

ning of British rule in India, "the supreme authority will shortly pass from exclusively British hands." It goes on to emphasize the gravity of the step:

A member of the Viceroy's Executive Council is much more than a departmental chief. He is, in a truer sense than the ministers of most European states, a ruler of men, and he should have the intellect and the moral training of a ruler. The largest and the weightiest problems in all branches of government come before him, and the decisions which he and his colleagues reach not only affect the lives of the 300,000,000 inhabitants of India, but often exercise a powerful influence upon the policy and the fortunes of the empire. For him there are no State secrets and no confidential documents. He has a right to know and to debate the *imperii arcana*. The most delicate mysteries of diplomacy, the most carefully guarded of military precautions, are trusted to his faith and to his discretion.

In other words, were the Viceroy's Council confronted with the possible danger of another Sepoy rebellion, a native of India would be party to the British plans. The impartial judge must, however, conclude that, on the whole, the new arrangement will remove the cause for more rebellions than it will incite.

#### THE SENATE TARIFF.

The tariff bill which Mr. Aldrich reported to the Senate on Monday is, properly speaking, no tariff bill at all. It is the Payne bill scratched and scored, with a mixture of the Dingley bill mangled. Important schedules are left for later introduction. Like the deformed Richard, the Aldrich bill can say that it was

sent before my time  
Into this breathing world, scarce half made up.

For the speed with which this patchwork was laid before the Senate, reasons are given in the report from the Finance Committee, or, rather, from its Republican members. The urgent need of passing a tariff bill at the earliest day possible, in order to end business uncertainty, is dwelt upon as justification for asking the Senate to take up and discuss an incomplete measure. This is sound enough, especially in view of the fact that the Senate may alter the bill out of its original semblance, and also that the final rates are to be written in conference between the two houses. Yet this plausible excuse that the king's business requireth haste, does not explain the whole procedure. It is plain that, in some of the contested parts of the

tariff, the Republicans on the Finance Committee could not agree. Wood pulp, coal, hides, together with the entire provision respecting maximum and minimum duties, and the administrative sections, are "left open for further action."

What lies behind that specious phrase, everybody knows: good trading material has been placed in the hands of the log-rollers. What will emerge, after they have got their work done, nobody can tell. Yet final judgment on the Senate bill must be deferred until we do see what comes out of the Senatorial melting-pot.

As the Aldrich bill stands, it has some features which are better than the corresponding ones in the Payne bill. The Senate rejects the 100 per cent. increases over the Dingley duties on gloves, and restores the rates as in the existing law. These themselves are too high, even considered as a tax on an imported luxury. Still, the Finance Committee has repelled this grab, and has also resisted the attempt to raise the taxes on hosiery; and for this, due credit must not be withheld. And if it is true, as Senator Aldrich asserts, that the rates in the Senate bill are "lower than in the bill as it passed the House," this fact will appear as the measure is analyzed, and the country will decide whether Republican pledges have been kept.

Meanwhile, we are bound to note certain disquieting symptoms. Senator Aldrich plumes himself on the fact that "the actual number of reductions" is "about three times the number of increases." But why any increases at all? The demand of the people, and the demand of President Taft, was for reductions. The President has declared that the increases should be "few, if any." But one-third is not a few. These increases are blandly explained by Senator Aldrich as in part due to the need of "preserving the symmetry of the schedules." The rueful taxpayer knows all about that symmetry. It is symmetrical greed, perfectly harmonious division of the plunder, on the principle that if you don't give me my share of the booty, by Heaven, I'll prevent you from getting yours. Furthermore, there is a suspicious change in the Senate bill from *ad valorem* to specific duties. This is especially the case in the cotton and silk schedules. Now, specific duties are the notorious lurking-places of tariff

"jokers," and it will be necessary to submit these new specific duties to close and expert examination in order to discover just who are the manufacturers and campaign contributors that have been getting in their fine work.

We think, too, that the country will regard the taking of iron ore off the free list, where the House put it, as not only a backward step, but an ominous one. It gives color to the rumor that the Senate was all along determined to make short work of free hides, free coal, and free wood pulp. It is about those articles that the Senatorial "hog combine" was reported to be forming, and the restoration of iron ore to the dutiable list will cause fears for the worst in the other items, too. Making iron ore free was, as Congressman McCall pointed out, one of the significant and strategic features of the Payne bill. It meant a determination to withdraw a perfectly needless protection from the few great corporations which control practically all the iron-ore deposits in this country. By so much, it implied a purpose to tax wealth, not poverty, at least in the sense that wealth would not be aided by law to heap up its accumulations at the expense of the masses of the people. But this good impression of the Payne bill, Senator Aldrich and his colleagues have at once gone to work to destroy.

Tariff legislation has now entered upon its really critical stage. The next few weeks will show whether the Senate can be responsive to public sentiment, or whether selfish and powerful interests are so firmly entrenched in the upper chamber of Congress that no popular attack can dislodge them. We may be sure that President Taft will not be deceived by any glib assurances that the Aldrich bill is a sufficient fulfilment of party promises, or a measure that will actually relieve the consumer. He will look closely to the facts. If they convince him that the tariff bill, in its final form, is playing fast and loose with the country, he will not hesitate to say so; and if a treacherous measure is in the end offered for his signature, it will, we are confident, get instead a veto.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC BREAK-UP.

Republican tariff-thieves are rejoicing that many Democrats are becoming as one of them. That is the real moral significance of all the talk about South-

ern Democrats having been at last converted from the error of their free-trade ways. Their showing in the House has, in truth, already been bad. It will probably be even worse in the Senate, as opportunity offers. Over thirty Southern Democrats voted in the House last week against the amendment to make lumber free. One of them was the chairman of the last Democratic National Convention, which said in its platform:

We demand the immediate repeal of the tariff on wood-pulp, print-paper, *lumber*, timber, and logs, and that these articles be placed upon the *free list*.

Political recreancy could not well be more unblushing. Looking at it, first, from the point of view of party, we can now see plainly how vain it would have been, in the last Presidential campaign, for tariff-reformers to pin their hopes to the election of Mr. Bryan. Himself never really a soldier in the war against protection, he had come to have a party following so drugged and debauched by protective and other socialistic arguments, that it could not be depended upon to attack resolutely even the most flagrant iniquities of the high tariff. Two Democratic Representatives were talking last week about the great defection on the tariff within their own party. One of them said that, on that issue, they had lost the Democratic whip, as well as the chairman of their National Convention and a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee. "Yes," chimed in his colleague, "and let us thank God the Democratic Presidential candidate was not also in the House, or he might have voted for a duty on oil." Of course, there have always been some Democrats who called themselves, openly or secretly, protectionists. Mr. Randall headed a group which, before Cleveland's day, prevented any revision of the tariff. But after the party has in four Presidential campaigns hoisted the banner of a tariff for revenue only, has once carried the country on that issue, and finally forced the Republicans to take it up, it becomes an act of peculiar turpitude for a Representative to say: "I am a Democrat to the core, but I am a protectionist." When you penetrate to that "core," you find a strong desire for a portion of the tariff swag. And the proportion of Democrats that now confess themselves to be actuated by that desire is large enough to rob their party both of its prestige and its power.

The explanation, to be sure, lies at hand. Poor human nature being what it is, the motive for going in for a part of the tariff plunder is obvious. It has been bluntly put by Senator Tillman. "Your whole system," he said to the Republican Senators, "is one of stealing; but so long as the stealing is going on, we of the South propose to have our share of the booty." Nor would we too severely blame the Representatives themselves. Behind them stands the mass of their constituents, with itching palms. The fatal lesson has been drilled into them that every citizen is entitled to finger coin from the national Treasury; that the only way to get on in business is to obtain a Federal grant in aid; and that the way to make a fortune is to secure the right to tax your fellows, so that their property may be, under the color of law, transferred to you. With these ideas both preached and practised for more than a generation, and with the "new South" reproached so long for standing for a principle, instead of rushing to fill its pockets out of the public funds, it is not a political miracle that we see Democratic Representatives from the South unable to withstand the pressure of selfishness and greed in their districts. While we must lament this, we cannot deny that it is wholly intelligible.

What we cannot easily understand, however, is the jubilation of high-tariff Republicans over Democratic accessions to their band. It is much like the ill-timed rejoicing at England's lurch away from free trade, or the raising of protective barriers in France and Germany. Considered from the narrowest self-interest of protection, this is a mistake. Success in that game can be won only when large numbers are "frozen out." Protection made universal, ceases to protect. There must always be some nation, or some class in a nation, unprotected, and hence open to exploitation, otherwise protection, on its own theory, is a dead failure. Therefore, to have Democrats insisting upon breaking into the grand system of log-rolling and corrupt bargaining which goes to the making of a protective tariff, is really an embarrassment to the high-tariff experts and beneficiaries. It makes their task both more difficult in execution and more dubious in effect. If tariff favors are too widely distributed, with too even a hand, they cease by so much

to be favors. And if we pass from protectionist tactics to public morals, what does all this mirth of the high-tariff Republicans over Democratic betrayals amount to? Why, merely to saying: "Others have become as bad as we are. They do not believe any longer in a fair field and no favor. To our doctrine of grab and push and squeeze and flch, they have come over. They will strengthen the forces of selfishness and of Socialism. They will fasten so many more blood-suckers upon the Treasury. They will sow envy and hate. They will be recruits to the army of political corruption. Therefore, let us thank God and take courage!"

#### ANGLO-GERMAN DIPLOMACY.

If statesmanship in Germany and England has not gone sterile, and diplomacy become imbecile, some way of making and keeping the peace between those two countries will speedily be found. The present situation of either, as pictured by its own public men, is growing rapidly to be intolerable; while their relations, as expressed in the alarms and jealousies and recriminations over the desperate competition in naval armaments, are daily becoming more bitter and tense. If ever there was a chance for large statesmanship, it is offered to-day on both sides of the North Sea.

Consider the plight of both nations, as they themselves confess it. It is, primarily, a contest between them of exhaustion. Each is studying the other to see which will first bleed to death. By heightened and oppressive taxation, each is opening its veins; and the financial doctors are standing by to determine which one will first fall fainting to the ground. Mr. Chiozza Money, the English statistical expert, has been taking stock of British wealth that can be flung into the ship-building game, and gravely assures his countrymen that, if they stand ready to surrender their last penny, they can hold out in the wasteful competition a year or two longer than Germany. Misery confronts the people of both countries, if the path they are now treading is followed to the end, but both are seemingly prepared so to pursue it. If Bishop Butler were alive, he would find in this Anglo-German madness fresh prompting and point to his speculation whether it were possible for a whole nation to go crazy.