

out of its boundaries, provided they had been held therein, even temporarily, either for consumption, sale or storage? And is not this section a plausible attempt on the part of Congress to delegate its power to regulate interstate commerce to the several states and territories?

The ostensible public purpose for laying a tax is to get money into the national treasury, with which to pay the national debt, provide for the common defence, and to promote the general welfare. But the first oleomargarine legislation was approved August 2, 1886, and entitled: "An Act Defining Butter; also Imposing a Tax upon and Regulating the Manufacture, Sale, Importation, and Exportation of Oleomargarine."

At the time this pretended revenue law was enacted, the national treasury was full and overflowing. The great question among statesmen was: "What shall we do with our surplus revenues?" Therefore, the first enactment could not have been purely for a public purpose. It could not have been because the public treasury needed more revenue. It must then have been legislation under a false pretence. The purpose of that legislation was purely for the promotion of certain special or class interests. The revenue was not needed and the real object of the enactment was to discourage, impede, and, if possible, destroy the manufacture of butter substitutes of all kinds. Notwithstanding this great injustice by the legislative branch of the government, the manufacture of oleomargarine and butterine has continued. And more unfriendly legislation is now sought, and also under the guise and pretence of getting revenues into the national treasury. But everyone understands that the revenues of the government of the United States have increased so rapidly during the last three years that many federal taxes were reduced by the last Congress, and many stamp duties have been done away with because there is a surplus revenue. We all understand perfectly well the plethora of money in the treasury of the United States which causes Mr. Secretary Gage to constantly advertise for and purchase at a premium the outstanding bonds of the government. It is evident from these conditions that there is no particular public purpose to be served by the taxation in the Grout bill. It provides that oleomargarine or butterine, not colored in imitation of butter, shall be taxed one-fourth of one cent per pound. But when it is colored in imitation of butter, the tax to be paid by the manufacturer shall be ten cents per pound.

Pretended Philanthropy.

This legislation is sought not by farmers, but by manufacturing and commercial dairymen. It has very properly

and quite naturally originated in the state of Vermont, whence came the Morrill protective tariff, and where the majority of the land-owners and farmers have persistently impoverished themselves by clinging to the fallacies of protection. And just as we have been asked to believe that the vast lobbies maintained at Washington for the purpose of securing higher duties on certain foreign articles imported to the United States are entirely philanthropic as to their motives, and that the sole object of high protective tariff laws is to make certain American manufacturers pay higher wages to their employees, and at the same time compel them to sell the products of the labor of those employees at lower prices; so we are now requested to tax our credulity and believe that the unselfish dairymen of the United States, incorporated and otherwise, are keeping and paying a lobby at Washington, solely for the public purpose of raising revenue for the government by imposing this ten cent tax on yellow-colored butter substitutes. Disinterested Samaritanism asks us to believe that it makes all these efforts to pass the Grout bill for the purely patriotic purpose of increasing the overflow of the torrential revenues of the general government. Sometimes, however, we are to understand that it is because of an affectionate solicitude for the general healthfulness of the American people that it is proposed to tax oleomargarine and butterine out of existence. It is even declared by some of these sympathetic health-guardians and amateur scientists who claim to be—not even excepting calves—the sole legitimate representatives of the meek-eyed cow, that oleomargarine and butterine, whether colored or not, are substantial and active causes of indigestion and dyspepsia. They ask us to refrain from using these proxies for butter because of their destructiveness to human health. Recently at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, there was a convention of, allegedly, the farmers of the United States. The farmers, however, were not all there from any one of the states or territories; nor was the representation extensive from any state, nor was there any representation from more than fifteen states. But with great unanimity that assorted collection of distinguished and disinterestedly benevolent dairymen passed vigorous resolutions in favor of the immediate enactment of the Grout bill. But by some unsanctified friend of the cattle industry an amendment was proposed to the effect that all so-called "Process Butter," if colored with the June tint or Jersey complexion, which is supposed to inhere with old-fashioned, churn-made, hand-worked butter, should be likewise subjected to the same tax and penalties provided by these patriotic philanthropists for butterine, oleomargarine and other butter

substitutes; however this amendment was rejected.

Process Butter.

The public may not generally know the fact but members of this National Convention of Cattlemen understand it pretty thoroughly, that for years it has been the custom of the incorporated creameries and dairymen generally to gather up in all the towns and villages of the country, from stores and warehouses, all the rancid, antique and malodorous butter on the market, for the purpose of reworking it—before "working it" on consumers—disinfecting, coloring and sweetening it, to go out into the world as the only genuine, cow-descended, absolutely pure bread-spreader, without guile and without reproach. Tons upon tons of this bric-a-brac butter, antique, loud-smelling, rancid and rank, have been gathered up throughout the country and by chemical processes rehabilitated, given the complexion of the finest, carrot-colored cream, and put upon the market by the very men who now assume the right to take charge of American digestion and prescribe all oleaginous or unctuous veneering for bread in this free country. These exemplars of commercial virtue, these reprobaters of fraud and denouncers of all modern bread-spreaders, when seeking to pass the Grout bill, decline absolutely in open convention of alleged dairymen to permit that the provisions of that enactment with all its penalties and taxes be extended to the renovated and rehabilitated butter in question. Unanimously that amendment was voted out and down. The vote was the voice of affectionate solicitude for the stomachs of their countrymen. And yet some of the best and most eminent chemists of the United States, including Dr. H. W. Wiley, chief chemist of the U. S. Department of Agriculture; Prof. Schweitzer, of the Missouri State University; Prof. Caldwell, of Cornell University; and Prof. Atwater, of the Wesleyan University at Middletown, have declared these butter substitutes, oleomargarine and butterine, wholesome, digestible, edible fats. They have declared them nutritious and healthful and protested against any further inimical legislation.

If, however, the manufacture of these substitutes for butter could be absolutely prohibited by the power to tax, it would give to the dairymen and renovated-butter makers a monopoly of bread-greasing in the American market. It would put the prices of butter to such heights that the ordinary working men of the country would be unable to purchase it.

An attempt to obtain goods under false pretences is no more a crime morally than the proposed anti-oleomargarine legislation is a crime, under the pre-