

STATEHOOD After lying dormant for three or four months, the bill framed in the Senate for the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as States was suddenly taken up last week in the Senate and passed without a dissenting vote. The only disagreement in the Senate regarding this bill was over the question whether it should be adopted instead of the bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives. On that question the division was on purely party lines. The unthinking manner in which Congress has in the past admitted States to the indissoluble partnership of the Union is apparently about to be repeated in this case. That there is any real popular demand throughout the country for Arizona and New Mexico to come and help govern the Nation at large we do not for an instant believe. There are apparently three reasons offered by the advocates of the Statehood Bill: First, that both Territories have as large a population as many States had when they were admitted, and are, therefore, entitled to become States. To this we answer that no Territory is entitled to Statehood. Statehood is a privilege, not a right; and it belongs to the American people as a whole and not to the people of the Territory to decide whether the people of the Territory shall help to carry on the government of the American people as a whole. We have not yet seen any cogent argument to show that the people of New Mexico and Arizona will greatly benefit the Nation as a whole by helping to govern it. The second reason offered is a party reason. Many Democrats desire Statehood for these two Territories because they think that the result will be four more Democratic Senators. Moreover, both party platforms have advocated the admission of these two Territories. The fact that an early morning plank is found in a party platform ought not to weigh for an instant against serious doubts as to the capacity of either Territory to become a part of a self-governing Union. The third reason that is given is that it has been advocated by the President. Inasmuch, however, as the President bases his advocacy upon the party platform, we cannot regard this reason as distinctive, much less do we regard it as conclusive.

The effort of Oklahoma (to which we refer in another paragraph) to nullify one of the provisions of the Act which admitted it to Statehood is a warning that the Nation should consider with special care the fitness of any Territory for the duties and privileges of Statehood.



THE PASSING OF LOG-ROLLING

Last week the United States Senate, we are glad to say, followed the House of Representatives in authorizing in the Sundry Appropriations Bill an expenditure of \$250,000 by the President to meet the expenses of the Tariff Board. That Board was established in virtue of a provision of the Payne Act giving the President power to employ certain persons in determining the application of the maximum and minimum tariff. The President promptly appointed three persons who have constituted an effective and non-partisan Tariff Board. They are Dr. Henry C. Emery, Professor of Political Economy at Yale; Mr. James Burton Reynolds, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in special charge of the tariff questions; and Mr. Alvin H. Sanders. The work of these gentlemen has been wider than a mere inquiry into the application of the maximum and minimum tariff; it has, of necessity, been an investigation into the cost of the production of commodities both here and abroad, covering the cost of labor, material, manufacture, and other elements of production. The intention of Congress has been, if it must revise the tariff, to revise for the benefit of special interests, not for the benefit of the public welfare. On the other hand, the idea of those who have stood for the establishment of a non-partisan, permanent commission has been to provide the country with a really scientific tariff. The tariff is scientific only when framed for the benefit of all the people, and not for the benefit of a favored few. Even Congressmen are coming to realize the necessity of making some concession to popular sentiment. This is evident from their grudging deference to the President's wishes in the matter of the new appropriations. No provision of the Payne Act was more acceptable to Mr. Taft than that concerning the appointment of experts to

aid him in determining tariff matters; he saw that, from these experts, he could obtain a body of impartially collected evidence, ready at the proper time to be used in officially illuminating the country as to just where we stand with regard to the tariff. Take the wool schedule, for instance—does any one contend that, as it exists, it is other than an injustice? And yet, when the interests of the wool-growers of the West and the interests of the woolen manufacturers of the East join forces, the Government of the United States is held up! No matter how strong such forces may be in the future, they are now, by the action of Congress itself, somewhat shorn of their most formidable weapon, and that is the kind of partial, one-sided, unfair information doled out to a supposedly unsuspecting public. Much fair and impartial information is now ready from a not discredited source—the Tariff Board. Such information, available to the public, will, if anything can, bring to an end the system of “log-rolling” in tariff legislation.



MR. PINCHOT ON THE PRESENT ISSUE

In an address at St. Paul, Minnesota, on June 11, Mr. Gifford Pinchot, formerly Chief Forester, and recognized as leader of the Conservation movement in the United States, presented his views on the issue now confronting the American people. Briefly put, it is the issue between the public interest and special interests. Naturally, he took as his text Conservation. Coming back from a trip abroad, he finds that “Conservation has captured the Nation;” that “its progress during the last twelve months is amazing;” that “official opposition to the Conservation movement . . . has vastly strengthened the grasp of Conservation upon the minds and consciences of our people;” and that this movement “cannot be checked by the baseless charge that it will prevent development.” The great danger to the country that he discerned is the alliance between business and politics. It is because the people think that the Senate and the House represent special business interests rather than the people as a whole that, as he believes, they have lost confidence in Congress. He cited

the new tariff as an illustration of the effect of such an alliance. On the other hand, Mr. Pinchot saw reason for great hope in the fact that party regularity is no longer as binding as it once was. “The man in the street,” said Mr. Pinchot, “no longer asks about a measure or a policy merely whether it is good Republican or good Democratic doctrine. Now he asks whether it is honest and means what it says, whether it will promote the public interest, weaken special privilege, and help to give every man a fair chance. If it will, it is good, no matter who proposed it. If it will not, it is bad, no matter who defends it.” As a consequence of this growing public opinion, the former prevailing type of politician is coming to be seen for what it is. In the meantime the people of the United States, Mr. Pinchot declared, are insisting “that the special interests shall go out of politics or out of business—one or the other.” And in concluding he predicted that “the conservation of political liberty will take its proper place alongside the conservation of the means of living.” This speech by Mr. Pinchot indicates the source of his influence. He has not merely been an expert student of forestry and an earnest believer in his work, but he has also been a seer who was able to perceive the principles which connected his work with the public welfare and to make those principles plain to the people.



THE DECADE'S WORK IN SAVING WATERSHEDS

The Weeks Bill is shortly to come before the House of Representatives. No bill, we believe, exceeds it in importance. In 1900 it was first proposed that the Government should purchase land in the White Mountain and Appalachian watersheds. Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, recommended the purchase of lands, especially in the Appalachian Range. His recommendation was based upon investigations made at the suggestion of Mr. Gifford Pinchot, who had been the first champion of the Appalachian Forest Reserve. Mr. Pinchot knew the region well, having been chief forester on Mr. George W. Vanderbilt's estate, Biltmore, near Asheville, North Carolina. Later in the year President Roosevelt supported the recom-