

last democratic national platform, recommended by a republican president and supported by a unanimous vote in the United States senate, and by almost a unanimous vote in the national house of representatives. It would look like there would be no opposition to the ratification of the amendment but powerful interests are at work to prevent ratification and these interests are not meeting the issue squarely—they can not. They are resorting to untruthful and insincere arguments. There is not the slightest reason to fear that a tax would be put on ALL incomes.

Nearly all the European nations collect an income tax and not one of them taxes ALL incomes. Our nation has collected an income tax; it did not collect on ALL incomes. Several income tax bills have been proposed and no bill drawn by a friend of the income tax included ALL incomes. When an editor advocates an income tax on all incomes he may be set down as an enemy of the income tax; when he argues that ALL incomes will ever be included in any income tax law he proves himself knowingly dishonest in his argument.

Who are back of Judge and Leslie's? Are its owners possessors of large incomes which they are trying to protect from an income tax? If so, why not deal frankly with the public? Why try to hide behind the people with small incomes who are now overtaxed?

The same issue of Judge has a cartoon warning President Taft to beware of the postal savings bank which his platform specifically endorsed. There seems to be no limit to the attack made by Judge and Leslie's on policies demanded by the people. Who own them?

"WHO COMMENCED IT?"

The Fort Worth (Texas) Record, condemning Mr. Bryan for his action on the tariff question, says:

"Pray, who first called attention to democratic tariff differences? Who voluntarily came to Texas to raise an issue? Who served notice that the tariff position of the Texas democracy must be repudiated or appeal would be taken to the national democratic convention? Who challenged the soundness of view deliberately expressed by eighteen democratic senators? Who proffered a tariff platform which every democratic congressional candidate must approve or reject? Who was it that voluntarily appeared upon the scene as the champion of free raw material and challenged answer to his argument here and elsewhere among democratic constituents?"

Yes, who did "commence it?"

What state brought an indictment against the only tariff law passed by the democrats since the war? Who repudiated in the senate and house the national platform of the party, and even the doctrine that platforms were binding? Who divided the democrats of congress on the lumber question, on the hide question and on the question of iron ore?

Who divided the Texas senators on the lumber question? Who divided them on the question of iron ore?

Mr. Bryan stands with a large majority of the democrats of the nation in his position on the tariff question. Is he responsible for discord when he defends the democratic position on the tariff? Who says that he must avoid Texas in his speech making tours, and if he is to visit Texas who says that he must change his views to suit democrats who advocate protection for protection's sake? Mr. Bryan expects to speak elsewhere and he expects to defend the democratic position.

"If this be treason, make the most of it."

PRINCE ITO ASSASSINATED

The assassination of Prince Ito, the "Grand Old Man of Japan," will be mourned by all who are familiar with his career. He has, for a generation, been a power in his country and has played an important part in Japan's progress and development.

Because the Korean question was Japan's greatest problem Ito was selected to handle it. That his administration of the affairs of Korea aroused bitter resentment among many of the people of the Hermit Kingdom was chargeable not so much to him as to the fact that no nation can govern another except by force and force always arouses hatred. Japan has done some wonderful things but she would perform a miracle if she succeeded in making her domination acceptable to Korea. No other nation has succeeded in accomplishing such a thing.

Mr. Bryan and the Committee on Rules

In the house of representatives August 29, 1893, the question of amending the rules was under consideration. Mr. Catchings of Mississippi had offered certain amendments to the rules. These amendments were debated for some time. The debate for one day covers perhaps twenty pages of the Congressional Record and the part taken by Mr. Bryan in that debate covers nearly three pages. Following are extracts from the Congressional Record of August 29, 1893:

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in behalf of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi and then a word in behalf of one or two provisions in the proposed rules. I think the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. Pickler) are worthy the consideration of members. We need not disguise the fact that there are in various parts of the country interests which pertain to those parts alone and that however honest and however anxious the members of the committee on rules may be to give every part of the country fair representation, it is impossible for them to enter fully into the wishes and interests of sections in which they do not live.

The gentleman from South Dakota has called attention to the history of this question and has shown that up to the thirty-fifth congress, I believe, the committee on rules contained a larger number of members; and it is strange to my mind that as our country grows in size and as the number of representatives in congress increases the number of members of this committee should diminish rather than increase. And I emphasize what has been already said that there is not today upon the committee on rules a member representing that great trans-Mississippi country.

The center of population has been going westward. It is now in southwestern Indiana. Take the western members of the committee on rules, and they are near to the center of population. Is it possible that these gentlemen, however desirous they may be to do justice to our section of the country, can as fairly represent our people, can as faithfully urge the importance of our measures as they could if they lived among us and understood our interests? And is it unfair for us to insist that this section of the United States is just as important as any other section, and that its interests should be looked after just as carefully?

It seems to me that if the membership of this committee was increased to nine, and the speaker was thereby permitted to select the additional members from the sections not now represented, no harm could be brought thereby to other sections, but that on the contrary justice would be insured to this large part of our country now unrepresented.

Mr. Hopkins, of Illinois: Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. Bryan: Certainly.

Mr. Hopkins, of Illinois: Did the gentleman from Nebraska hear the proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boatner) to clothe the various committees of the house with authority to control the legislation reported from them?

Mr. Bryan: I knew of the resolution before it was presented in the house, but was not present when it was read.

Mr. Hopkins, of Illinois: I would ask the gentleman further if the method there suggested would not meet his approval as presenting a better system than by the proposed enlargement of the committee on rules?

Mr. Bryan: I think that both propositions might be adopted. The proposition of the gentleman from Louisiana helps the case, but it is not inconsistent with this proposition to also increase the membership of the committee on rules.

As has been said, Mr. Speaker, the committee on rules is the most important committee of the house. To that committee is committed the question as to what measures will come before the house for its consideration. We all know that we do not reach bills on the calendars. After a few weeks of the session have passed the calendars are loaded down with measures too numerous to receive consideration, and there must be some extraordinary process resorted to for selecting from among them those which should be considered. When we give into the hands of the committee on rules almost the entire control of the legislation of the country,

as we do in this case, it is only just and fair that this committee shall be large enough to represent every interest in this vast country, and every section as well.

I do not see what objection can be made to the suggestion of increasing the committee, in view of the fact that all of our principal committees have been enlarged. That geographical considerations have weight in the make-up of the committees is shown from the fact that all of our committees are chosen with a view to representing all interests.

Mr. Wilson, of Washington: Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him to say that if he will look at the committee on ways and means and the committee on appropriations he will see that in these committees geographical considerations were not regarded? I would like to ask the gentleman to inquire of the membership of these committees of the house if they have been selected with a view to geographical situations, as far as the western part of our country is concerned.

Mr. Bryan: I am not here to discuss whether or not in the selection of every committee there has been such care given to represent the various portions of the country as should have been given; but I say that the geographical consideration is taken into view in making up the committees, at least to a certain extent.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we come to act on this proposition, whether we shall increase the membership of the most important committee of all, and find that there is not a man representing the great country west of the Mississippi river upon that committee, or that even lives near the Mississippi river—except the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Catchings), who lives on the east side—is it unjust that this part of the country should insist on having representation upon that committee? I submit it to the intelligence of this body, I submit it to your sense of justice, if we are asking more than our right when we ask you to change the rule and permit the membership of this committee to be enlarged so as to include the representation from these sections? It might be possible with a committee of five only to cover more than one-half of the country; but with a committee of nine, there could be no excuse for leaving unrepresented the various interests which, up to this time, have been unrepresented in the make-up of this important committee of the house.

Mr. Wilson, of Washington: We have representation enough in the west on the arid lands, but we never get any appropriations to irrigate them. (Laughter.)

Mr. Bryan: I have not investigated that particular committee. But having said this much in behalf of the amendment, I desire to say a word in regard to the other parts of the report.

Mr. Cox: Has the attention of the gentleman been called to the fact that all committees have been increased in number except this?

Mr. Bryan: Yes, sir.

Mr. Outhwaite: The important committees?

Mr. Bryan: The gentleman has suggested that the large committees, the important committees—

Mr. Outhwaite: That is better.

Mr. Bryan. (Continuing): Have been increased in number, and yet the most important committee of all remains only at five, when the membership of the house has been increased since our last session.

But I will not detain the house longer on this question. I desire to submit a word only in behalf of some portions of the rule where they differ from the rules of the Fifty-first congress. A great deal has been said here about the supreme court having ratified or approved of the action of the speaker of that congress in counting a quorum. I call the attention of the house to the fact that the supreme court simply decided, in a case before it, that this house had the right to determine, by rule, in what manner the presence of a quorum should be ascertained. The court did not say that the speaker of the house was authorized, before the adoption of the rules, to declare that certain members were present, and therefore that a quorum was ready to transact business. That question was not brought before the court.

It is immaterial to us, however, whether the speaker had authority for his ruling or not before the adoption of this new rule by the house. It is immaterial to us whether he said in 1880: