

today if it had never before. Reserving his information on this bill he compelled everybody to vote on the amendments paragraph by paragraph. Does he expect to keep the confidence of the republican membership of this body by a proceeding of that kind? He is the leader of the republican side, and as such he has aided in bringing us into a position of embarrassment before the republican constituency of our various states."

"The senator from Rhode Island," Mr. LaFollette continued, "with all his craftiness, has embarrassed the republicans."

Mr. LaFollette went on to say that the senator from Rhode Island had come from a state that had granted ninety-nine year franchises, which he declared was something not tolerated in Wisconsin. He said Mr. Aldrich had made no report on this bill, and had "chilled or frozen" those who had sought with perfect courtesy to gain some light upon the changes he had made in it. He proceeded: "The senator from Rhode Island need not take to himself any anxiety about the report that senators of the middle west will make when they return to their states, and discuss these questions with their constituents. He can not by any legislative trick argue any amendments that have been voted upon, confusing the minds of senators here, who have been exercising some independence, by inciting terror or timidity."

No sooner had these words been uttered than there was a hasty protest by Senator Gallinger, who called upon Vice President Sherman to invoke paragraph 2 of rule 19.

"In my experience in this body," said Mr. Gallinger, "I have never heard so oft-repeated accusation that legislative tricks were being practiced, and I ask that this rule be laid before the senate, that anyone may know what it is."

Rule XIX which relates to the necessity for avoiding personal allusions, was then read and the vice president declared that he thought the senator from Wisconsin had violated it.

Mr. LaFollette, who had taken his seat, arose saying he had noticed that this rule had not been equally applied to all senators of the floor. He said he had noticed that some senators could say things without attention being called to them, and it was generally understood that he had in mind Senator Penrose's recent criticism of himself, which was not rebuked.

Vice President Sherman said he would see that the rule was uniformly applied, to which Mr. LaFollette replied that he did not blame the vice president, as he understood that the rule was only applied when the attention of the chair was directed to it.

The Aldrich-LaFollette incident then came to a close, and Senator Bacon took the floor.

Numerous amendments offered by Mr. LaFollette providing ad valorem for specific duties in the wool schedule were promptly taken up for the purpose of voting on them "en bloc," as Vice President Sherman announced.

Senator Cummins, taking the floor, said he would vote for these amendments, not so much because he was satisfied that they were exactly right, but because he was sure the schedule reported by the finance committee was absolutely wrong. Mr. Cummins announced that he would move to re-commit the wool schedule to the finance committee.

Arguing the justice of his plan for a compensatory duty on products of woolen manufacturers to allow them to pay a higher price for wool than do their foreign competitors, Senator Cummins said that to levy a duty on goods partly of cotton as if entirely of wool would be to give domestic manufacturers an advantage that no man should have. In reply to a question by Mr. McCumber Senator Cummins said he was willing to make the duty high enough to meet foreign competition on the assumption that all imports are of goods containing only the finest grades of wool.

Senator Warren, opposing the plan of the Iowa senator, declared that it would unduly encourage the importation of shoddy.

"And," added the Wyoming senator, "this is not a shoddy nation."

Mr. Cummins declared that he marveled at the "blindness of the leaders of the republican party that they were willing to commit their party to such a woolen schedule."

"Senators," he said, "you are simply courting the destruction of your party by allowing such a schedule to go out to the country."

A contemporary says that Senator-elect Lorimer has "climbed from the bottom to the top." Perhaps; but he has brought entirely too much of the bottom up with him.

A SIGNIFICANT RESOLUTION

The Episcopal diocesan council of Lexington, Kentucky, adopted a significant resolution dealing with present economic conditions. The resolution follows:

"Whereas, we the Protestant Episcopal church in the diocese of Lexington, state of Kentucky, being a branch of God's church and assembled in council, feel deep concern over conditions created and being perpetuated by alarming, if not revolutionary legislation, whereby the necessities of the lives of the needy are disproportionately taxed, and

"Whereas, such legislation is fast destroying men's reverence for law and so tending to anarchy;

"Therefore, we, members of the council aforesaid, conscious of the trust of righteousness committed by the Triune God to plead with all constructing and controlling forces of our land—senatorial, congressional, legislative and executive—to give us laws right in the sight of God, just and true to all the people, call upon every Christian organization in the land to join us in this purpose and pleading."

Practical Tariff Talks

A strong testimonial to the entrenched strength of the sugar trust in the senate was given a few days ago, when that body refused to eliminate the Dutch standard of color test on importations. If that test had been cut out of the law it would have permitted the importation of light and dark brown sugars—cheap sugars. The provision requiring that all importations must be of a certain color, dark red, when it is uneatable and unmarketable save to the trust, means that nothing can come in unless it needs further refining—and the trust attends to the refining.

The Aldrich bill proposes to increase the tariff on razors from 55 to 100 per cent. This means doubling the price of razors to every purchaser. No less an authority than the Iron Age says that this will effectually shut out foreign competition, and thus return no revenue to the government, but that it will place the American market at the mercy of the cutlery manufacturers, who now maintain one of the strongest trusts in the country. This trust is not only protected by patents on articles and on machinery, by copyrights and trade agreements, but it asks absolute protection from competition in the home market. And the Aldrich bill gives it. The head of the Simmons Hardware company of St. Louis, who claims to have sold in his fifty-three years of business, more razors than any man who ever lived in the United States, is quoted in the Congressional Record as having said that the rate of wages paid workmen in this country is very little more than is paid for the same kind of labor in Germany and England, and that we can not make as good razors or grind them properly in this country. America today manufactures about 20 per cent of the razors used in the country. The Aldrich bill is intended to hand over the remainder of the business to the cutlery trust, and to do this it gives it the protection of 100 per cent duty when so high an authority as Edward C. Simmons of St. Louis asserts that there is very little difference between the rate of wages paid razor makers here and abroad. This raises the interesting question of what is a reasonable profit for the razor manufacturer, such as the republican platform guarantees him after it has made up the difference in wages.

The senate has refused to take the tariff off lumber. No well-informed republican can defend this tariff, and no wise one will attempt to do so. The republican idea of the tariff is that it should be high enough to protect American labor from the competition of low-paid labor abroad and that there should also be included a reasonable profit to the manufacturer. This is the platform definition or measure of the tariff. How does it work out in practice? The tariff on lumber ought to insure the American workman a higher wage than the lumberworker across the border. Yet Theodore M. Knappen of the National Forest Conservation League submitted to congress extensive tables which show that higher wages are now being paid in both the mills and the logging camps of Canada than in the United States. It follows, therefore, that the workmen here need

no protection and if the manufacturer is getting his labor for less than his nearest competitor abroad then in that fact alone lies a reasonable profit for him. Why a tariff? Here is the explanation—and it clearly shows the character of the work the republican congress is doing against the public interest—a tariff operates to restrict the volume of imported lumber and to increase its price. If it is retained the value of the stumpage holdings is enhanced and the power of the lumbermen to dictate prices is continued. Does this not show in whose interest the tariff is being made? C. Q. D.

ROOSEVELT AND TOLSTOY

The following editorial appeared in the Detroit Times:

Out of that realm of savagery and slaughter, Darkest Africa, comes this latest Rooseveltian onslaught, via the highly religious Outlook:

"Strong men may gain something from Tolstoy's moral teachings, but only on condition that they are strong enough and sane enough to be repelled by those part of his teachings which are foolish or immoral. Weak persons are hurt by the teachings. We are not liable to certain kinds of wickedness which there is real danger of his writings inculcating; for it is a lamentable fact, as is so often the case with a certain type of mystical zealot, there is in him a dark streak which tells of moral perversion. That side of his teachings which is partially manifested in the revolting Kreutzer Sonata can do little damage in America, for it would appeal only to decadents; exactly as it could have come only from a man who, however high he may stand in certain respects, has in him certain dreadful qualities of the moral perverser."

The subject of this arraignment—an arraignment unjust, cruel, false and cowardly—is dying in Russia among the peasants to whom his life has been devoted with singular purity and unselfishness.

The writer is in the African jungle, where a horde of native and professional beaters are driving wild beasts within range of his gun to be slaughtered.

A finer delicacy, a fairer consideration will be shown Tolstoy even in the country whose iniquities and barbarisms, whose massacres and other atrocities against his people, and whose tyrants of the royalty and aristocracy he has assailed with a powerful pen, revolting at them the teachings drawn from the Christ life.

More consideration will be shown this dying seer there even by those who hate him for the truths he has written and spoken against them, and on his death bed he will be spared the pain which would come in the knowledge that a life of such unselfishness, such hardship and forbearance directed in the interest of a bleeding and suffering people, and mankind in general, had brought no better word than this and from one who has held the high position in the eyes of the world as president of the United States, and who professes the faith that commands, "Thou shalt not bear false witness."

This attack upon the dying Tolstoy, this gentle, unresisting man, is from the pen of Roosevelt, the killer and the jingoist.

Tolstoy is not a man or beast killer and he abhors war.

Not as one who feared war for his own body's sake, nor as one who lacked love of country or patriotism, for after knowing what war was, and no man has been able to see war as he saw it and so described it, he asked to be re-assigned on his return to Russia from the Caucasus and, as showing his bravery, to the division on the Danube face to face with the opposing Turk.

He was present at the siege of Silistra. From there he went to the Crimea and the besieged Sebastopol, the center of the war, where for eleven months he served at the "fourth bastion" and was subjected to the murderous fires of the allied armies.

What impressed him most was that men in war could shoot each other down and yet have nothing against each other as men, and what inspired him most was the devotion of the men on either side of the battle to country.

Tolstoy never had the blood-thirst and he was not a man glorying in more Dreadnaughts, for he did not like the man-killing business.

He had looked upon war beyond its gold braid, its flags, the inspiring bugle and the quickstep of the band. These he thought all very fine in themselves, but most deplorable as incitements to slaughter.

But war to him was battlefields running red with blood, terrible with the cries of the in-