

The Commoner.

reached the roll call stage, and until the Saratoga senator, yielding to the importunities of the author of the document, cast his vote for it, its fate was in doubt. Twenty-six votes were needed to put the resolution through, and twenty-five senators had voted for it when the clerk reached the last name on the roll. Senator Davenport then demanded that the names of absent senators be called, and it was then that Brackett was prevailed on to provide the one vote necessary for favorable action. Twenty senators voted against the resolution. What effect the action of the upper house will have on the question of New York state ratifying the income tax proposition remains to be seen. The assembly by one vote defeated an identical resolution because of the backsliding of Tammany Assemblyman Mitchell E. Friend, who on a previous occasion had voted for it. The friends of the income tax resolution have insisted since that the Tammany assemblyman was rewarded by being assured of his seat in the lower house, which had been contested by his republican opponent. The Davenport resolution will now go to the committee on rules of the assembly, which is under complete control of Speaker Wadsworth, who joined forces with Governor Hughes to defeat the measure. Whether the rules committee can be compelled to disgorge the Davenport resolution remains to be seen. The indications are that it will only be released after a more exciting battle than has so far occurred. The opponents of the Davenport resolution resorted to every parliamentary trick tonight to defer final action upon it. Several substitute resolutions imposing a state income tax, providing for an investigation of the subject and for developing the state resources in indirect taxation were proposed and voted down."

ONLY ONE democrat Bayne by name voted against the income tax in the New York state senate. The World's correspondent says: "The most pretentious speech in favor of endorsing the Taft income tax plan was made by Mr. Davenport. A uniform income tax, such as this,' he said, 'upon all fields of investment, would leave every field of investment relatively as strong as it was before, and there would be no appreciable change in the price of state and municipal securities, and no injury to the instrumentalities of state credit. There would then be no taxless field to which capital could flow to get rid of the uniform tax, and so there would be no change in the price of securities as the result of the general uniform tax upon all fields.' Davenport contended that it was 'politically unthinkable' that congress would impose a tax aimed solely at state and municipal bonds, and thus seek to destroy the taxing powers of the states. The idea of a state income tax was scoffed at. 'Either the source of the income or the taxpaying citizen slips over the state line,' said the speaker. Answering the argument that New York would bear the great proportion of the burden of a federal tax Mr. Davenport said that, being the richest state in the union, it ought to do so. Declaring that an income tax was the surest avenue of escape from radicalism, he predicted that if the legislature was bound to have the burden continue to be borne by the poor man a spirit of discontent and radicalism would surely be engendered which would eventually 'prompt the people to break down the barriers and have their own riotous way.'

SENATOR HINMAN, who has been known as a "Hughes senator," and whose attitude on the income tax had not previously been revealed, came out strongly in favor of it. Disregarding the advice of Governor Hughes Senator Hinman said: "There is certainly no reason why if I have \$100,000 and live in New York and John Smith has \$50,000 and lives in Pennsylvania, I should not pay just twice as much as Smith does for the protection that is assured me by the army, the navy, police departments, fire department, the courts and what not. Of all the vicious things on the statute books our system of indirect taxation is the worst. It breeds extravagance because the people are paying the bills and don't know it. The people of this state and nation are for this proposition, I tell you. They want it and they'll get it, if not now, eventually, surely." Mr. Wagner, democrat, of Manhattan, said: "Unlike our high republican tariff, this is a tax on plenty instead of on necessity. It will lighten the burdens of the poor. In time of war 49 out of every 50 of those who volunteer to make up our great armies are persons whose patriotism is as great as their wealth is small. And this

doctrine of untaxed wealth that the poorer classes should both pay our taxes and also imperil their body and limb is a vicious doctrine and should have no place in our government." The fight against the ratification of the amendment was led by Mr. Newcomb, who reiterated the arguments advanced by Governor Hughes. Mr. Schultz, democrat, spoke in favor of the plan, as did Mr. Wainwright, another Hughes follower. Messrs. Hill and Brough assailed it bitterly.

NEW YORK is considerably stirred by the victory for the income tax in the state senate. It might be after all that this great reform would be ratified by the Empire state. The Buffalo (N. Y.) Times prints this interesting editorial: "Notwithstanding the previous adverse action of the assembly the passing of the income tax amendment by the state senate is of a genuine practical importance which the adversaries of the amendment will be unable to minimize. Had it no other value than as a protest it would still be well worth while. But it has a larger significance than that. It will have its effect on the prospects of the income tax measure in states which have not already put themselves on record. Also, in all fairness it ought to put up to the assembly, at the present session, reconsideration of the amendment. If the assembly does nothing more, it will be on account of the dictatorial will of Speaker Wadsworth, and the grip of the rules committee. The people want the income tax amendment put to another vote in the assembly, and the issue now becomes one between the principles of Cannonism, as extended to the assembly, and fair and free legislation. The income tax amendment was lost in the assembly by a single vote, that of a recreant democrat, 'Mannie' Friend, who was won over by the republican machine. The income tax resolution must now go back to the assembly, and the indications of this morning point to a strong fight for another vote. It is said that at the present time eighty votes can be mustered for the amendment in the assembly. But under the autocratic traditions of the rules committee, a demand of 100 members would be necessary to take the question of a re-submission out of the rules committee and place it before the house. But if the rules committee shall defy the wish of a decisive majority of the assembly to reconsider the amendment, it will offer a demonstration of the arrogance of the committee which will not be lost on the people of the state. It will be a renewed proof that Cannonism is a state as well as a national abuse, that the assembly has its Cannon in Speaker Wadsworth, and that a prime necessity to insure representation of the popular will is to curb the power of the speaker and clip the wings of the assembly rules committee."

THE POPULAR impression with respect to the Taft administration is that it has made "blunder upon blunder." Under that headline the New York World prints this editorial: "When Mr. Taft was a judge of the United States circuit court he allowed no subordinate of litigation to prepare tentative opinions for him. He permitted no lawyer to ante-date briefs in order to meet the claims of opposing counsel. He heard all the arguments himself; he read the briefs himself; he decided the case himself, and the decision was the decision of Taft, judge. It was nobody else's decision. The public rightfully assumed that this was the way Mr. Taft acted in the Ballinger case too; that the president sat as a judge; that he carefully weighed all the evidence both against and for the secretary of the interior, and that when he exonerated Mr. Ballinger he was deciding as an impartial judge, uninfluenced by anything except the cold, remorseless facts. The country can no longer believe that this was Mr. Taft's attitude. In permitting Attorney General Wickesham to tamper with the date of a written opinion, and in allowing the assistant attorney general for the interior department to prepare a memorandum to help the president in framing his decision, Mr. Taft divested himself of his function as a judge and must now be included among the attorneys for the defense. Senator Dolliver in his speech at Des Moines the other day described the president as 'a good man surrounded by people who know exactly what they want.' This is the view the country is beginning to take of him, and it is certain to be strengthened by his conduct in the Ballinger case. The public will place less and less reliance hereafter upon the president's judgment. It will be less and less confident that his opin-

ions are his own, arrived at independently by a judicial determination of the evidence. This is unfortunate from every point of view. If there is to be a further enlargement of the president's cabinet, as many persons have urged we should like to suggest a department of common sense in charge of a competent secretary who could always be trusted to act as a disinterested adviser to the chief magistrate."

FORTY-TWO candidates for congress were nominated in Ohio May 18 for the twenty-one Buckeye seats. Ralph D. Cole, democrat, of the Eighth district, was the only present congressman defeated for a renomination. Frank B. Willis takes his place on the ticket. The campaigns made against Representatives Taylor of Columbus, Kennedy of Youngstown, Thomas of the Eighteenth district and Keifer of Springfield on the score of their tariff attitude, failed signally. Following are the republican and democratic nominees: First district—Representative Nicholas Longworth, rep.; Dr. Thomas P. Hart, dem. Second district—Representative Herman P. Goebell, rep.; Alfred G. Allen, dem. Third district—George R. Young, rep.; Representative James M. Cox, dem. Fourth district—C. E. Johnson, rep.; J. H. Goeke, dem. Fifth district—R. D. Roe, rep.; Representative T. F. Ansberry, dem. Sixth district—Jesse Taylor, rep.; Representative M. R. Denver, dem. Seventh district—Warren R. Keifer, rep.; J. D. Post, dem. Eighth district—Frank B. Willis, rep.; T. C. Mahon, dem. Ninth district—J. Kent Hamilton, rep.; Representative I. R. Sherwood, dem. Tenth district—Representative A. R. Johnson, rep.; Edmund Willis, dem. Eleventh district—Representative Albert Douglas, rep.; H. C. Claypool, dem. Twelfth district—Representative E. L. Taylor, Jr., rep.; Frank S. Monnett, dem. Thirteenth district—J. D. McLaughlin, rep.; Representative C. C. Anderson, dem. Fourteenth district—J. G. Chamberlain, rep.; Representative W. G. Sharp, dem. Fifteenth district—Representative James Joyce, rep.; George White, dem. Sixteenth district—Representative D. A. Hollingsworth, rep.; W. B. Francis, dem. Seventeenth district—A. B. Critchfield, rep.; Representative W. A. Ashbrook, dem. Eighteenth district—Representative James Kennedy, rep.; J. J. Whiteacre, dem. Nineteenth district—Representative W. A. Thomas, rep.; E. R. Bathrick, dem. Twentieth district—Representative Paul Howland, rep.; William Gordon, dem. Twenty-first district—Representative J. H. Cassidy, rep.; R. J. Bulkley, dem.

THE SIOUX CITY (Ia.) Journal, a standpat republican newspaper, prints this editorial: "It is a matter of some surprise that the following from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican should have escaped the attention of the leading insurgent newspapers of this state: 'No one has deemed it worth while, thus far to point out that the speeches of Senators Dolliver and Cummings at Des Moines early this week could have been rolled into one and passed off as an address by Mr. Bryan some years ago, criticising the republican party. How very like the Bryan of almost any year between 1896 and 1908 was Senator Cummings' assertion that the present leaders of the republican party are in league with the corporations and have 'scant time to consider the needs and desires of the great mass of humanity.' When Senator Dolliver used the word 'pirate' to describe the same leaders, he reminded one of Mr. Bryan in his campaigns against all the arts and the money of Mark Hanna. The republican insurgents of this type ought now to be ready to concede that Mr. Bryan was accurate in his claim, in 1908, that the Roosevelt policies would be safer in his care than in Mr. Taft's.' Harvey Ingham, the presiding officer on the occasion referred to, has given many proofs of intimacy with the Springfield Republican and of his respect for its opinions. The Register and Leader, Mr. Ingham's senior newspaper, has given numerous quotations concerning 'the greatest political meeting ever held in Iowa,' and in the collation of these quotations the anxious shears have not neglected search in the upheaval districts of Massachusetts and New York. The Springfield Republican must have proved disappointing to its friends in Des Moines, for it has been dropped from the list of quotable papers. The Journal is not displeased to find itself somewhat approved in its independent judgment by so high an authority in independent expression as this newspaper of Springfield. The compliment—if compliment is involved—is Mr. Bryan's alone."