tries are still favored, and just as hitherto they had been the leaders of protection, their own financial interest will now make them clamor for the repeal of all the multitudinous tariffs which help to raise the price of the raw material and machinery necessary to their own industries. Dye stuffs, stationary engines with their appurtenances, spinning machinery, etc., would be placed on the free list with practically no opposition. As the free list would thus be broadened the number of free traders would correspondingly be increased until at no distant date every vestige of protection would be wiped from the statute books.

❁

A new source of revenue having become available through the income tax, the excuse for a revenue tariff does not now appeal with anything like the force it did a year or two ago. Should this source of revenue be insufficient to meet the expanding free list it could well be supplemented by a heavy inheritance tax. Such a tax would not discourage energy or enterprise. Moreover, it is a generally recognized fact that an inheritance, exceeding a very moderate one, is more of a curse than a blessing to its recipient. Hence taxes on such inheritances would relieve a tariff burdened people without injuring anyone.

Another principle involved, is the introduction of the Referendum into national politics. This will render the Democratic party immensely popular with that class of progressives in all parties who favor the principle of the Initiative and Referendum. Many Republicans and all Progressive Congressmen will feel in duty bound to vote for such a tariff measure, because of its influence in furtherance of the Referendum. An impulse would surely be given to this cause that its sincere advocates cannot fail to grasp. No amount of theoretic literature and speeches could give it a boost comparable with this practical nation-wide application of the Referendum principle.

E. J. BATTEN.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CONGRESSMEN AT THEIR OLD TRICKS.

Washington, July 13.

Does this Congress intend to pass a publicity law* which will enable the voters to know who is putting up the money in the election this fall?

Or have the Standpatters who control both the old-line parties through the caucus system, arrived at a quiet bi-partisan agreement that there shall be no publicity for the November election at which every seat in the House is to be filled, and one-third of those in the Senate?

Narrowing down again, is the party in power going to sidestep legislation which will give the people any of that "pitiless publicity" we have been hearing about since 1908?

Congressman Rucker of Missouri says not. During the debate in the House last Wednesday upon the bill proposing publicity for campaign contributions, replying to a question by Congressman Bryan of Washington, he said: "There is no probability of this bill becoming a law before the next election this fall."

Mr. Rucker spoke with the positive assurance of a man who knew things from "way back." As chairman of the House Committee on Elections, which reported the bill, he is in a position to know. He further warned the House that anything broader or more effective than his bill would be rejected by the Senate, and if the Senate did strengthen it, the House would not concur.

This is not welcome news to the voters of this nation, who know that the corrupt use of enormous sums of money in influencing elections strikes at the heart of popular government, and is a danger to the republic, and who, on this account, have been demanding publicity for years.

The Democratic platform of 1908 contained a plank on "publicity of campaign contributions," starting thus: "We demand Federal legislation forever terminating the partnership which has existed between corporations of the country and the Republican party." The 1912 platform reaffirmed this plank. The Republican platform of 1912 contained a plank along the same lines, but what have they done?

In 1910 the Republican Congress, under the control of the Aldrich-Cannon machine, passed a bogus publicity law, the main joker of which lay in its aplication only to such campaign committees as operate "in two or more states." Hence, the predatory corporations could get in their work through State and local committees without publicity. It was denounced by insurgent Republicans and progressive Democrats, but it was "put over" and has accomplished its design—nothing.

And now, after all this agitation, comes the Democratic Committee on Elections in the House, solemnly proposing to re-enact the Republican fiasco of 1910.

Last Wednesday, the day on which the bill was scheduled to pass the House, the National Popular Government League, with headquarters in this city, sent a letter to every member of the House, protesting against its passage. Judson King, the Executive Secretary of the League, eschewing the polite and diplomatic language customary among Congressmen, and using the speech of the folks back home, told the members that the bill was a plain "fake." No less strenuous speech would have produced a dent in the smooth working of the machine at that late hour. Mr. King was specific in his charges. He pointed out the following "chief jokers": The bill retained the "two States" provision; it required no publicity from State, district or local committees in primary elections, nor from persons, firms or other organizations than political committees, in primary elections while compelling the candidate himself to give publicity—a joker clearly setting free the Big Interests to work for their men in secret; it limited

*See Public of April 21, 1911, at page 369.

the amount a candidate could spend, but not the amount which might be spent by others in his behalf; it provided punishment for "wilful" violation only—a thing which is next to impossible to prove in court.

When asked on the floor to explain these charges Mr. Rucker went into a rage and proceeded to prove himself a first-class understudy for the chief actor in that grand old play, "Caught With the Goods." He denounced the author of the letter, but he failed to explain the charges.

A non-partisan fight was precipitated which lasted all day. The progressives of all parties were aroused. They made several amendments of a minor nature over the protests of Mr. Rucker, but the parliamentary status of the bill was such as to inhibit them from doing much. Their attitude toward the whole bill, however, is reflected in the vote on the motion to recommit with instructions to strike out of the "two or more States" joker in one place. (Only one amendment was possible at this juncture under the rules.) This carried by a vote of 134 to 116.

But the bill is still of little account. The Interests are free to get in their work both at primary and general elections without publicity from State or local committees, while candidates must report. There is no limit to the amount any individual can spend to help elect any candidate. Reports of national or interstate campaign committees must still be filed only with the clerk of the House at Washington, D. C., not less than ten nor more than fifteen days before election. An attempt to have them also filed in the various States, where they would be promptly available was voted down. What chance is there to get the information to the voters before election? The amount that can be spent on postage and stationery is not limited. The "wilful" violation joker is retained.

To sum up—the bill is still bogus. The stand-patters, united under Mr. Rucker, Democrat, and Mr. Mann, Republican, were successful in preventing genuine publicity.

The bill is now before the Senate Committee on Elections. That committee has also before it a bill by Senator Owen, giving real publicity. The Owen bill eliminates all the jokers in the Rucker bill and other minor jokers which time and space will not permit including in this writing.

What will the Senate do? Will the reactionary members of this body in both parties repudiate the platform pledges of the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1912?

D. E. McCRAT.

SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Washington, D. C., July 6, 1914.

More fundamental than the movement for just taxation and public ownership in the District is the struggle now going on to secure suffrage and self-government. More fundamental because the people must own and control their government before they can make any safe and enduring progress on the road to economic justice.

If "an injury to one is the concern of all," it should be a matter of serious concern to every citizen of the United States that in sixty-nine square miles of territory, under the very shadow of the Capitol dome, a third of a million Americans are denied the right of self-government and are "taxed without representation." The present form of government by committees of Congress, by three appointed Commissioners and several independent and irresponsible boards and officials, was introduced in 1874 and made permanent by the act of June 11, 1878. In form, it is an absolute despotism. It would be impossible in this brief article to trace the historical causes which imposed this un-American form of government upon the people of the District; but the question will naturally arise, Why has the District remained disfranchised? It is inconceivable that any other American city could be disfranchised without violent protests, and perhaps armed resistance. Why has Washington been so patient during the past forty years? What influences have been at work here to maintain the status quo?

It is very largely a case of economic determinism and class rule. Under the so-called Organic Act of 1878, the Federal Government defrays one-half of the expenses of the District to the extent that Congress approves the estimates submitted. The actual proportion now paid by the Federal Government is about 40 per cent. To this Federal subsidy, taxes and land values have become adjusted. The land owners, real-estate operators and other special interests are agreed that the "half-and-half system" must not be disturbed. "It would hurt business," we are told, "and cause a slump in real estate." Now, to agitate for the right of suffrage is believed to imperil the Organic Act, which is the fountain-head of the sacred "half-and-half system." So it has long been understood that any Washington newspaper which demands the right of suffrage in the District will incur the wrath of the special interests, who are known to control much valuable advertising patronage. Some of the newspaper men are personally in favor of suffrage, but not one of the four daily newspapers of Washington is actively supporting the present campaign for popular government in the District, while they are all enlisted in support of the "half-and-half system." In point of fact, the average home owner and renter would be benefited financially if the present Federal subsidy were cut in half, provided that we could secure just assessments, a heavier tax on land values and the partial exemption of buildings from taxation, but it is difficult to obtain newspaper publicity for facts of this character.

Ever since 1878 there has been more or less local agitation for the rights of suffrage, self-government and representation in Congress. The spark of freedom has never been quite extinguished. Within the past few years there has been a well-organized movement in behalf of popular government. The Central Labor Union is on record in favor of popular government. In 1911, the first District platform of the Socialist party demanded popular government. But neither the trade-unions nor the Socialist organizations are especially active or aggressive in their work for the cause.

In 1912 the District of Columbia Suffrage League was organized. Its executive secretary and recog-