

Ambassador Naon's Speech

and transfers thereof, face value each \$100	2c.
Damage certificates, etc	25c.
Other certificates required by law	10c.
Broker's note or memorandum of sale	10c.
Deeds or realty transfers valued between \$100 and \$500	50c.
Deeds, ditto, each additional \$500	50c.
Entry goods at Custom House, \$100 value	25c.
Ditto, not exceeding \$500 value	50c.
Ditto, exceeding \$500 value	\$1.
Entry for withdrawal of goods from customs bonded warehouse	50c.
Insurance of property, new or renewed policies, each \$1	¼c.
Policies of insurance or bond of nature of indemnity for loss, each \$1	1c.
Passenger tickets for sea to foreign ports costing less than \$10	\$1.
Ditto, not exceeding \$60	\$3.
Ditto, exceeding \$60	\$5.
Perfumery, cosmetics, etc., vaseline, hair dyes, tooth washes, graded in values of 5 cents up to 15 cents, each 5 cents of value	¼c.
Ditto, valued from 15 cents to 25 cents	½c.
Ditto, each additional 25 cents retail	½c.
Chewing gum, etc., valued less than \$1 a unit	4-10c.
Ditto, each additional \$1	4-10c.
Voting powers or proxies	10c.
Power to convey real estate, protests	25c.
Palace or parlor car seat or berth	1c.

TAXES ON LIQUORS

The remaining war taxes, which went into effect immediately on its passage, October 22, are:

Beer, per barrel	\$1.50
Per bottle of quarter pint or less	¼c.
Bottle containing more than ¼ but not more than ½ pint	½c.
More than ½ pint but not more than 1 pint	1c.
More than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart	2c.
All still wines in other containers, a gallon	8c.
Domestic and imported champagne and other sparkling wines and all artificially carbonated wines, bottle of ½ pint or less	5c.
Bottle more than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart	20c.
All liquors, cordials or similar compounds, domestic and imported, bottle containing not more than ½ pint	½c.
More than ½ pint and not more than 1 pint	3c.
More than 1 pint and not more than 1 quart	6c.
On large containers, a gallon	24c.
Grape brandy or wine spirits used in the fortification of pure sweet wines under publication of the act of 1890. Gallon	55c.

These are also paid in stamps. Cancellation in each case consists in affixing date and initials of canceler.

MR. BRYAN LEADS AGAIN

Mr. Bryan's letter to General Rye indicates how important he feels it to be that the control of the national democratic party shall not be in the hands of those friendly to the liquor traffic. Already the commoner is being violently abused in some quarters because he has taken up a new issue. The reactionary organs everywhere are displeased. It is nothing new for Mr. Bryan to be marching far ahead of the procession. Like William E. Gladstone, England's Grand Old Man, he did not hesitate to espouse a cause long before it became popular. Mr. Bryan already has shown his sentiments on the liquor question, when it was presented for settlement in his own state. There was a fight inside the democratic party there much the same as there has been of late years in Tennessee. My Bryan's lance is borne against any great corrupt interest. He knows that the democracy may not permanently control in this country if the liquor interest guides its destinies. He cites the defeat of the democrats in Ohio as due to the alliance with the liquor interests. When the party surrenders to that interest in any state it can not win, and when it stands out against that interest the name democracy has no attractive sound to the liquor element.—Chattanooga (Tenn.) News.

The election returns show that the progressive party polled only about 50 per cent more votes than did the socialists. At this rate of decrease it won't be even the third party very long.

Addressing a conference of the representatives of the twenty-one republics of the western hemisphere, held in Washington, December 8, Ambassador Naon of Argentina spoke on his resolution outlining the situation of the American republics in the world war and appointing a commission to study the problems presented. Mr. Naon's address follows:

Mr. Chairman:

We are passing through moments of gravest world-wide concern in which it is possible to realize how fundamentally have varied the circumstances in the midst of which the political thought which inspires and maintains international relations has been developed up to the present time.

It was necessary—this outburst of the greatest social catastrophe recorded in the history of the centuries to bring us to a true realization of the point to which the interdependence of civilized peoples has grown. Were it not for the painful moral upheaval from which the spirit of humanity is suffering, those of us who had relied upon the complete realization of the idea of human solidarity might well feel satisfied.

I recognize that it would have been difficult to foresee how deeply this war was going to affect the nations of the world which, far from the councils in which European interests were discussed, find themselves nevertheless compelled to suffer the restriction of their rights and the paralysis of the essential sources of their economic development. But this situation which has been created can not continue. In addition to the general inconvenience, justice and the law which directs world relations are opposed to it. Up to the present time an explanation could be found for the development of the principles of international law in giving consideration above all to the needs of the belligerents and the accentuation of their rights because almost the entire weight of the horrors and sorrows of war fell upon them. The interests of the neutral countries were not greatly affected. At that time the activity of nations from an economic and commercial point of view, was exercised with much greater independence in respect to other nations than in our day, and notwithstanding the natural hardships which a state of war might impose upon them, neither the enormous and far-reaching economic development nor the intertwining commercial relationships created by modern internationalism under the influence of scientific progress upon the industrial activity of the world had been attained.

Therefore, the interpretation of the principles of international law responded to the situation which explained, if it did not justify, the preferential consideration given to the rights of belligerents. Mr. Chairman, the evolution of human events has changed conditions and the interpretation of those principles now compels a modification as fundamental as that which social conditions have undergone. Face to face with the rights of the belligerents we now have the rights of the neutrals; the rights of those countries which, though compelled to halt, at an unfortunate moment, in their onward progress to permit the rancor and hate or the conflicting interests engendered by the war to vent their satisfaction bitter though it be, as a recognition of the control which every country exercises over its own destinies, can not allow their sovereignty to be encroached upon, unmindful of the rights and imperative duty we have to protect and defend it.

The interests of the countries not involved in conflict are as much entitled to respect, as sacred, to say the least, as those which could be invoked by the countries which misfortune has led to belligerency. The mission of the neutral countries is to maintain the progress of the world and to conserve its moral and material energies as a nucleus for the re-establishment of the disturbed equilibrium in a future which we all earnestly hope will be immediate. That social mission which is as supreme as the very defense of sovereignty, augments, if possible, the attention which deserves the respect for the integrity of their rights as neutrals. If these rights and the rights of the belligerents conflict, a spirit of justice, a sentiment of humanity and a reason of high practical policy determine, Mr. Chairman, that the rights of the neutrals

must prevail, inasmuch as their mission is a mission of progress, of preservation, and of life.

Notwithstanding the longings of those of us who continue to believe in the more or less far off prevalence of the counsels of justice, of charity and of law in the relation of peoples, war is a calamity, the realities of which, unfortunately, we are compelled to endure. But it falls to us, the young democracies of America which are seeking to realize the ideal of civilization founded upon the value and the strength of principles, to do our utmost that they become the chief basis of international relations. If war can justify the setting aside of the rights of neutrals, there would disappear our commercial activities and our economic resources in the preservation of which are concerned both our own existence and the exigencies of civilization.

The American continent is bound to the countries at war by conspicuous and intimate bonds of race, of civilization and of culture. The activities of those countries have been associated far more than a century with the economic and social progress of our own, and we have developed in the course of these fruitful relations a sentiment of deep respect for their moral capacity. This leads us to trust that they will share with us the truth that an arbitrary interpretation of international principles is not justified under the pretext of consulting only the exigencies of self-preservation which is transitory and not even effective. Such an interpretation does not constitute either the best practical policy or the most appropriate expression of the consideration called for by the world's interests which are permanent and superior and which must triumph in the end to the injury both of the conveniences and of the moral prestige of those who resist them.

Mr. Chairman, it is those permanent and superior interests which I invoke and which I believe all of us invoke in voicing what may be said to be the earnest desire and conviction of the nations of the continent, which seek recognition, once for all, of the rights of the neutral countries in such a form as to respond at the same time to the requirements of their commerce, which are vital, and to the respect for their sovereignty which is inviolable before the law and which should also be so before the conscience of the world.

The right of the belligerent ends where the right of the neutral begins. Therefore, the restrictions imposed by the fate of war are reciprocal and can not go beyond the line laid down by the strictest necessity of belligerency. Any excess in its favor is an injustice, a violation of law, an arbitrary act which can find justification in no sound concept, in no consideration other than contempt for principles.

The various equally well founded and just initiatives taken by several American governments as well as the continuous and vigorous propaganda of the press from one end of the continent to the other, show to what extent the non-recognition or non-definition of the rights of the neutrals constitutes for our America the most absorbing and intense problem of the present moment. They justify more than any other prompts us and the duty imposed on us of studying the new problems which the present war has presented to us and of obtaining solutions tending to avoid in the future or to lessen in the present the injuries due to such lack of definition.

I entertain the hope, Mr. Chairman, that these brief remarks offered as a basis for the proposition which I have presented under express instructions from my government, will receive the consideration of all the governments engaged in the present war, and that consequently we may expect that the conclusions at which we may arrive in our work will be shared by those governments to all of which we are so friendly. They are without doubt as much interested as we are in not weakening the capacity of the neutral countries and in limiting as far as possible the colossal waste of energies, capital and principles, not to speak of the loss of so many lives upon whose activity our continent counted to continue its upward progress.

As long as the war continues to offer us the sad spectacle which moves all of us, may at least our young democracies continue to develop their productive energies and build up their tradition of harmony and continental fraternity which rest above all on right and justice.