

it. Other features of the wood pulp schedule are still pending.

Senator Bailey, speaking for himself and most of the democratic and republican advocates of the income tax, announced that he would consent to postpone the disposal of the income tax question until after the tariff schedules were disposed of. After debate an order postponing the subject was suggested by Senator Bailey, and agreed to. The formal presentation of the matter was made by Senator Aldrich, and it took the form of a unanimous consent agreement to defer the entire income tax and corporation tax questions until the tariff schedules are out of the way. At that time Senator Bailey's amendment for an income tax and the committee's substitute for it will be taken up and kept before the senate until they are disposed of.

The finance committee's amendment to the hide paragraph of the tariff bill was presented to the senate. It levies a tariff of 15 per cent ad valorem on "hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dried, salted or pickled," with a provision for a drawback equal to the duty when exported in the form of leather. The amendment's effect is to take hides from the free list, where the house left them. The hide amendment failed of final consideration, and was still under discussion when the senate adjourned. Senator Lodge spoke for three hours in opposition to the provision which imposed a duty of 15 per cent, which is the Dingley law. Senator Warner took occasion to defend the provision.

The senate adopted the window glass schedule, placing a lower duty on such glass than is provided either by the Dingley law or the house bill. Senator Bacon's amendment for still lower rates than those recommended by the committee was rejected.

By a viva voce vote the senate agreed to the committee amendment fixing the duty on illustrated post cards at 15 cents per pound and 25 per cent ad valorem.

#### FROM THE TARIFF DEBATE

Mr. Aldrich—Is the senator from West Virginia opposing these increases on agricultural products?

Mr. Elkins—Not at all. I am not opposing them in any way. All I ask is that the distinguished senator will put a fair duty on the products of West Virginia, which are worth just as much—yes, more in many localities—and entitled to the same consideration. All I desire is that the finance committee be just, fair and consistent. This is all I ask for West Virginia at the hands of the committee; nothing more; no discrimination against our products.

Mr. Aldrich—Is the senator from West Virginia trying to make a trade with me or with the senator from North Dakota, Mr. McCumber?

Mr. Elkins—I had rather trade with the chairman of the committee, the senator from Rhode Island. (Laughter.) He can deliver more, and I think West Virginia would get better treatment from him. He is a sound protectionist.

Mr. McEnery, of Louisiana—I recollect in 1897 I received letters from Cleveland, Cincinnati, Pittsburg and some other cities relative to sugar machinery, all of which was to go to the state of Louisiana. Then they buy all their chemicals abroad. They use the finest mules in the world. To draw a sugar plantation plow requires from two to eight mules. This class of mules are the very finest which can be produced. They are raised in Kentucky, in Tennessee and in Missouri. Our planters send out there and buy a vast number of mules. I know the state of Tennessee, for instance, almost worships the mule, and I am inclined to think that that is brought about a good deal by the big purchases which the sugar planters of Louisiana make. I recollect once going into a court room in a town in Tennessee. There was a judge who probably was not excelled by any one in the state of Tennessee for ability and character. He was in his seat, and on his right was a picture of a jack. Nobody who did not have great admiration for the mule and the benefits it brought to him would have there hanging such a picture in the court room and having it the handmaid of justice.—From the Congressional Record.

#### PARTY PLATFORMS

The Nebraska State Journal (Rep.) says: "If the party platform is to serve no higher function than to make hypocrites of statesmen and dupes of their constituents, it should be abolished, and soon." There is one other alternative; abolish the statesmen who repudiate their platform and then educate the dupes.

## Carnegie Pension Come Home to Roost

Already the management of the Carnegie pension fund is undertaking to exercise control over universities that have permitted the Carnegie influence to lay hold upon them. A New York dispatch carried by the Associated Press says:

"Harvard, Columbia and New York universities have been warned of laxity concerning standards at the institutions which may violate the requirements for participation in the benefits of the Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching, according to the Herald today. Official communications calling the institution's attention to the supposed laxity in standards have been sent out by the foundation."

The request of the University of Illinois to be placed on the foundation's list has been denied. The foundation contends that entrance facilities are too easy and that the advertised standard is not maintained. The request of the University of North Carolina also is denied. The University of Wisconsin is held to be the model institution by the foundation.

A Washington, D. C., dispatch to the Lincoln (Neb.) Journal says:

"The executives of the Carnegie foundation have withdrawn from George Washington university of this city the privileges of the fund and its pension features on the ground that the university has not the \$200,000 productive endowment required by the foundation in order to receive such benefits; also on the ground that its endowment was mis-stated to them and finally, because it is charged the university does not enforce strictly its scholarship requirements for admittance and permits its degrees to be issued without the necessary amount of work. The university authorities, while admitting that the institution is very much cramped financially, deny these charges. Columbia, New York City University and even Harvard are reported now to be on the list of possible treatment of the same sort."

Referring to the Carnegie pension affair the Lincoln (Neb.) News (rep.) prints this editorial:

"The critics of the plan of placing the University of Nebraska upon the Carnegie teachers' pension list have discovered a real objection to it. That is that the men in charge of the distribution of the fund seek to exercise a general superintendence over the universities that accept the beneficence, and insist upon having them run as they think they ought to be run, under penalty of having the pension fund withdrawn from the institution.

"In proof of this they bring forward the case of Georgetown university. The regents recently discharged two professors for reasons best known to themselves. Georgetown university is located in the national capital, by the way. The executive committee of the Carnegie foundation has summarily scratched Georgetown off its list, and its professors must go pensionless or move elsewhere. The reason assigned in the dispatches is that the committee believed the university had not acted right by the two retired professors, and anyway, that the institution was trying to cover too broad a field with the financial backing at its command.

"This phase of the matter can not be over-emphasized. If the Carnegie executive committee can exercise the power of veto on university management, then no self-respecting university can place itself under obligations to it. The critics say with considerable force that if the Carnegie committee can say who shall not be discharged as professors, then it can also say who shall be discharged, or who shall be engaged. It is also true that no such outside interference with the judgment of the regents can be permitted on the personnel of the teaching force or the field covered.

The advocates of the acceptance by Nebraska of the Carnegie fund have contended that Carnegie had, by the terms of his gift, placed the control of the fund beyond the reach of his control, but the dictation sought to be exercised towards Georgetown smacks a great deal of the ironmaster's methods. The only reason that actuated the News in urging the acceptance of the pension by Nebraska as that all of its rival universities were going in, thus leaving Nebraska at a disadvantage upon what seemed to be in most part a quixotic ground of refusal. But before it can be accepted by Nebraska the

conditions must be made so clear that no such club as was shaken over Georgetown's head can be wielded over that of Nebraska. Freedom with poverty is as much to be desired in the university as in the individual."

#### EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM

The New York newspapers publish the full text of the letter written by President Prichett of the Carnegie foundation fund, giving in detail the reasons for dropping George Washington university from the benefits of the foundation. In the letter it is alleged that the revenues of the university have fallen below the required amount, that its standards of admission are not strictly upheld, and that there is "lax administration" of the college of political sciences. It is interesting, by the way, that Mr. Carnegie's agents should take so deep an interest in the political science department of a university on their pension list! Why political science rather than languages, or botany, or astronomy? Is it because plutocracy feels itself more vitally affected by what political science is taught, and how it is taught, than in other lines of university work?

President Prichett's letter says further:

"The committee further calls your attention to the extract from the rules for the admission of institutions. The trustees of the Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching reserve the right to discontinue the privilege of participation in the system of retiring allowances of the foundation whenever, in the judgment of the trustees, an institution ceases to conform to the regulations maintained by the trustees. The executive committee feels compelled also to protest against the extraordinary action of the institution in forcibly retiring two professors, both of whom are in the prime of their active teaching, on the ground that the institution needs to save money by the retiring allowance system."

An interview with President Needham of George Washington university is also printed, in which he declares that "the action of the trustees has been taken hastily and as the direct result of the controversies which have arisen through the working out of economies in our work." He declares that the university's standards are honestly upheld, and that its assets are greater than they ever were, while its work is better today than it was at the time it was admitted to the Carnegie benefits. He concludes by saying:

"To every fair minded man I am sure it will be apparent that to discontinue this important relation without giving the university any hearing whatever was hasty and prejudiced and unjust."

There is the case. Perhaps the university is right. Perhaps the Carnegie trustees are right. The discharged professors may have been treated justly or unjustly. The university may be governing itself wisely or unwisely. But the same thing may be true of the state of Nebraska, or the government of the United States. Both of them have made mistakes and committed injustices, and may be doing so today. If not one billionaire but several should establish a foundation to furnish revenue for the state of Nebraska or the government of the United States, and should cut off the revenue if either government should displease the foundation, it would be a similar case.

Universities undoubtedly make mistakes in their government. But they are supposed to govern themselves none the less. All the labored explanations, to the effect that the Carnegie fund contemplated no dictation or interference with the conduct of colleges profiting by it, appear to be given the lie direct in the light of the news from George Washington university.—Omaha World-Herald.

#### INDIFFERENT, OF COURSE!

Some of the protectionist democrats at Washington have, in reply to The Commoner's criticism, declared that they are indifferent as to Mr. Bryan's opinion. But that is not the question. Why are they indifferent to party platforms? They will find among their constituents many old fashioned democrats who still believe in keeping promises. And it must be remembered that the average democrat, having no trust attorney to prepare argument for him is apt to tell the truth about the recreant democrats.