

they will face with equanimity, but the more radical cure they will not tolerate. State regulation is thought to be sane, because the control of the state can be retained in the hands of the beneficiaries of the unearned values; profit-sharing is looked upon as safe because it distributes the increment a little more equitably, but still leaves the control of the situation in the same hands; Socialism will be tolerated as a last resort, because here, too, the situation will be in the hands of the forceful.

But under any method of actually eliminating the opportunities themselves through the taxing power, the gambling instinct on both large scale and small would have nothing to feed upon, and the motive for the control of government would be gone.

+

It is because of this, that, of all proposed reforms, the Single Tax is the one which will be fought in this country to the last ditch. Even after Socialism is on trial, should Socialism come, a bitter fight will be waged against it.

An inkling of this is shown in the present English situation. The spreading of Socialistic sentiment and Socialistic reforms in Great Britain in recent years has not at any time created half the real consternation that the proposal to tax land values is now causing.

+

Let no disciple of Henry George think the fight is won, in England or elsewhere.

It has really but just begun.

JOHN MOODY.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date. ●

Week ending Tuesday, July 6, 1909.

The Tariff in Congress.

The tariff schedules (p. 634) having been disposed of in the Senate on the 28th, consideration of the income tax and the corporation tax questions were taken up on the 29th, the discussion being opened by Senator Cummins (Republican) of Iowa. Senator Cummins rested his argument upon the fact that the question then was not

whether there should be an income tax amendment to the tariff bill, but what kind of income tax it should be. In explanation he said:

The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas and myself, which have now been merged into a single amendment, provided for a general income tax to be paid by all persons, copartnerships and corporations with net annual earnings in excess of \$5,000, so adjusted that the tax would not be laid upon any person unless he enjoyed such an income even though a part of it is derived from a corporation. The amendment recommended by the President, and offered by the finance committee, provides for a special income tax laid only upon corporations and measured by their net earnings. The difference between the two plans is fundamental, and involves the most vital principle in the authority of any government to tax its citizens and their property.

Before Senator Cummins got the floor, two motions were made by Senators Lodge and Aldrich, respectively, evidently by prearrangement with a view to preventing any amendments of the President's corporation-tax provision as formulated by his advisers. Mr. Lodge first moved as an amendment to the Cummins-Bailey income tax proposition, a substitute providing for countervailing duties against countries imposing duties on articles exported to the United States; whereupon Mr. Aldrich moved, as an amendment to Mr. Lodge's amendment, the substitution of the corporation tax provision recommended by President Taft. As there can be no amendment to an amendment of an amendment, the corporation tax proposition was thereby fenced in against attempts to alter it either in form or substance.

+

Senator Cummins and Senator Borah occupied the time on the 30th, both speaking in favor of the Cummins-Bailey income tax proposition. Both speakers turned their batteries upon Senator Aldrich.

+

President Taft's corporation tax proposition was adopted by the Senate and became a part of the Aldrich bill on the 2nd, by a vote of 60 to 11. Eight Republicans and three Democrats opposed the amendment on the final vote. The Republicans were Borah of Idaho, Bristow of Kansas, Bulkeley of Connecticut, Clapp of Minnesota, Cummins and Dolliver of Iowa, Heyburn of Idaho and La Follette of Wisconsin. The Democrats were Hughes of Colorado, Chamberlain of Oregon and Shively of Indiana. Three other Democrats—Bacon of Georgia, Overman of North Carolina and Stone of Missouri—were present and declined to vote. The path to this final vote required four preliminary steps, in forcing which Senator Aldrich is accused of breaking the traditions of Senatorial courtesy by cutting off debate. The first vote was upon the corpora-

tion tax proposition as an amendment to Senator Lodge's dummy substitute. It carried by 45 to 31. The Republicans who voted in the negative were Borah, Bristow, Bulkeley, Clapp, Cummins, Dolliver and La Follette. No Democrats voted with the majority. Senator Lodge then withdrew his dummy substitute, and the corporation tax was again voted on in its place. The vote was again 45 to 31. An amendment to the corporation tax for the exemption of educational, fraternal and religious corporations, offered by Senator Bacon, of Georgia, was tabled by Senator Aldrich by a vote of 42 to 32. The Republicans who voted with the Democrats against laying the amendment on the table were Borah, Brandagee, Bristow, Bulkeley, Clapp, Cummins, Dolliver and La Follette. Brandagee and Bulkeley were moved to take the position they did by the Connecticut interest in mutual insurance companies. Brandagee voted for the corporation tax when the final vote of the day was taken. A second amendment, offered by Senator Bacon, for a 2 per cent excise tax to be levied on the interest on bonds, was tabled by a vote of 41 to 34. The Republicans who voted in the negative were Borah, Bristow, Clapp, Crawford, Cummins, Dolliver, Gamble, Jones, La Follette and Piles. Then came the final vote on the adoption of the corporation tax, as recorded above. On the 3rd the maximum and minimum provision of the tariff bill—a weapon for use against tariff discriminations of foreign nations—came up for consideration. Senator Root argued that while the United States cannot say to France and Germany or other nations that may hereafter discriminate against our products, that unless such discrimination ceases the maximum rates will apply, that our Administration must be placed in a position where its action can be a concession, something in the way of reciprocity, a reduction of rates in return for favorable treatment extended our products. The amendment was adopted by a vote of 36 to 18. The Republicans voting with the Democrats against the amendment were Bristow, Burton, Crawford and La Follette.

✦

The Brown joint resolution providing for the submission to the several States of a Constitutional amendment to permit the levying of a Federal income tax, came up on the 5th. Senator Bailey of Texas wanted the resolution modified so as to require the submission of the proposed amendment to State conventions instead of to the State legislatures, either course being permissible. The idea behind this plan, according to Mr. Bailey, was that the question should not be clouded by local issues. His amendment was voted down by 46 to 30. All the Democrats, except the two Virginia Senators, and five Re-

publicans—Bristow, Clapp, Cummins, Jones and La Follette, voted for the amendment. The original resolution was then unanimously adopted.

✦ ✦

For Consolidation of Free Trade Sentiment.

The following address was issued to the press of the country on the 5th, from the offices of the Tariff Reform Committee of the Reform Club in New York (42 Broadway):

To the Citizens of the United States:

The apparent acceptance in some degree of the so-called Protective policy by the present Congressional representatives of both the political parties—the Republicans championing Protection with incidental revenue, and the Democrats urging revenue with incidental protection—might beget the impression that our nation contains no men who believe in the absolute and unconditioned freedom of trade between the peoples of the earth.

The undersigned, proclaiming themselves as Free-Traders, contend:

(1.) That Protection erects artificial barriers between nations, preventing that natural and healthful interchange of products which makes for increased comfort, for peace, and for the solidarity of mankind.

(2.) That Protection, by reducing the quantity of incoming foreign goods, reduces the buying-power represented by such goods, and consequently subtracts from the demand for merchandise and labor which would inevitably be fostered by the unrestricted freedom of exchange.

(3.) That Protection, in addition to lessening the demand for labor, and to a consequent reduction of wages, greatly increases the cost of necessaries, thus becoming a powerful agent in dragging down the condition of our wage-earning classes.

(4.) That Protection has not only become the Mother of Trusts, but that, by stifling foreign competition, it has granted them a license to prey upon the community.

(5.) That Protection encourages extravagance in national expenditures, which, as they are paid by taxes on what the people consume, are in the main extracted from the pockets of the wage-earning and salaried classes.

(6.) That Protection, by its methods of indirection, cunningly disguises the incidence of taxation, and thus weakens that desirable interest in legislation and in government policies which direct taxation tends to develop.

(7.) That Protection, which is in effect a process of class-enrichment by legislative favor, is a festering source of political corruption.

(8.) That Protection, by engendering special over-production due to excessive profits and widespread under-consumption due to excessive prices, contributes to producing those panics which cause so much human waste and misery.

(9.) That Protection, by conferring on favored classes the right to tax their fellow citizens, and by the consequent unequal and inequitable distribution of the boundless wealth which is created by the energy and natural resources possessed by the American people, has generated resentments which express

themselves by dangerous methods intended to wrench from its possessors a portion of the wealth which has been unjustly appropriated.

(10.) That Protection, by the swollen fortunes which it heaps up for its beneficiaries, and by the concentrated, selfish class-interests which it fosters, becomes so powerful through their ability and readiness to debauch public opinion by the expenditure of money, that it can never be dislodged until the great body of our people are brought to realize its wasteful, sinful, anti-social character.

Concurring in such views, the undersigned call on all fellow citizens who are in agreement therewith, to join them in an effort to consolidate the Free-Trade sentiment of the nation. Such a consolidation will reveal the true economic opinion of at least a portion of our citizens, and will facilitate co-operation with the Free-Traders of other nations which are also suffering from the evils of a Protective policy.

Names and addresses should be forwarded without delay to any of the undersigned:

JOHN BIGELOW, 21 Gramercy Park, New York.
 CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, India House, Boston, Mass.
 JAMES H. DILLARD, 571 Audubon St., New Orleans, La.
 LOUIS R. EHRICH, 50 West 77th St., New York.
 WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, 6 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 BOLTON HALL, 56 Pine St., New York.
 BYRON W. HOLT, 54 Broad St., New York.
 TOM L. JOHNSON, Cleveland, Ohio.
 DAVID STARR JORDAN, Stanford University, California.
 GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY, 2 Rector St., New York.
 LOUIS F. POST, Ellsworth Building, Chicago, Ill.
 WM. G. SUMNER, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
 CHAS. D. WILLIAMS, 44 Campau Building, Detroit, Mich.

+ +

A More Civilized Independence Day.

As a result of municipal efforts quite general through the country the more dangerous and boisterous methods of celebrating Independence day were this year greatly curtailed, with the result of a decrease in fatalities and injuries. The Chicago Tribune's report for the whole country was 44 dead, as against 56 last year. According to the Tribune,

Cleveland probably made the best record of any city of its size in the country in the fight against the noise and perils of the day. While there were ten persons killed and sixty-two injured during the one day celebration in 1908, the two day festivity in 1909 was passed without a single death or injury serious enough to require the attention of a physician. This was due to the fact that the firing and even the sale of fireworks or firecrackers was forbidden within the city limits.

+ +

The Cleveland Traction Fight.

A new question has been thrown into the Cleveland traction controversy (p. 633), by a decision of the Supreme Court of the State, just made,

to the effect that the law for voting with machines is unconstitutional. If this view of the law had been taken at the time of the traction referendum of last Fall, the traction franchise would have been sustained; for that referendum was partly by ballot and partly by machines, and on the ballot vote there was a majority in favor of the franchise. It is now predicted in some quarters that if the referendum of August 3 is carried for the new Schmidt franchise, the traction ring will go into court claiming that the settlement franchise voted on last Fall is in force. Against this contention, there are several points, one of which is that the election was invalid because machines were used; and another, that if not invalid the declared result has been acquiesced in by all interests.

+ +

Police Rebuke in New York.

Mayor McClellan on the 30th upheld Supreme Court Justice Gaynor's charges that Police Commissioner Bingham was guilty of injustice and oppression (p. 350) in retaining the picture of George B. Duffy in the rogues' gallery. The Mayor ordered the police official to remove the photograph of the boy from the rogues' gallery, and return all photographs, negatives, and Bertillon measurements of the young man to his father. The Mayor further condemned Commissioner Bingham's whole administration of police affairs in Brooklyn, and gave him twelve hours in which to make certain specified changes in the personnel of the force and the rules of his office. The Commissioner complied with seven of the Mayor's eleven orders, but refused to comply with an order to remove his secretary, D. G. Slattery. The Mayor thereupon summarily removed the Commissioner from office, and appointed in his place William F. Baker, who had held the position of first deputy commissioner.

+ +

For Free Speech.

A mass meeting was held at Cooper Union, New York City, on the 30th, to protest against the suppression of free speech in the United States by the police. The immediate occasion of the meeting was the interference of the police in many cities with Emma Goldman's lectures (p. 580); but, as the call for the meeting stated, "it is not necessary to approve or share Miss Goldman's ideas to recognize the importance of the issue raised by this kind of tyranny. Such methods may logically result in the suppression of any one disagreeing with the dominant political rule." The committee which issued the call was composed of Grace Potter, Leonard Abbott, Bolton Hall, Alexander Irvine and Meyer London. Among the signers were: Eugene V. Debs, Clarence S. Darrow, B. O. Flower, Louis F. Post,