

ed to harm it instead of to help it. It will recall the fact to the minds of republicans that this issue has never received the indorsement of any republican national convention. The republicans, as a war measure, passed an income tax in 1861, but at that time the government was fighting for its life, and it reached out for all the cash that was in sight. Soon after the war, when the heavy drain on the government ceased, the tax was abolished. It was the most unsatisfactory impost which was ever levied. The cost of collection was heavy, and the number of votes which it drew away from the republican party was large. Republicans who remember that act when it was in operation, or those who have read about the confusion which it caused, will be likely to vote against any tax of this sort in the future. As a Greek bearing gifts, Mr. Bryan's championship of the income tax will arouse republican distrust. It has been the good fortune of the republican voters of the country to have fought Bryan and Bryanism through three national campaigns, and neither the one nor the other has changed sufficiently in the past twelve months to alter the republican attitude. It will be remembered that immediately after the election of 1896 Mr. Bryan declared that his trail through the campaign was marked by increased republican majorities. If, as now seems to be probable, he takes the stump in favor of the income tax amendment, that proposition will lose the votes of many republicans who otherwise might be inclined to accept the tax as a necessary evil.—St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

"EVERYBODY WORKS POOR FATHER"

Washington, June 30.—(Special Dispatch to Lincoln, Neb., News)—How do the tariff schedules, as adopted by the senate, hit father?

A careful analysis of the bill in its present stage of development shows that the man of family is entitled to a considerable grouch, granting of course, that the increase made in the duties of some of the necessaries of life, as well as on minor luxuries, mean a corresponding raise in retail prices—which is usually the way a tariff bill works. The very first thing in the morning, supposing pa is fond of bologna sausage for breakfast, he may well wrinkle his brow, for the tariff on that article of food has been raised beyond expression in figures of percentage.

In the Dingley law and the Payne bill, the succulent bologna was on the free list; the tariff rate was no percentage at all. The senate made the rate 25 per cent ad valorem.

Should pa lead off in his breakfast bill of fare with a few juicy slices of pineapple, bologna would be the second jolt to his nervous system. Payne raised the Dingley rate on pineapples, the senate finance committee raised it some and the senate shot it up again, the net result being 128 per cent over the Dingley duty.

When he comes to his German fried potatoes he will get a third shock, for the senate aeroplaned the price of potatoes from 25 to 45 cents a bushel—an elevation of 80 per cent.

Buckwheat cakes will be a fourth reminder of the senate's penchant for boosting rates. The tariff on buckwheat was raised over Dingley and Payne rates 25 per cent.

Unless the milliners are philanthropic enough to bear the tax, father will find that he will have to pay more for his wife's and daughter's trimmings next fall. If it is true, as has been alleged in the senate, that retail profits are higher than the present temperature in Washington, maybe the milliners will deduct the increases made in the bill, but father hardly expects that. The duty on ostrich feathers and on artificial fruits, leaves and other exhibits from the farm, field and forest that adorn the headgear of the feminine, has been increased 20 per cent.

His monthly bill for the children's clothes will also be higher. In the matter of cotton cloth the house adopted the Dingley rates, but the senate bill raised the rate on common, unbleached cotton 125 per cent; on the bleached 400 and on the colored or printed goods, 50 per cent. The finer grades show increases of 10 to 50 per cent, and some are unchanged.

Knit goods remain about the same, the average rate exceeding 100 per cent. The Payne bill raised the Dingley duty on woman's cotton stockings from 20 to 30 cents a dozen, but the Aldrich bill restored the Dingley rate.

Pa may find some consolation, also, in the fact that ladies' and children's gloves, on which Payne raised the Dingley rates from 100 to 300 per cent on the ground that the protection would transfer the industry to this country, have been returned to the old rates in the Aldrich bill. He can not help wondering, however, what the conference committee will do to this schedule as well as to that relating to shoes, on which the senate placed a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem as compared to 15 per cent in the Payne bill and 25 per cent in the Dingley law.

If he has any occasion to buy silk plush outfits, he will be confronted with the fact that Aldrich raised the Dingley rate of 75 per cent to 105 per cent. He will learn that there is

an increase of 15 per cent each on silk, velvet and ribbons. Many other varieties of silk fabrics have been increased from 10 to 13 per cent.

Lingerie will also give father some palpitations of the heart, for Aldrich succeeded in raising the tariff on laces and embroideries from the present rate of 60 per cent, the highest that had ever been imposed, to a rate varying from 70 to 150 per cent. This falls particularly upon the very cheapest laces, those that in the Europe market sell at less than two cents per dozen yards. It should be noted, moreover, that the increased duties are not confined to laces proper, but are imposed equally upon all articles of which laces form even the most insignificant part.

When father pays his grocery bill he will find that there have been increases over the Dingley rates on lemons of 50 per cent; celery 51 per cent; jellies 28 per cent, and grapes 25 per cent.

The same old rates, however, prevail on such imported food supplies as meats, eggs, breadstuffs, dairy products, fish and berries.

There have been also the following increases on farm products:

Corn, 33 per cent; oats, 32 per cent; wheat, 20 per cent, and rye, 100 per cent.

It may afford satisfaction to father to learn that imported "hand-me-down" suits are not increased in the Aldrich bill over the 50 per cent ad valorem rate of the Dingley bill.

It will depend largely upon the compulsion of father's pocketbook whether or not he will have any reason to growl over the fact that a duty of 35 per cent has been put upon foreign made yachts, whereas, they used to come in free.

But after the bills for the month have been received, and father compares them with his balance in bank, perhaps he may find relief in turning to paragraphs 14 and 78. He may take his choice as between chloroform and strychnine, as each has been reduced to 50 per cent.

THE TARIFF BEFORE CONGRESS

The two houses remained practically idle while the conference committee deliberated. An Associated Press dispatch under date of July 16 says:

"Twenty-four hours would see the end of the work of the senate and house conferees on the tariff bill, and a substantial agreement on the questions at issue, but for the five propositions—iron ore, coal, hides, oil and lumber—upon which the president stands firm for radical reductions or even abolition of the tariff. This is the way the conferees describe the situation, and upon capital hill they are facetiously calling these propositions 'the national issues.'"

On July 16th, twenty-three republican members of congress called upon President Taft and sought to impress upon him the importance of having a tariff on raw material. Referring to this meeting, the Associated Press says:

The spokesmen of the visitors were Representative Young of Michigan, who dwelt on the necessity of placing a high duty on iron ore; Mondell of Wyoming, who is particularly interested in coal; Gaines of West Virginia, speaking for coal and iron; Langley of Kentucky, for coal and lumber; Cowles of North Carolina, for lumber and Austin of Tennessee, for coal, iron and lumber, and Hayes of California.

Mr. Langley put the matter squarely up to the president as a question of political expediency.

"We come from democratic states, some of us," said Mr. Langley, "but we were elected as republicans who believe in the protection of the raw materials. If we fail to protect our constituents we will be 'revised downward'—into private life."

President Taft remarked dryly that he was as much interested in republican success as any one could be.

The President's Statement

Later in the day the following official statement was made at the White House:

"Mr. Young of Michigan opposed free ore; Mr. Mondell opposed free coal or reciprocity with Canada and free hides; each on the ground that the policy would injure the interests in his state, and a discussion was participated in by other representatives who urged that the doctrine of free raw materials was not a republican doctrine. The president replied that he was not committed to the principle of free raw material, but that he was committed to the principle of a downward revision of the tariff which he had promised, and that he was obliged to look at the matter not from the standpoint of

any particular district, but from the standpoint of the whole country, and also from the standpoint of responsibility for the entire republican party. He said the question in each case was a question of fact, to be determined by evidence, as to whether the present duty was needed for protection, or whether the rate was excessive so that a downward revision, or putting the article on the free list, would not injure the industry.

He repeated the platform of the republican party, and he said he understood it meant a downward revision in many instances, though perhaps in some few cases an increase might be needed; that he reached this construction of the platform on what he understood to be the principle of protection and its justification, namely, that after an industry was protected by a duty equal to the difference between the cost of production abroad, and the cost of production in this country, including a fair profit to the manufacturer, the effectiveness of American labor, and the ingenuity of American inventors under the impulse of competition behind the tariff wall, would reduce the cost of production, and that, with the reduction and the cost of production, the tariff rate would become unnecessarily high, and ought to be reduced.

This was the normal operation of the tariff, as claimed by the defenders of the protective system—not in every case, but as a general rule that of course a revision of the tariff would not be perfect, must have defects and inconsistencies, but insofar as his influence went, when called upon to act, in connection with legislation, it would be thrown in the direction of performing the promises of the party as he understood them; and that if iron ore and oil and coal and hides did not need protection and the conditions were such as to enable the ore producers and the oil producers and the coal producers and the producers of hides to compete successfully without reduction of wages, with the producers from abroad then they did not need a duty and their articles should go on the free list.

It was a question of fact which he hoped to make up his mind with respect to, on such evidence as was available to him in order to carry out what he understood to be the promises of the party to the whole people. He said he felt that his position as the titular head of the republican party and as president, gave him a somewhat broader point of view than that of a single member of congress in respect to articles produced in his district. He felt strongly the call of the country for a downward revision within the limitations of the protective principle and he hoped to be able to respond to that call as he heard it, as well in the interests of the party as of the country.

WILL THE VOTERS FORGET?

The following dispatch was printed in the St. Louis Republic:

Chicago, Ill., July 1.—"More democratic votes, more democratic sentiment is being created by Senator Aldrich today than William Jennings Bryan ever created in his whole life," said Harry Selz, second vice president of Selz, Schwab & Co., wholesale shoe dealers, today in discussing the tariff on heavy hides as proposed in the Aldrich bill. "But what have the people to expect from democracy when ten of its principal representatives in the United States senate voted with the high protectionist republicans, as they did for a duty on hides?"

"When I protested before the senatorial committee in Washington that they were making democratic votes and sentiment they laughed at me.

"Oh, the voters will forget all about it by the congressional election a year from next fall," they replied.

"Well, wait and see, but I'll bet they won't."

Mr. Selz was commenting upon the prospects for an increase in the price of shoes and the protest of the shoe manufacturers, who met at the Union League Club on Wednesday.

"It is the trust methods to which I object," he declared. "I don't care if the packers do go into the leather business—they are fast getting a monopoly of the tanneries as it is—nor do I care if they go into the shoe business, if they don't have special legislation to help them drive the independent manufacturer out of the business."

WELL! WELL! WELL!

So the republican senate has endorsed the income tax amendment! Well, have a smile with us.