preservation of the Constitution, threatened on the one hand by the Democratic party and on the other by those Republicans who have left the party to try their fortunes in a new one, and by the proposals of the Democrats for reductions in the present tariff.

The Tariff on Wool.

By 160 to 62, the lower house of Congress passed on the 23d the conference committee's report on the wool tariff, which had been agreed to by the committee on the previous day. This report is upon the basis of 29 per cent duty on raw wool—a compromise between the 20 per cent of the House bill and the 35 per cent of the Senate bill. On yarns the House rate of 30 per cent and the Senate rate of 45 per cent are compromised at 35 per cent. [See current volume, page 324.]

The Tariff on Steel.

The steel bill was passed on the 3d by the Senate, which receded from its amendment repealing the Canadian reciprocity law. The average duty is put at about 22 per cent as compared with about 34 per cent under the Payne-Aldrich bill. The bill went to the President on the 5th. [See current volume, page 539.]

La Follette's "Gateway" Amendment.

In the United States Senate on the 6th, Senator La Follette of Wisconsin introduced a joint resolution for a "gateway" amendment to the Constitution of the United States—an amendment, that is, which will make all future amendments reasonably easier. Under the Constitution now, no amendment is possible unless it is (1) proposed by a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of all the States, or (2) proposed by a convention called by Congress on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of all the States and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of all the States. With these restrictions upon amendments, and the liberties taken with the Constitution by judges appointed for life, the people have lost control of their law-making power so completely that only a violent revolution can secure any fundamental change against the opposition of a small minority. Of the fifteen Constitutional amendments that have been adopted, the first ten were virtually an original part of the instrument, having been adopted within three years after the foundation of the government, and pursuant to arrangements necessary to secure the assent of all the original States to the compact of Union. The eleventh was adopted within the next five years, and in order to allay a general fear of an overturning of State sovereignty by judicial usurpation. The twelfth was adopted in 1804 to correct an awkward and generally unsatisfactory operation of the complex Electoral College scheme. The remaining three amendments were adopted by the use of arbitrary force and as culminating political acts of the conquering States in a bloody civil war over the slavery question, which they were intended to settle in accordance with the result of the war. In order to enable the people hereafter to alter their fundamental law on disputed questions peaceably, Senator La Follette's proposed amendment reads as follows:

Resolved, By the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:

Article XVIII. The Congress, whenever a majority of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or on application of ten States by resolution adopted in each by the legislature thereof or by a majority of the electors voting thereon, shall propose amendments to this Constitution to be submitted in each of the several States to the electors qualified to vote for the election of Representatives, and the vote shall be taken at the next ensuing election of Representatives in such manner as the Congress prescribes. And if in a majority of the States a majority of the electors voting approve the proposed amendments, and if a majority of all the electors voting also approve the proposed amendments, they shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution.

The parts in black letter indicate the alterations proposed. [See vol. ii, no. 63, p. 4; iv, p. 110; xiv, p. 485.]

Home Rule in Taxation for California.

At the election in California next November, the people of that State are to vote, under the Initiative provisions of the recently adopted amendment of their Constitution, upon the following proposed amendment for home rule in taxation:

The People of the State of California do enact as follows: Article XIII of the Constitution of the State of California is hereby amended by inserting therein a new section to be designated and numbered as Section 8½ of said Article to read as follows:

Section 8½. Any county, city and county, city, town, district or township in this State is hereby empowered to raise revenues for its local purposes and to provide for the time or times of collecting taxes for such purposes in such manner as it may determine by ordinance or resolution, adopted by a majority vote of the qualified electors thereof, voting thereon at an election held on the question of establishing a new revenue system, or of altering or amending any system of taxation now or hereafter existing for raising such local revenue. Such proposed system or amendment thereof may be submitted at any general or special election held in such county, city and county, city, town, district or town-

Digitized by Google

ship, by initiative petition as provided by law or by resolution of the legislative body of such county or other political subdivision above enumerated.

Property may be classified for the purposes of taxation or exemption from taxes; and taxes or exemption therefrom shall be uniform for all property of each of such classes; provided that no tax for any local purpose, except for payment of the principal and interest of any bonded indebtedness created and outstanding by any such county, city and county, city, town, township or district, prior to the 8th day of November, 1910, shall be levied on any property set aside for purposes of taxation for State revenue, nor shall any such tax be levied upon any property exempt from local taxation by this Constitution or by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

The valid signatures to the petitions for submission of this amendment are reported from San Francisco as numbering 33,702 in the State at large, inclusive of 18,132 secured in San Francisco, and as being more than enough to put the amendment upon the ballot at the coming election.

The First National Newspaper Conference.

Continuing its meetings at Madison under the auspices of the Wisconsin State University, the first national conference on the newspapers of the United States carried out its program as follows:

July 30—(Forenoon): "Is the newspaper-reading public getting all the truth it is entitled to?" W. H. Ellis of the Grange Lake (Ill.) Searchlight; Livy S. Richard of the Boston Common. (Afternoon): "Can the impartiality of the news-gathering and news-supplying agencies be fairly challenged?" Melville E. Stone of the Associated Press, Roy Howard of the United Press, A. M. Simons of The Coming Nation, and Herman Ridder of the New York Staats-Zeitung.

July 31—(Forenoon): "How is news service affected by (1) the constantly increasing cost of the newspaper plant? (2) the increasing proportion of total newspaper revenue derived from the advertisers? (3) the non-journalistic interests of the capitalist owner?" Don Seitz of the New York World, and George French of the Twentieth Century Magazine. (Evening): "If the newspaper is to play its due part in the social advance, can it be run as simply a business proposition?" Charles Grasty of the Baltimore Sun and Louis F. Post of The Public.

August 1—(Forenoon): "Can commercial journalism make good, or must we look for the endowed newspaper?" Hamilton Holt of the New York Independent and Professor Ross of the Wisconsin University.—(Afternoon): "Can commercial journalism make good, or must we look for the public newspaper?" George H. Dunlop, president of the municipal commission for the publication of the Los Angeles Municipal News.

In the evening, at a banquet at which Chief Justice Winslow of the Wisconsin Supreme Court was toastmaster, Edward G. Lowry of the New York Evening Post, Richard H. Little of the Chicago Tribune, George French of Boston, Hamilton Holt of the New York Independent, Zona Gale of Wisconsin, and Charles Grasty of the Baltimore Sun were the speakers. On motion of Mr. Grasty as chairman of a committee on the subject, a resolution requesting a second conference under the same auspices was adopted. [See current volume, page 730.]

Freedom of the Country Press.

Under a perpetual injunction, issued by Judge Landis of the Federal court at Chicago on the 3d, three corporations are prohibited from combining in the business of furnishing ready-made printed matter for about 16,000 newspapers. They are the Western Newspaper Union, the American Press Association and the Central-West Publishing Company, the last being a "holding company" for the consolidation of the other two. In his opinion in the case, Judge Landis says:

The news thus distributed and the discussions of important questions thus supplied would all be designed to mold the sentiments of the readers to one particular view. It appears in the negotiations had between the companies looking to their consolidation, that the expectation was that in view of the greater power thus acquired in disseminating information the united property could be disposed of at great profit to those interested in instilling certain economic ideas in the minds of the public, and that it was the design that such a disposition of it should be made. This circulation from week to week of information dealing with questions of public importance is of itself interstate commerce, and for one concern to acquire the power to distribute all of such information and to deceive the public by its perversion is itself a serious and substantial restraint upon and a monopolizing of interstate trade and commerce.

The decree followed the filing of a suit by Special Assistant Attorney General William Chantland. Attorneys for the organizations assented to the entry of the decree, asserting there was no wish to form any coalition if it was not desired by the government and would be a violation of the Sherman act. The government began to investigate this so-called "boiler plate" business when the American Press Association filed a complaint against the Western Newspaper Union. The latter organization made a counter complaint. As the investigation continued the Federal District Attorney at Chicago is reported as saying—

We found that before 1909 the two concerns acted separately and in concert to destroy competition. They undersold competitors, sent out traveling men to call only on the customers of competitors, and summoned competitors to conferences and openly told them they could not continue in their competing business. They were told they must sell out or get out and coupled demands with threats of fiercer competition, including the installation of competitive plants. In 1909 negotiations were begun between the officers of the defendant corporations for the purpose of uniting their business. They failed to

Digitized by Google