

Marine and Fisheries proposes amendments that will allow vessels navigating the northern and northwestern lakes within three miles of shore, between May 15 and September 15, to run with only 50 per cent accommodation for passengers and crew. And of that 50 per cent two-fifths is to consist of boats, and three-fifths of collapsible boats and rafts. The press dispatches do not say just how the half of the passengers that is to be saved is to be distinguished from the half that is to be lost. Possibly this mere matter of detail will be left to the discretion of the ship owners. It might be disposed of on the "first come, first served" principle, at the time of the accident. Or, consecutively numbered tickets might be sold, the odd numbers to have life-boat privileges, and the even numbers to take their chances of swimming ashore. Such a trifling matter undoubtedly will be settled to the satisfaction of the shipowners and the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and so long as they are satisfied, the rest need not count. The interesting feature about it all is that it will offer a practical test of seamanship. The ship that brings into port more than it drowns may be considered a successful ship. Neither the "Titanic" nor the "Empress of Ireland" met this test.

S. C.



The Graft That Has Gone

Protectionists who still insist that the tariff has nothing to do with the cost of living will do well to study a recent circular sent out by the Federal Sugar Refining Company of Philadelphia. According to this circular the 25 per cent reduction in tariff already in effect has saved consumers \$48,700,000, and this saving, when sugar becomes absolutely free of duty will be increased to \$100,000,000. And yet Louisiana sugar interests are insisting that a great wrong was done when this graft was abolished!

S. D.



Reactionary "Progressives."

Reactionary in its tariff attitude, as is the Democratic party organization of Louisiana, an attempt to outdo it seems to be made by the Progressive party organization of that State. Judging by the platform adopted at a conference in New Orleans on June 18 the party is basing its hope for success on a plan to rob the sugar consumers of the United States for the benefit of Louisiana planters. Condemnation of the repeal of the sugar tariff is its loudest note. It declares in substance, but not in words, that Louisiana's sugar industry is a parasite which can only live by drawing trib-

ute from other industries, and considers the withholding of such tribute to be a great wrong. That is a fine position indeed for a party to take that claims to stand for social justice. Real progressives of Louisiana as well as of other States can not afford to recognize as co-workers, members of an organization which shamelessly insists on robbery for the benefit of a special interest of its own State. The tariff attitude of the National Progressive party is weak and indefensible enough. It can not well afford to let itself be further led into defense of a predatory privilege by giving the slightest encouragement to these Louisiana reactionaries. Louisiana needs a real progressive party badly—one that will offer some hope of relief from the reactionary, sugar-ring-dominated Democratic organization. But the offer of the fire as a refuge is exceedingly unsatisfactory to those who wish to escape the discomforts of the frying pan. This seems to be all that Louisiana's alleged "Progressive" organization has to offer.

S. D.



The Income Tax Disappointment.

The income tax seems to have been dodged to such an extent as to reduce its yield far below expectations. It will require more inquisitorial methods to uncover this dodging. This in itself shows that, while better than a tariff tax, the income tax is neither desirable nor just. Those who have honestly earned their incomes, who have given equivalents in useful service, cannot be blamed for dodging the tax. If they have reasonable consciences they need suffer no greater mental distress from successfully evading an attempted robbery by the government than from evading a similar attempt by an individual. Those whose incomes are unearned are mainly unaware of that fact. The government sanctions the means whereby their incomes are secured, while the system by which they profit is endorsed by influential publications, politicians and professors of political economy. It is easy to understand why they do not realize their obligation to help the government in collecting from them. To denounce these tax dodgers as dishonest is unjust. This trouble would not have occurred had Congress levied a land value tax instead of the income tax. That could not have been evaded, would have taken nothing from any individual that he has honestly earned, and would easily have yielded ample revenue. Congress is not to blame for failure to adopt this method since public opinion was not ready to endorse it. The income tax experience will help to educate.

S. D.