

from the attorney general of the United States that the orders of the federal court would be backed by federal troops if necessity required it. The bitter controversy has been re-opened as a result of the campaign in Alabama for the adoption of a constitutional amendment for prohibition. Governor Comer has been stumping the state in the interest of this amendment, and has been relentless in his criticism of Judge Jones. These criticisms grew out of the railroad rate litigation, in which the enforcement of rates and regulations adopted by the legislature was enjoined by Judge Jones. The issue was brought to the front by the governor in reviewing his administration. He charged that Judge Jones was not qualified to sit in the rate cases, because for years he had been attorney of one of the railroads. Governor Comer, following the issuance of federal injunctions, instructed the state officials to carry out the orders of the state courts, regardless of any action taken by the federal authorities. In the language of Judge Jones, 'the governor at this time was insisting that it was his duty to enforce the laws of the state. If his legal advisers—as they doubtless did—informed him of the universal rule of law, it had little if any weight in serving him from his dream of forcible defiance of the laws of the United States. He seemed bent on bringing on a collision.'

WRITER IN the Washington Post says: "Men of imagination love solitude, and they are never less alone than when alone. Their teeming thoughts and pleasing fancies are delightful company, and their day dreams the sweetest comrades. In a passage on walking the New York Evening Post says: 'He who uses his legs is thereby enabled to use his eyes. Nature in all moods is the companion of him who walks. A network of sun and shadow or a maze of muddy pools lies before his feet. His cheek feels the impact of kindly breezes or harsher rain. The bend in the road lures him onward and fills him with peaceful conjecture. A pleasant comrade at his side seems not amiss to most, though Hazlitt and Stevenson cast their voices against it, declaring that the full flavor of a walking tour is best gained by solitude. Stevenson better analyzes moods, but Hazlitt is the more lyric. He was among the first of Anglo-Saxon blood to sing the open road.' But to get the best results from walking, let 'a pleasant comrade' go the other way. Reverie is a game of solitaire, with one player and no more. The late Tom Reed, as long as he was in congress—twenty years—always walked to the capitol from his home, unless the weather was the surliest and he went alone. Woe to the friend who sought to accompany that extraordinary man. He was frozen by operation of a reserve on the part of the big 'un that caused him to take up or down when they reached the next crossing. And yet never was there a more genial, companionable, glorious good fellow than Tom Reed when in the mood; but he would have that morning walk from his home to the capitol to himself. John James Ingalls was another famous man who loved to walk alone, and would not have a companion. It was impossible for either Reed or Ingalls to be what coarse grained men call 'lonesome.' Their thought and fancies made brilliant company that a companion would have banished. L. Q. C. Lamar had this sort of endowment in even more extravagant degree than either Reed or Ingalls. Half his walking moments were spent in introspections that turned to day dreams. Such men are to be envied. They are of the cradle, not the coffin."

## President Taft's Tour

At Omaha President Taft was entertained by the Ak-Sar-Ben, a local organization of business men. It is claimed that the governor was slighted because he had signed the eight o'clock saloon closing law. Ak-Sar-Ben leaders say that Mr. Taft was not the guest of the state or city but of the organization. Governor Shallenberger sent the president the following message of welcome on behalf of the people of Nebraska: "President William H. Taft, Omaha, Neb.: On behalf of the people of Nebraska I extend to you a hearty welcome to our state. I wish you a safe and pleasant journey on your trip. "ASHTON C. SHALLENBERGER."

At Denver Mr. Taft, in delivering a speech in support of the corporation tax, made an extended argument against the income tax. In brief his statement was that while he hoped the income tax amendment to the constitution would be adopted he is not in favor of imposing

the tax which this amendment will authorize except in the event of war or some other great national calamity. Referring to this speech, the Omaha World-Herald says:

"All this from a president who was believed, by millions of people, to be in favor of an income tax when he was a candidate for their suffrages! All this spoken in behalf of a party that only yesterday excused itself for defeating the income tax law on the plea that it was 'afraid' it wouldn't be constitutional!

"The mask is torn off by the candid Mr. Taft. There is an end to pretense. Besides, it is no longer necessary to deceive the people. The election is over.

"We invite the attention of progressive republicans to this great reform leader of theirs, under whose unsullied banner they so triumphantly 'did up' the Aldrich-Cannon crowd in the national convention hardly more than a year ago!

"We must have no income tax now, he tells us boldly, because it will interfere with the protective system. It will be a sacrilege to the false idols of high tariff. It will provide so much revenue, out of taxes levied on wealth, that there would be less and less excuse for tariff taxes on poor folks' sugar and shoes and stockings and clothes. The income tax would be a menace to the steel trust, the oil trust, the big profits of the woolen and cotton mills—and so is to be considered only as a last resort. Only in case of dread and grim necessity, if the land were running red with blood, if all the taxes it was possible to pile on the bowed shoulders of the poor still fell short of meeting the awful need of the government—only then would William Howard Taft consent to a tax on the incomes of the nation's rich men; only then would he consent to allow this wicked menace to the protective fetish for a little while to stalk the earth!

"The Taft who faces the great and progressive west today, smilingly defiant, politely insolent to its dearest ideals, cheerfully scornful of its most cherished principles and policies, is a different Taft from that one who came among us as a candidate a twelvemonth gone. That Taft carried the Roosevelt aegis before him. The Roosevelt halo was above his head. With a brawny arm he hugged a Roosevelt nursing bottle to his breast. From his lips fell dulcet words of encouragement and hope to those who were gnashing their teeth because the LaFollette platform had been trampled under foot in the Chicago convention.

"But now that same Taft is using the planks of the LaFollette platform for golf balls, while Joe Cannon and Nels Aldrich are his appreciative and admiring caddies."

At Des Moines President Taft talked on the railroad question. He said:

"Another most important amendment of the interstate commerce law—part of which was specifically promised in the platform—is a prohibition against any interstate railroad company acquiring stock in any competing railroad in the future, and a further provision that no railroad engaged in interstate commerce shall after a certain date hold stock in a competing railroad, and the further amendment that, after the passage of the amending act, no railroad company engaged in interstate commerce shall issue any additional stock or bonds or other obligations except with the approval of the commission—based upon a finding by the commission that the same are issued, first, for purposes authorized by law, and, second, for a price not less than par for stock and not less than the reasonable market value for bonds, such price being paid either in cash or in property or services, and if in property or services, then at the fair value thereof as determined by the commission."

In the same speech President Taft said: "It has been suggested that the law ought to limit its denunciation to those contracts in restraint of trade that are unreasonable. I do not favor any such limitation. It seems to be proposed to leave to the judges to decide what combinations and contracts in restraint of trade ought to be permitted to exist and to be enforced on general grounds of public policy—in other words, to have the court attempt to establish some lines between what are called good and bad trusts, as if the suppression of competition in some cases was a good thing and in other cases was bad. I can not agree that any such distinction can be properly made. All combinations to suppress competition or to maintain a monopoly in whole or in part of interstate trade are and should be in violation of the anti-trust law and should be punished as such; and there is no room for the expression—reasonable or unreasonable—in this general view of the statute."

## Practical Tariff Talks

One of the tariff schedules which defenders of the Payne-Aldrich law have been insisting contained marked reductions is that covering metals and manufactures of metals. The claim is well founded, in a few particulars. As a general proposition the revision of the metal schedule is upward. In the publication issued by the senate finance committee will be found two significant lines. One of these shows that on articles of voluntary use—an arbitrary classification made by some one unknown—the percentage of tariff under the old law was 42.84. The equivalent ad valorem under the new law is 43.46. Under the general designation of necessities—another classification arbitrarily made—it will be found that the old law carried a percentage of 30.21. The equivalent ad valorem under the new law is 29.71 per cent. This is a reduction on the necessities of one-half of one per cent. President Taft expressed his satisfaction with this law, and claims that it is a substantial reduction from the Dingley law. One-half of one per cent will be regarded generally as a very insubstantial reduction. Suppose a merchant advertised substantial reductions in the price of clothing, and when customers hurried to buy they found he was selling \$10 suits for \$9.95 and \$20 suits for \$19.90, one-half of one per cent reduction! He would run serious risk of being branded as a fraud.

A reduction in the tariff, let it be remembered, does not necessarily mean a reduction in the price of the article affected. If the steel trust found that it could not market its products at cost plus the tariff it would sell them for less. If this market price was 10 per cent less than the sum of the tariff and production cost, it meant there was an excess tariff of 10 per cent. A reduction in the metal schedule of 10 per cent, the cutting off of the excess tariff, would not affect the price of articles thereunder a particle. The metal schedule under both the Dingley and the Payne-Aldrich laws carries excess in almost every line. The entire labor cost of producing steel and manufactures thereof in this country is but 20 per cent of the total production cost, yet the tariff on necessities alone is nearly 30 per cent, half again as much as is paid for the labor going into them. This excess tariff is used by the steel trust and subsidiary and allied companies to mulct the consumer in America, while at the same time it enables it to market its products in competition with the world at prices much below those charged Americans. The steel trust gets out price lists of all its products. The ones issued to the home trade contain one set of discounts, those to the foreign trade another. The list is a very exhaustive one, embracing practically everything manufactured of iron or steel.

Among other items it may be noted that the price of auger bits is quoted 39 per cent higher to the home trade than to the foreign trade; cowbells are sold for 11 per cent more at home than abroad; bird cages 40 per cent more; bolts from 17 to 25 per cent more; braces about 36 per cent more; can openers 33 per cent more; cartridges 64 per cent more; chains 11 per cent more; coffee mills 11 per cent more; harness snaps 33 per cent more; lawn sprinklers 19 per cent more; saws from 27 to 65 per cent more; screw drivers 37 per cent more; trowels 47 per cent more; vises from 25 to 122 per cent more. The list could be extended indefinitely.

In other words, the American consumer, through the levying of an excessive tariff, makes it possible by paying more for the goods he buys, under the tariff, for the foreigner to pay less. Protection to the home manufacturer is not, therefore, protection to the home consumer.

C. Q. D.

## WAITING

The Outlook, Theodore Roosevelt contributing editor, prints an editorial relating to the late Edward H. Harriman. It is not a particularly illuminating article. If, however, the Outlook would command for an editorial entitled "Edward H. Harriman" widespread attention let it print such an editorial over the name of its distinguished contributing editor. The Outlook would find the world waiting to read the estimate which one of America's "practical men" gave of his old-time counsellor.