself.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But this is an amendment, and that is the point I wanted to get straightened out so far as the parliamentary situation is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not an amendment to existing law. If we change the American valuation, then of course this will have to be changed, but if there is no such change, then this is just a transfer from one paragraph to another.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the opinion of the present occupant of the Chair, would the Senator from Wisconsin be espoused from presenting a motion, while still in Committee of the Whole, to strike out the committee amendment beginning at line 20, if action is now taken to adopt that amendment?