

bill, was under consideration in congress, Sereno E. Payne, John Dalzell, Julius C. Burrows, Thomas B. Reed, Albert J. Hopkins and John H. Gear signed a minority report on the bill. In this report they used this language: "If he (the manufacturer) can make his goods any cheaper because of free wool, he must sell them just as much cheaper."

Q.—Well, well, these big republicans admitted that free wool was right from the consumer's standpoint, didn't they?

A.—They did.

Q.—How many woolen manufacturing establishments are there in this country?

A.—In 1905 there were only 1,213 such establishments.

Q.—How many sheep raisers are there in the country?

A.—That is a difficult question to answer. There are probably only a few thousand who are exclusively in the wool growing business.

Q.—Then, this tariff on wool is placed on a necessary of life to help a comparatively few sheep owners?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Is it democratic doctrine to place all raw materials of manufactures on the free list?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Should the question of revenue to pay the expenses of the government enter into the question?

A.—Yes. Of course we must raise a sufficient amount of revenue to run the affairs of the government.

Q.—If you can not obtain enough revenue to run the government by levying a duty on manufactured products, then how will you get the revenue?

A.—I would place a revenue duty on raw materials not produced in this country, like raw silk, raw rubber, and diamonds.

Q.—Why do you say you would place a duty on raw materials not produced in this country?

A.—First, because whatever the people might have to pay for the privilege of consuming such materials or articles manufactured out of them would go into the public treasury and not into the pocket of some special interest.

Q.—What is your second reason?

A.—Well, when it became necessary to change the duty or tariff tax on such raw materials such change would not disturb the business conditions of the country.

Q.—But, would not this duty cause these things after they are advanced to the finished article to cost the people who use them more than if they were placed on the free list?

A.—But, people who wear diamonds and silk and own automobiles are better able to pay taxes than those who have to buy woolen clothing.

Q.—Then, you would not lay down the hard and fast rule that all raw materials should always be placed on the free list?

A.—I would say all raw materials out of which are manufactured the necessities of life should be placed on the free list, so that the poor could get those necessities cheaper than if the raw materials were taxed.

Q.—Where would you place the highest tariff taxes?

A.—On luxuries.

Q.—The next highest?

A.—On the comforts of life.

Q.—Then, what would you do?

A.—I would place the necessities of life on the free list.

Q.—But, if you could not raise enough revenue in that way to run the government, what would you do?

A.—I would pass an income tax law, the most just and equitable tax that has ever been devised.

Q.—But, another question on raw materials. I have read in the Congressional Record where some distinguished democrats have said, "The raw materials of one man is the finished product of another."

A.—You mean that great democrat, ex-Senator Nelson W. Aldrich of Rhode Island, said that, don't you?

Q.—Come off, what are you giving me? Do you think I am so ignorant that I do not know that Aldrich is a republican and has been one of the leaders of the republican party for the past quarter of a century? I don't mean Aldrich, I mean I have noticed where democratic members of congress and senators have advanced this doctrine in recent speeches in congress. I want to know who originated this doctrine, that for tariff purposes the raw material of one man is the finished product of another?

A.—I am glad you have asked me that question, because I believe I can give you the origin of this fallacious doctrine. Back in 1888, when

the Mills bill, a democratic tariff measure, was being considered by congress, Mr. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, submitted to the senate a report on this bill in which he said: "The doctrine of free raw materials as advocated by tariff reformers is a difficult one to enforce in legislation. In the usual division of labor, the finished product of one man becomes the raw material of his industrial successor."

Q.—Well, it seems that democrats who make that argument are following in the footsteps of Senator Aldrich, rather than in the footsteps of the democratic fathers. Is that true?

A.—That is undoubtedly true.

Q.—Well, I now think our democratic representatives and senators should advocate the time honored principles of the democratic party, including free raw materials, and reduce the tariff on the finished products of the manufacturer to a strictly revenue basis. Then, when we succeed in enacting a graduated income tax law in this country, we can lighten the burdens of the toiling millions of this republic, caused by the tariff taxes on what they consume and the tools they work with, and thereby compel the wealth of the country to bear its just proportion of the burdens of government.

A.—You are right. Shake.

"UNSPOILED LAWYERS"

In a recent speech at Lexington, Ky., Governor Wilson of New Jersey said:

"The lawyer has always been indispensable, whether he merely guided the leaders or was himself the leader, and nowhere has the lawyer played a more important part in politics than in England and America, where the rules of law have always been the chief instruments of contest and regulation of liberty and efficient organization, and the chief means of lifting society from one stage to the next of its slow development.

"The lawyer's ideal part in this struggle is easy to conceive. He, above all other men, should have a quick perception of what is feasible, of the new things that will fit into the old, of the experiences which should be heeded, wrongs that should be remedied, and the rights that should be more completely realized.

"He can play this ideal part, however, only if he has the right insight and sympathy. If he regards his practice as a mere means of livelihood, if he is satisfied to put his expert advice at the service of any interest or enterprise, if he does not regard himself as an officer of the state, but only as an agent of private interest; if, above all, he does not really see the wrongs that are accumulating, the mischief that is being wrought, the hearts that are being broken, the lives that are being wrecked, the hopes that are being sapped, he can not play the part of guide or moderator or adviser in the large sense that will make him a statesman and a benefactor.

"The truth is that the technical training of the American lawyer, his professional prepossessions and his business involvements, impose limitations upon him and subject him to temptations which seriously stand in the way of his rendering the ideal service to society demanded by the true standards and canons of his profession. Modern business, in particular, with its huge and complicated processes, has tended to subordinate him, to make of him a servant, an instrument instead of a free adviser and master of justice.

"The lawyer seldom thinks of himself as the advocate of society. He moves in the atmosphere of private rather than public service. His business becomes more and more complicated and specialized. His studies and his services are apt to become more and more confined to some special field of law. He becomes more and more a mere expert in the legal side of a certain class of great industrial or financial undertakings.

"It is evident what must happen in such circumstances. The bench must be filled from the bar, and it is growing increasingly difficult to supply the bench with disinterested, unspooled lawyers, capable of being the free instruments of society, the friends and guides of statesmen, the interpreters of the common life of the people, the mediators of the great process by which justice is led from one enlightenment and liberalization to another.

"One can not but realize how much depends upon the part the lawyer is to play in the future politics of the country. If he will not assume the role of patriot and of statesman; if he will

not lend all his learning to the service of the common life of the country; if he will not open his sympathies to common man and enlist his enthusiasm in these policies which will bring regeneration to the business of the country, less expert hands than his must attempt the difficult and perilous business.

"The tendencies of the profession, therefore, its sympathies, its inclinations, its prepossessions, its training, its point of view, its motives, are part of the stuff and substance of the destiny of the country."

These are timely words. There is an increasing need for "unspooled lawyers." We need a few just now for the United States bench.

A PARALLEL CASE

The press dispatches report that Premier Asquith has sent the following letter to Mr. Balfour, the leader of the minority:

"Dear Mr. Balfour: I think it is courteous and right, before any public decisions are announced, to let you know how we regard the present situation. When the parliament bill, in the form of which it has now assumed, returns to the house of commons we shall be compelled to ask that house to disagree with the lords' amendments. In the circumstances should the necessity arise the government will advise the king to exercise his prerogative to secure the passing into law of the bill in substantially the same form in which it left the house of commons and his majesty has been pleased to signify that he will consider it his duty to accept and act upon that advice."

It is an interesting coincidence that such a letter should be sent to the leader of the minority in Great Britain just when a similar letter is being sent to President Taft, who (according to the vote cast at the last congressional election) is the leader of the minority in the United States. The following is, in substance, the letter which is being sent to the president:

"Dear Mr. President: We think it is courteous and right, before any public decisions are announced, to let you know how we regard the present situation. When the tariff bills are rejected by the senate or returned to congress with your veto we shall be compelled to persist in our demand for relief from high tariff taxation. In the circumstances should the necessity arise the democratic party will advise the sovereigns—the people—to exercise their prerogative to secure tariff reduction by the selection of a president and senate friendly to tariff reduction, and their majesty—the people—have been pleased to signify by their votes last fall that they will consider it their duty to accept and act upon that advice. Yours truly,

"THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY."

A CHILDISH ACT

The Douglas county democratic convention, made up of delegates named by the local democratic machine, on Saturday passed resolutions practically indorsing Governor Harmon, of Ohio, for president.

The purpose, of course, was not so much to indorse Harmon as to take a slap at W. J. Bryan.

Bryan, it will be remembered, last fall helped to defeat the attempt to enthrone the breweries in the state house. Ever since then the local democratic machine has been persistently camping on Mr. Bryan's trail.

Last week Mr. Bryan printed a list of available democratic candidates for the presidency and left out Harmon because Harmon is not a progressive; consequently, the Douglas county democratic machine declares for Harmon.

It was a childish thing to do—and will hurt Bryan as much as does a fly bite.

However, the action is likely to hurt the democratic rank and file of the county and state—even though conventions count for little nowadays—because it will give the impression that Nebraska is receding from progressive principles.

The democrats of Douglas county and of Nebraska are progressive, and they are, therefore, hardly likely to prefer for presidential candidate a man of such standpat caliber as Harmon when there is so much good, progressive timber in the field—Woodrow Wilson, for example.

Nor are the level headed democrats of the county and state likely to be switched from progressivism even if they happen to disagree with Mr. Bryan on county option or some other issue—the Douglas county democratic convention to the contrary, notwithstanding.—Omaha Daily News.