

What we have quoted from these beef trust resolutions is enough to illustrate the true spirit of the whole protection fraud; but the remainder is too good to be lost in Congressional pigeon holes. So here it is:

In view of this truth and not considering the justice or expedience of what is called the protective policy—

Mark that now! What band of protectionists ever did consider either the justice or the expediency (except to themselves) of the protective policy? All that they consider in the way of ethics is a square deal in the distribution of plunder. But to proceed with the quotation—

not considering the justice or expedience of what is called the protective policy, the live stock producers of the country claim that in the administering of such policy the government should consider the rights and welfare of all classes and should make the tariff schedules conform to the principles of justice and equity, avoiding discrimination and forbearing from the building up of interests inimical to the general welfare by granting high tariff rates to one and leaving the other unprotected. Equality of opportunity for all—

Does this mean "equality of opportunity" to go a-pirating?

should be the guide of lawmakers in the matter of revenue as well as in all other legislation. Considering the facts and principles herein set forth, we hold that the making of free hides and the reduction of the rates upon wool is a direct violation of equitable principles and will have a disastrous effect upon the live stock industry of our country. In this connection we would call the attention of our lawmakers to the fact that under a protective policy of many years' standing that has favored the manufacturing industries and classed the agriculturist and live stock producer as a maker of raw material, the country has developed many enormous fortunes coming from the special privilege arising from a high tariff on manufactured articles, while on the contrary we have few or no examples of great wealth accumulated by the live stock raisers or farmers of our land. Therefore, not opposing the policy of tariff reduction—

Whose policy is this policy of reduction, now that the election is over?

in any manner, except to insist upon the principles above stated—

A pretty comprehensive exception, by the way; but no broader than that which Mr. Payne and Mr. Aldrich are giving their sanction to, in the name of the Republican party.

we again protest against free hides and low rates on wool. In arranging the schedule, cut the exceedingly high rates of interests that do not need them—What an absurdly treasonable and un-Republican suggestion!

and leave the little protection that has come to the great live stock producing and agricultural interests.

If all protectionists were as candid as the Chicago Live Stock Exchange, the fraud-inflated protection bubble would collapse before morning.

+ +

### Significance of the Income Tax.

The opposition of Big Business to an income tax is not easily guessed, at first sight. One is at a loss to understand why so slight an exaction from great incomes should be resisted so strenuously for personal reasons; and the ethical objection that an income tax falls upon earned as well as unearned incomes is never raised. What is it, then, that makes the Big Business opposition so vigorous? One of the Washington correspondents seems to answer the question. He explains that any income tax at all raises an issue which, as the protected interests plainly see, would soon put an end to tariff taxation. The income tax would grow at the expense of tariff taxation. The struggle against the income tax is therefore a life-and-death struggle for the perpetuation of protection.

+ +

### The Mexican Neutrality Cases.

The Federal authorities in Texas are broadly charged with perverting the neutrality laws, in the case of Antonio de P. Araujo, in such manner as to amount to suppression of freedom of the press. According to Mr. Araujo's friends, he has been convicted nominally of organizing on American soil expeditions for the invasion of Mexico, but actually of exposing and denouncing, in a periodical published by him in Texas, the unconstitutional tyrannies of Diaz. If his conviction is in good faith what it purports to be, a conviction of conspiring in this country to make an armed attack upon a country with which we are at peace, there is no more reason for criticism than there would be if it were for any other crime. Whatever our individual sympathies may be with reference to the internal commotions of another country, our nation must enforce neutrality so long as it professes neutrality and makes neutrality laws. He who resists it in this, must endure the prescribed penalty as part of the price of a revolutionary assertion of independence of the laws under which he lives. But if it is true that Araujo's only offense is his freedom of speech through the press, that presents a different case. To denounce in American publications the lawlessness and tyranny of the master of a sister nation is no breach of neutrality. Right there is the line of distinction. We ought to be able to trust our courts to decide the point—to trust them with absolute confidence. Unhappily, however, Federal judges have

not made a very good record under our Bill of Rights. Property interests have loomed up much larger before them than human interests. Yet it is to be hoped that the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, which is to hear the appeal from Araujo's conviction in a few days, will draw the line in his case clearly and convincingly between breach of neutrality on the one hand and freedom of speech and the press on the other.

+

About the same time that Araujo's appeal is to be heard at Austin, Texas, four other Mexican leaders—Magon, Villareal, Rivera and Sarabia (p. 253) are to be tried at Tombstone, Arizona, also for breach of our neutrality laws. They should have been tried months and months and months ago; but some sinister influence seems to have been at work keeping them in prison, incommunicado at times, while postponing their trial. All this is disquieting as the trial approaches. For the influences that could defy the rights of prisoners as to promptness of trial and liberty pending trial, might very easily pack a jury. If this could be done in Chicago, as it was at the "anarchist" trials, it might be done in Tombstone, if in fact the Mexican authorities are as influential in the case of these prisoners as they have seemed to be. But upon the assumption of a fair jury, these accused Mexicans are now about to be put to the test to which they are entitled and which has been long and arbitrarily denied them. If they have engaged in organizing armed expeditions in our country against our neighbor, no matter how good their cause, they have violated laws of ours which must be vindicated; but if they have not engaged on our side of the line in schemes for armed assaults upon the Mexican authorities, or having so schemed in Mexico have sought an asylum here, they deserve all the protection from Diazian vengeance that it is in the power of this nation to afford.

+ +

#### Where the Profit Lies.

"It has actually been demonstrated by experience that the profits from the mere holding of timber are larger than those resulting from manufacture." This is the advice, to the investing public, of a great timber-holding company. And incidentally it explains that "many investors when interesting themselves in timber stipulate that there shall be no undertakings to manufacture." This is very reasonable and highly significant. What investors want is profit; and these thoughtful ones have learned that profit comes more abundantly

from holding timber out of use than from putting it to use. The fact that they thereby put a check upon industry, and increase the number of industrial bankruptcies and the army of the unemployed, does not concern them. But it ought to concern everybody else. Why should we help these investors, at the expense of burdening industry, by getting our taxes from the men who use timber instead of the men who hold it out of use?

+ +

#### Judicial Progress in Cincinnati.

Other communities than those of Ohio are hard hit by the sound and courageous decisions that Judge Gorman is making in that city with reference to certain contemptible, not to say lawless, methods of raising public revenues. "Perhaps the fault lies," he justly observes, "in our bad system of taxation, whereby the State seems to be willing to reach out by the hand of the tax gatherer and lay hold of any thing, object, business or calling, which will enable it to raise revenue, regardless of any moral question that might be involved in the levying and collecting of taxes." That remark alone, coming appropriately from the judicial bench, is of incalculable civic value. Our methods of taxation do utterly ignore moral principles. Not only that, but these methods are defended upon the preposterous plea that there are no moral principles of taxation. Such special pleaders are oblivious, too, to the inevitable inference that their plea put taxation into the criminal categories, along with burglary, sneak thieving and forgery. The cases in which Judge Gorman has made his excellent decisions were on applications for injunctions restraining the taxing authorities from collecting liquor taxes from houses of ill-fame. State agents had been sent as spies into these places, not to ascertain their immoral character and invoke the police power against them; but to catch them at selling beer in order to make them pay a liquor tax! This seems to have been a common practice in Cincinnati, as it probably is elsewhere. But Judge Gorman sustained injunctions, on the common sense ground that inasmuch as traffic in intoxicating liquors in such places is absolutely prohibited by law, the State is not "justified in employing agents in the revenue department, and for the purpose of raising revenue, to tempt and induce the keepers of such houses to violate the law in order to enable the State to profit by the act." In other words, as he concludes, "there is no equity or justice in allowing the State to profit by employing and paying agents to bring about a violation of some of its