

minimum level as retaliation against any nation held to be discriminating against us. The senate has altered this in terms and form, but whether in substance seems doubtful, to say the least. It looks greatly like another instance of using words to conceal meaning, a practice of which we have had many examples during the construction of this tariff bill, and a literature to which much has been added. Under the senate's treatment of the maximum and minimum scheme, the provisions of the dutiable list and the free list of the customs section of the law would constitute the minimum tariff. After March 31, 1910, there would be paid on all articles imported from foreign countries the rates of duty prescribed by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list and, in addition, 25 per cent ad valorem. But when the president is satisfied that any foreign nation does not discriminate against American products, he is to make proclamation to that effect, whereupon such foreign country shall have its products admitted into the United States under the terms of the minimum tariff—in other words, the regular tariff as prescribed by congress. The arguments offered by Aldrich, Root and others in support of this alleged modification of the house plan were the arguments which would be made for genuine modification of that plan. They were good arguments put to a bad purpose, to a purpose either itself blind or supposing the country blind, as we see it. 'Nations are more touchy than individuals,' said Root, speciously. 'What would not offend the individual will frequently offend the nation. We can not say to our neighbors that unless you do so and so, you will be constrained to do so and so, but we can with propriety, without violating diplomatic etiquette, say to our neighbors, 'provided you will do so and so, we will do so and so.' The senate plan does not to us seem to offer any real relief whatever from the house plan. The nation upon which a tariff war is to be opened will be designated by omission from the president's proclamation restoring others to the favor of the minimum tariff instead of by being named in a proclamation taking away from it that favor. And what's the difference? Would a man hang any more comfortably for having a dozen others sentenced mock fashion to hang with him and then pardoned at the foot of the scaffold? It isn't likely. The senate leaves the maximum and minimum section of the tariff bill as essentially a measure for retaliation and hostilities as when it came from the house, and adds insult to injury by supposing the people of the country so stupid as not to be able to thread the tangle of words and forms and hippodrome performances, and single out the truth at bottom."

ON JULY 12, the house adopted the income tax resolution. Payne of New York (rep.) declared that the tax would make a nation of liars. Following are extracts from the Associated Press report: "By the decisive vote of 317 to 14, more than the necessary two-thirds, the house today passed the senate joint resolution, providing for the submission of the income tax amendment question to the states. The negative votes were all cast by republicans. The resolution now goes to the president for his signature. The debate lasted about four hours, and this afforded many members, mostly democrats, an opportunity to air their views. The burden of the democratic speeches was that it was simply a case of stealing democratic thunder, although some of the remarks on that side incidentally touched upon the tariff, and the corporation tax with no little amount of castigation of the republicans for failing as was alleged to keep party pledges. To a man, the democrats voted for the resolution, while fourteen republicans cast their votes against it, as follows: Allen, Maine; Barchfeld, Dalzell, McCreary and Wheeler, Pennsylvania; Fordney, Michigan; Gardner, McCall and Weeks, Massachusetts; Hill and Henry, Connecticut; Olcott and Southwick, New York; Calderhead, Kansas. While favoring the amendment Mr. Henry, of Texas, expressed the fear that it would suffer defeat, if submitted to the legislatures. He desired to have the proposition submitted to constitutional conventions. Mr. Bartlett, Ga., shared in this view. The proposition, he declared, was a sham, and designed to prevent the imposition of such a tax. In a fiery speech in support of an income tax, Mr. Robinson of Arkansas, arraigned the republicans for, as he charged, 'fooling the people,' before the last presidential election. He defended William J. Bryan, declaring that he stood head and shoulders above any other man in private life today. He was

pure and spotless, and yet he said, the same republican party that denounced Bryan as an anarchist, was now appropriating his political thunder. 'There are men here,' he remarked, 'who owe William J. Bryan an apology.' 'I scorn,' said Mr. James of Kentucky, in favoring the resolution, 'a government whose taxing power provides that Lazarus shall share his crumbs, but that Dives must not give up his riches.' Mr. James quoted from an ante-election speech in which Mr. Taft favored a graduated income tax and expressed the view that perhaps a change in the personnel of the United States supreme court might effect a reversal of its former opinion, holding the income tax unconstitutional. 'You denounce Bryan for that,' he exclaimed, facing the republican side. 'You said he was assailing the honor and integrity of the supreme court, yet the man you elevated to the loftiest station in the nation virtually repeated the very same words that for twelve years the democratic platform had uttered.'

AT THE Baron de Hirsch school, New York City, seven hundred pupils competed in a prize essay contest. The prize was won by Pauline Garb, a fifteen-year-old girl who came from Russia less than one year ago. The subject of Miss Garb's essay was "America." American children and American parents should read and re-read the beautiful tribute made to this country of ours by this young Russian girl. The essay follows: "America! How beautiful this name used to sound to me when I was in Russia, at the time of the revolution, at the time when so many people gave up their lives in the fight for the rights of mankind, at the time when you could seldom see happy smiling faces. At that time I began to dream about America. I thought of it day and night. Even in my sleep I saw this wonderful country. A long time has passed since then. Now I am here in this bright land of day. The more I think of America now the more I see that what I dreamed before was true. America is a wonderful country—a country where the bells of freedom and liberty were first heard by the people, a country where every person enjoys his freedom and opportunities—in short, a country where every man in the world can find his fortune. How little many people born in America seem to appreciate their fatherland! Very little they know about other countries, from where their ancestors came and where they struggled so much. But this fact we can not assert about immigrants. No matter how long they will be in the land of freedom they will always appreciate it, because they can never forget the grievances and sorrows which made them come to America. Such people do not remain foreigners. They try to make this country their fatherland and help to maintain its greatness among the civilized nations in the world."

The Tariff in Congress

The tariff bill passed the United States senate at 11 o'clock p. m. July 8. Those republicans who voted in the negative were Beveridge, Indiana; Bristow, Kansas; Brown, Nebraska; Burkett, Nebraska; Clapp, Minnesota; Crawford, South Dakota; Cummins, Iowa; Dolliver, Iowa; LaFollette, Wisconsin; Nelson, Minnesota.

McEnery of Louisiana was the only democrat recorded in the affirmative.

The vote in detail: Yeas: Aldrich, Borah, Boutell, Bradley, Brandegee, Briggs, Bulkeley, Burnham, Burrows, Burton, Carter, Clark (Wyoming), Crane, Depew, Dick, Dixon, Dupont, Elkins, Flint, Frye, Gallinger, Gamble, Guggenheim, Hale, Heyburn, Johnson (N. D.), Kean, Lorimer, Jones, McCumber, McEnery, Nixon, Oliver, Page, Penrose, Perkins, Piles, Scott, Smith (Mich.), Smoot, Stephenson, Sutherland, Warner, Warren, Wetmore—45.

Nays: Bacon, Bailey, Bankhead, Beveridge, Bristow, Brown, Burkett, Chamberlain, Clapp, Crawford, Culberson, Cummins, Daniel, Dolliver, Fletcher, Foster, Frazier, Gore, Hughes, Johnston (Ala.), LaFollette, McLaurin, Martin, Money, Nelson, Newlands, Overman, Owen, Shively, Simmons, Smith (S. C.), Stone, Taliaferro, Taylor—34.

The Associated Press says: Offering an amendment placing on the free list articles in the production of which there is no composition in the United States, Mr. Cummins declared that this plan conformed to the principles of protection. The amendment was rejected. The

failure of the senate to keep the promise made to the people by the republican party, respecting a revision of the tariff downward was the theme of Senator Beveridge, as the debate on the pending bill was drawing to a close. "Our votes," he said, "shall be cast in harmony with our party's pledges as voiced by our party's leader, and the nation's president."

Suggesting that the insurgents would cast their votes on the final passage of the bill in conformity with their previous action, Mr. Beveridge said they would do so, as a notice to the conferees to bring back a bill in which there should be decreases of duty.

Mr. Beveridge was answered by Mr. Aldrich who said he had often seen men interpret their own judgment as the judgment of their party. The bill was then put on its passage. It was passed, 45 to 34.

Upon motion of Mr. Aldrich the vice president announced the senate conferees as follows: Senators Aldrich, Burrows, Penrose, Hale, Culom, Ross, republicans; and Daniel, Money and Bailey, democrats.

IN THE HOUSE

When the tariff bill went to the house, the 847 amendments put on by the senate were disagreed to by a vote of 178 to 151. Mr. Payne appeals to his colleagues to send the conferees to the senate unhampered by instructions. Eighteen republicans voted with the democrats against sending the bill to conference. One democrat, Broussard of Louisiana, voted with the republicans for a conference. After appointing a conference committee, the house adjourned until Monday noon.

In the debate in the house, Mann of Illinois, Davidson of Wisconsin, Douglass of Ohio, and other republicans denounced the tariff measure as amounting to a bold violation of the republican party's pledges. Norris, republican, of Nebraska, was particularly vigorous in denouncing the measure.

Speaker Cannon appointed the following members of the house committee on ways and means to be the house conferees: Payne, New York; Dalzell, Pa.; McCall, Mass.; Boutel, Ill.; Calderhead, Kan.; Fordney, Mich.; Clark, Mo.; Underwood, Ala.; Griggs, Ga.

IN CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

It was apparent early in the day that in the selection of the conference committee, Aldrich had his way in the house as in the senate. A strong effort was made by western republicans to have Mr. Calderhead of Kansas, appointed on the conference committee. This request was refused and the members of the ways and means committee of the house were chosen.

An Associated Press dispatch says: "The manner in which the house conferees were selected by Speaker Cannon is occasioning much criticism in the house, and an effort is being made to have President Taft take part in the threatened controversy. According to current report Mr. Payne sought to have the republican conferees named in order of their seniority as was done in the senate. The speaker chose the conferees himself, ignoring Representatives Hill of Connecticut and Needham of California. Representative Calderhead of Kansas and Fordney of Michigan, who were named in spite of the fact that they are outranked by Messrs. Hill and Needham, are declared to be 'standpatters' of the most pronounced type."

As soon as the conference committee met, Aldrich adopted "steam roller" methods and barred the democratic members from the conference committee. The Associated Press says:

"All of the conferees including the democratic members, met in the office of the senate building, at the appointed time. They were in session about an hour when the democratic members were dismissed. Senator Bailey and Representative Champ Clark, walking out together, laughingly told a number of newspaper men that they could not expect much help from the democrats in covering the news of the conference. 'We have been dismissed,' said Mr. Bailey, 'and we will not be called in again until the majority completes its job of fooling the people. Senator Aldrich frankly told the minority that the majority would prepare its report without assistance. No protest was made by the democrats, as it had been known all along that they would not be permitted to participate in making up the conference report any more than they had been permitted to have a hand in making up the bill in committees.'"

In conference between the president and members of congress, it was decided to reduce the new corporation tax from two per cent to one per cent.