

Humorous Department.

The Professor's Mistake. When Mrs. Sillbery went out for the afternoon she told her husband that she hoped the children would not annoy him at his work—the husband being, of course, that famous Prof. Sillbery of whom so many stories are told.

"He was, as he well knows, one of the profoundest scholars that America has produced and little more than a baby in the affairs of everyday life. Mrs. Sillbery, then, expressed a hope that the children would not interrupt the professor's work; in saying which she showed herself a singularly sanguine woman. There were a lot of children, and they seemed to have no other mission in life that afternoon except to make work of any kind impossible.

They began with hide and seek on the floor of the room where the professor was working, till he stopped that; then they slid down the staircase in bathtubs and tea trays and things. That being prohibited, they played at three ring circus in the room over the professor's head, materially assisted therein by the possession of a big drum which some considerate friend had given one of them at Christmas.

The professor stood it with such patience as he could command till the afternoon began to draw in, and then, in his despair, an inspiration came to him. He would put them to bed. It was rather a complicated proceeding, but he managed it—not being at all certain which child belonged to which bed—and left them with a threat that if they stirred till their mother came home he would call a policeman.

The professor had hardly returned to his work when Mrs. Sillbery came in, and he told his story. "Gracious!" said Mrs. Sillbery. "How did you get them undressed and into bed? Didn't you have a lot of trouble?"

"Not much," said the professor. "Except with one boy who is in the cot by the door in the small nursery. 'I will go up and see,' said his wife. And up she went. 'I don't wonder you had some trouble with that boy,' she said quietly, when she came down again ten minutes later. 'Do you know which child that is?'"

"No," said the professor. "I don't think I noticed," said the professor. "I don't think you could have," said his wife. "That is Tommy Wilkins from across the street,"—Bellman.

Parrot, Not Dog. On her way to the country a young widow approached the desk of the hotel Manhattan and asked for two rooms. She was accompanied by a maid carrying a dog basket, says the New York Herald.

"I have closed my house and want to stay here a few days before going to the country," said the young woman. She pulled off her glove and took up the pen to register. Mr. Hill, the clerk, was somewhat embarrassed, for while he kept one eye on the dog basket, he could not refuse the rooms easily, as the applicant was a frequent visitor at the Manhattan.

"I am very sorry, madam,"—he hesitated. "Oh, I am not particular. Rooms with good air, with a view uptown, perhaps, even small rooms. Don't say you haven't any. I can manage."

"But, madam, your dog! We are not in the habit of taking dogs. In fact, it is against the rule." "Beat it!" came from the basket. Mr. Hill's face flushed. He was confused, as he had not properly located the voice. He thought the pretty widow was chiding him.

"We don't admit dogs, but in this case," "Good morning! Beat it!" came from the basket. There was a general titter in the lobby at Mr. Hill's expense.

"There is no rule against parrots—not yet," he explained as he selected a key for the young woman.

A Nickel Cigar.—A good "kid" story from the Hutchinson Gazette: It was the boss's birthday. The office boy knew it, because he had heard the boss's wife say so. The office boy worshipped the boss and had bought him a birthday present. Often he had heard the boss say that the only presents they were 10-cent cigars, and he was worried for fear the boss might not like his present.

"The boss came in and threw open his desk. Lying there he saw a small parcel. He opened it and found that it contained a cigar. He looked at it closely. It was a nickel cigar.

"Huh," said the boss, disgustedly. Then he noticed that there was a writing on the paper. He read: "Happy birthday, I didn't buy a ten cent cigar I only had a nickel."

"The boss bit the end off the cigar, reached in his pocket and drew out a match and lighted the weed. He puffed critically a minute. "I didn't know they made such good cigars for a nickel," he said.—Kansas City Journal.

Tourist Bromidioms.—A statistician who recently returned from a trip to British Columbia is willing to affirm that he heard people ask: "How cold does it get here in the winter?" 2,133 times.

"What is the height of that mountain?" 795 times. "How far away do you suppose that glacier is?" 821 times.

"Is this the Medicine Hat where the weather comes from?" 1,142 times. "How far do you suppose it is over to where that man is ploughing?" 1,231 times.

"Are there any trout in that stream?" 4,621 times. "Do the bears ever come down to the railroad?" 944 times.

"Where do we change time again?" 6,889 times. "Why is it that it doesn't get dark here until nearly 10 o'clock?" 3,108 times.

"Has anybody ever climbed to the top of that mountain?" 2,246 times. "Are these the Rockies or the Selkirk?" 9,712 times.

"Wouldn't it be great if we could have one of these mountains set down on the prairie back of Chicago?" 562 times.—Chicago Record-Herald.

The Story Teller.

JOHN CUTTS SECRET.

How a Farmer's Shrew Wife Got Left.

"Is Mr. Cutts in?" asked a gentleman who, having knocked at a door, was saluted by a woman from an upper window with, "Well, what's your name?"

"Is Mr. Cutts in?" "Yes, he's in or about somewhere, I suppose," she replied; "but Mr. Cutts where any business is to be done. He's Mr. Cutts eatin' and drinkin' and sleepin' sometimes."

"Well, my good woman," said the gentleman, "I think he will be Mr. Cutts for my business, too. I wish to see him."

"What do you want of him," asked the shrew, thrusting her head still further out of the window. "To do something for me. But I must see him," was the reply.

"Is it real business, or pay, or only a favor you want? I can let your horse have a peck of oats, or I can direct you to the shortest road to the Four Corners, or I can—I can—why—I can do anything for you that he could, and a good deal more! I can take the money and write the receipts and pay the men, and I take care of the produce. I'm as good a judge of stock as he is, and I can't be beat on horse-flesh."

"But," said the gentleman, drawing down his face solemnly, "you can't take his place now. Find him for me at once."

The shrew was baffled. "Look-a-here, mister, maybe you do not know the circumstances of this case. This here farm is mine, and it was my father's afore me; and Cutts, he ain't no more claim to it than that I'm down there has. And, besides, I'm seven years older than he is, a foot higher, and weigh twenty pounds more! What's your business on my place, if I may make so bold?"

"To see you talk with your husband," replied the gentleman, getting out of his buggy and hitching his horse to a post as if he meant to stay until he did see him.

"Be you a doctor? 'Cause there ain't a living thing the matter with Cutts. He's the wellesst man in town, and so be I," said this woman for the times.

"No, my good woman, I'm not a doctor. Do you think your husband will be in soon? Send that boy to find him," said the stranger.

"The boy ain't in his mother's face—but he knew his own interests too well to start without orders. 'Then you're a minister, I suppose, by your black coat. I may as well tell you and save your time, that we don't go to meeting and don't want to. It ain't no use for you to leave no tractor for nothing—I've got a big dairy, and ain't no time to idle away readin', and I keep him about early and late, that when he's done work he's glad to go to bed and rest."

"I'm no minister, madam; I wish I was though, for your sake," said the gentleman.

"Look here, mister," now appearing at the door, and looking defiantly at him, "you're a schoolmaster huntin' up a district school, and you think he's a committee-man; but he ain't this year."

"Send for your husband; I cannot wait much longer. I must see him at once."

The boy started to his feet again, and looked into his mother's eye; but she gave no marching orders.

"Ma'am Cutts," as the neighbors called her, dropped her hands at her side and heaved a groan. She had found a man she couldn't manage.

"See here, now, mister," she said, "I can read a man right through, and I know what you was the blessed minute I clapped my eyes on you. I can tell by your everlastin' arguin' that you are a lawyer. We hadn't got no quarrels; don't want no deeds drawn or wills made, so if you're hunting a job of my husband, you may as well onchit your horse and drive on. We know enough to make a little money and I know enough to hold on to it."

"My good woman, you entirely misunderstand my errand. I can tell no person but himself what he is, and must tell him in confidence. If he chooses, he can break it to you the best way he can."

"Oh, my goodness sake alive! Brother Life's blowed up in the Mississippi boat, I bet! Oh, la me, the poor fellow. He left a little something, didn't he?"

"I never heard of him, and nobody's blowed up; that I know of," replied the gentleman.

"Oh—now I know! You're the man what wants to go to congress, and have come here huntin' after votes. He shall not vote for you! I hate politicians, especially them that goes agin women, and thinks they were made to drudge and nothin' else! I go in for free and equal rights for white folks—men and women—for Scripture says, 'there isn't neither man or woman, but all's one in politics.' I believe the day is comin' when such as you and me will have to bow the knee to woman, afore you can get the big place and high pay that's eatin' us up with taxes! You can't see my husband! We are goin' to the polls on the way to the mill, and I'll promise you that he votes right."

"I'm no candidate, and I don't know what you are talking about. Ah! there comes the man I want." And the stranger went toward Mr. Cutts, who had just leaped a pair of bars which led from the potato patch into the lane.

Mrs. Cutts flew into the house for her sunbonnet to follow them; but by the time she got to the bars her mysterious visitor and Cutts were driving down the road.

The strong minded woman shouted after her husband, "You'd better come back, I tell you!" but the wind was blowing the wrong way, and carried the words into the potato patch.

"But, sir, you needn't reply to my questions unless you are perfectly willing," said the stranger.

"Ask your question," said Cutts, "and I will not repeat it." "Well, Mr. Cutts, I am laying fence

Miscellaneous Reading.

THE NEW TARIFF BILL.

Outlook Gives Interesting Summary of Its Purport.

The tariff bill passed the senate on July 8, by a vote of 45 to 34. It contains about 400 paragraphs. The senate made 840 amendments to the house provisions. As the bill now stands instead of being a revision downward as promised by the Republican party, it is wholly to the advantage of all manufacturers and the trusts, and an increased expense is thrown upon the consumer. The daily press of the country is seldom so solidly arrayed against anything as it now is against this tariff bill of Mr. Aldrich's. The president has intimated that the bill will have to fulfill the promises of his party, when it is ready for final adoption.

The tariff law will be made in the conference between the two houses of congress. Until this measure is passed, it will be impossible to arrive at a final estimate of the revision accomplished. Meanwhile the "Outlook" has summed up what has been done by congress during the last four months recognizing the enormous complexities of a general tariff measure and the lack of adequate information available. We quote the following abstracts:

"In the latter part of May a table was given out by the treasury department to show the amount of duty that would be paid on certain necessities of life under the Dingley law, the Payne bill, and the Aldrich bill. On clothing valued at retail at \$97, the Dingley act imposes duties to the amount of \$32.12. On the same clothing, according to the table, the duties under the Payne bill would be \$32.26, and under the Aldrich bill \$32.95. In other words, the net result of the revision on nearly \$100 worth of medium quality clothing would be to increase the tax 14 cents under the Payne bill, and to decrease it 7 cents under the Aldrich measure. Practically the same results are disclosed on household furnishings valued at \$85 included in the same table. The amount of duties under either the Payne or the Aldrich bill differs by only a few cents from that under the Dingley law.

"Obviously, these figures cover only a fraction of the items of a tariff measure, so that it would be unjust to generalize from the above. But the careful student of the proposed revision does not materially alter the impression which these figures create. At the request of Senator La Follette, the bureau of statistics has published a valuable book comparing the senate bill, as originally reported from the committee on finance, with the Dingley law. This volume is based on the figures furnished by the finance committee, and makes a showing much more favorable to the principle of downward revision than the facts now before the public. For many years a revision in duty has been skillfully concealed in changes in classification. Waving these increases, however, the summary shows how insincere has been the senate's attempt to keep the campaign pledges. The imports of 1907, exclusive of those from Cuba and the Philippines, have been taken as a basis. On 75 per cent of the valuation of imports for that year the duties have been left undisturbed, on 15 per cent they have been increased, on 9 per cent they have been decreased. That is, on more than 90 per cent of the duties have been left unchanged or raised. On less than 10 per cent they have been reduced. In actual operation the showing would be even worse. For instance, the book of comparisons takes no account of the additional duty of one cent a square yard on mercerized fabrics, which constitute a large proportion of the cotton importations. It makes no allowance for the heavy increases concealed in the cotton schedules which were exposed by Senator La Follette and Senator Doolittle. Further, it ignores the proposed new basis of valuation which Senator Aldrich estimates will add \$5,000,000 a year to the customs receipts, and so will be equivalent to a horizontal increase of nearly 14 per cent on all schedules. Against this showing the statement of the finance committee that it has made 400 decreases in schedules to only 40 increases is of small value. The decreases generally affect unimportant items. Thus, in the linen schedule there are 172 reductions and only one increase. But the reductions are chiefly on numerous varieties of threads and twines, on which the imports range from \$2 to \$500 a year. Altogether they affect imports valued slightly in excess of \$600,000. The single increase is on woven fabrics, of which \$5,000,000 worth were imported in 1907. The average decrease was 18 per cent. The single increase was 27 per cent. Here is real revision upward, where a mere glancing at the figures would naturally infer that there had been revision downward.

"Unfortunately, no similar compilation has been made for the duties in the house bill. It contains a few spectacular reductions. Iron ore, hides, and bituminous coal are on the free list in the house bill, while in the senate bill there is a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore, 15 per cent on hides, and 50 cents a ton on coal. The house duties on leather goods, lumber and lead products are materially lower than those of the senate. On cotton goods the house retains the Dingley rates as applied by the courts. The senate, under the pretext of restoring the original Dingley rates, has materially increased them above the rates now collected. On certain articles in the glass and steel schedules, and on gloves and hosiery, the senate rates are lower than those imposed by the house, and the senate has amplified the house provision for free works of art.

"While no accurate compilation is available, an expert's opinion is that with over ninety per cent of the imports the house bill either leaves the duties untouched or raises them. This review of the bills ignores the possibility of material increases should the maximum provisions go into effect against one or more of the larger nations of Europe. Should France or Germany be penalized, the result would be a material increase over the duties of the existing law.

"The president has steadily refused to interfere while congress was at work on the schedule. He has assumed that his views were known and that it was unnecessary to emphasize them. Now the president's influence is limited by the new tariff bill. It is possible that a better measure than either the Payne or the Aldrich bill may be agreed upon.

Rose That Changes Its Color.—White in the shade, red in the sun, such is the

Miscellaneous Reading.

THE NEW TARIFF BILL.

Outlook Gives Interesting Summary of Its Purport.

The tariff bill passed the senate on July 8, by a vote of 45 to 34. It contains about 400 paragraphs. The senate made 840 amendments to the house provisions. As the bill now stands instead of being a revision downward as promised by the Republican party, it is wholly to the advantage of all manufacturers and the trusts, and an increased expense is thrown upon the consumer. The daily press of the country is seldom so solidly arrayed against anything as it now is against this tariff bill of Mr. Aldrich's. The president has intimated that the bill will have to fulfill the promises of his party, when it is ready for final adoption.

The tariff law will be made in the conference between the two houses of congress. Until this measure is passed, it will be impossible to arrive at a final estimate of the revision accomplished. Meanwhile the "Outlook" has summed up what has been done by congress during the last four months recognizing the enormous complexities of a general tariff measure and the lack of adequate information available. We quote the following abstracts:

"In the latter part of May a table was given out by the treasury department to show the amount of duty that would be paid on certain necessities of life under the Dingley law, the Payne bill, and the Aldrich bill. On clothing valued at retail at \$97, the Dingley act imposes duties to the amount of \$32.12. On the same clothing, according to the table, the duties under the Payne bill would be \$32.26, and under the Aldrich bill \$32.95. In other words, the net result of the revision on nearly \$100 worth of medium quality clothing would be to increase the tax 14 cents under the Payne bill, and to decrease it 7 cents under the Aldrich measure. Practically the same results are disclosed on household furnishings valued at \$85 included in the same table. The amount of duties under either the Payne or the Aldrich bill differs by only a few cents from that under the Dingley law.

"Obviously, these figures cover only a fraction of the items of a tariff measure, so that it would be unjust to generalize from the above. But the careful student of the proposed revision does not materially alter the impression which these figures create. At the request of Senator La Follette, the bureau of statistics has published a valuable book comparing the senate bill, as originally reported from the committee on finance, with the Dingley law. This volume is based on the figures furnished by the finance committee, and makes a showing much more favorable to the principle of downward revision than the facts now before the public. For many years a revision in duty has been skillfully concealed in changes in classification. Waving these increases, however, the summary shows how insincere has been the senate's attempt to keep the campaign pledges. The imports of 1907, exclusive of those from Cuba and the Philippines, have been taken as a basis. On 75 per cent of the valuation of imports for that year the duties have been left undisturbed, on 15 per cent they have been increased, on 9 per cent they have been decreased. That is, on more than 90 per cent of the duties have been left unchanged or raised. On less than 10 per cent they have been reduced. In actual operation the showing would be even worse. For instance, the book of comparisons takes no account of the additional duty of one cent a square yard on mercerized fabrics, which constitute a large proportion of the cotton importations. It makes no allowance for the heavy increases concealed in the cotton schedules which were exposed by Senator La Follette and Senator Doolittle. Further, it ignores the proposed new basis of valuation which Senator Aldrich estimates will add \$5,000,000 a year to the customs receipts, and so will be equivalent to a horizontal increase of nearly 14 per cent on all schedules. Against this showing the statement of the finance committee that it has made 400 decreases in schedules to only 40 increases is of small value. The decreases generally affect unimportant items. Thus, in the linen schedule there are 172 reductions and only one increase. But the reductions are chiefly on numerous varieties of threads and twines, on which the imports range from \$2 to \$500 a year. Altogether they affect imports valued slightly in excess of \$600,000. The single increase is on woven fabrics, of which \$5,000,000 worth were imported in 1907. The average decrease was 18 per cent. The single increase was 27 per cent. Here is real revision upward, where a mere glancing at the figures would naturally infer that there had been revision downward.

"Unfortunately, no similar compilation has been made for the duties in the house bill. It contains a few spectacular reductions. Iron ore, hides, and bituminous coal are on the free list in the house bill, while in the senate bill there is a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore, 15 per cent on hides, and 50 cents a ton on coal. The house duties on leather goods, lumber and lead products are materially lower than those of the senate. On cotton goods the house retains the Dingley rates as applied by the courts. The senate, under the pretext of restoring the original Dingley rates, has materially increased them above the rates now collected. On certain articles in the glass and steel schedules, and on gloves and hosiery, the senate rates are lower than those imposed by the house, and the senate has amplified the house provision for free works of art.

"While no accurate compilation is available, an expert's opinion is that with over ninety per cent of the imports the house bill either leaves the duties untouched or raises them. This review of the bills ignores the possibility of material increases should the maximum provisions go into effect against one or more of the larger nations of Europe. Should France or Germany be penalized, the result would be a material increase over the duties of the existing law.

"The president has steadily refused to interfere while congress was at work on the schedule. He has assumed that his views were known and that it was unnecessary to emphasize them. Now the president's influence is limited by the new tariff bill. It is possible that a better measure than either the Payne or the Aldrich bill may be agreed upon.

Rose That Changes Its Color.—White in the shade, red in the sun, such is the

Miscellaneous Reading.

THE NEW TARIFF BILL.

Outlook Gives Interesting Summary of Its Purport.

The tariff bill passed the senate on July 8, by a vote of 45 to 34. It contains about 400 paragraphs. The senate made 840 amendments to the house provisions. As the bill now stands instead of being a revision downward as promised by the Republican party, it is wholly to the advantage of all manufacturers and the trusts, and an increased expense is thrown upon the consumer. The daily press of the country is seldom so solidly arrayed against anything as it now is against this tariff bill of Mr. Aldrich's. The president has intimated that the bill will have to fulfill the promises of his party, when it is ready for final adoption.

The tariff law will be made in the conference between the two houses of congress. Until this measure is passed, it will be impossible to arrive at a final estimate of the revision accomplished. Meanwhile the "Outlook" has summed up what has been done by congress during the last four months recognizing the enormous complexities of a general tariff measure and the lack of adequate information available. We quote the following abstracts:

"In the latter part of May a table was given out by the treasury department to show the amount of duty that would be paid on certain necessities of life under the Dingley law, the Payne bill, and the Aldrich bill. On clothing valued at retail at \$97, the Dingley act imposes duties to the amount of \$32.12. On the same clothing, according to the table, the duties under the Payne bill would be \$32.26, and under the Aldrich bill \$32.95. In other words, the net result of the revision on nearly \$100 worth of medium quality clothing would be to increase the tax 14 cents under the Payne bill, and to decrease it 7 cents under the Aldrich measure. Practically the same results are disclosed on household furnishings valued at \$85 included in the same table. The amount of duties under either the Payne or the Aldrich bill differs by only a few cents from that under the Dingley law.

"Obviously, these figures cover only a fraction of the items of a tariff measure, so that it would be unjust to generalize from the above. But the careful student of the proposed revision does not materially alter the impression which these figures create. At the request of Senator La Follette, the bureau of statistics has published a valuable book comparing the senate bill, as originally reported from the committee on finance, with the Dingley law. This volume is based on the figures furnished by the finance committee, and makes a showing much more favorable to the principle of downward revision than the facts now before the public. For many years a revision in duty has been skillfully concealed in changes in classification. Waving these increases, however, the summary shows how insincere has been the senate's attempt to keep the campaign pledges. The imports of 1907, exclusive of those from Cuba and the Philippines, have been taken as a basis. On 75 per cent of the valuation of imports for that year the duties have been left undisturbed, on 15 per cent they have been increased, on 9 per cent they have been decreased. That is, on more than 90 per cent of the duties have been left unchanged or raised. On less than 10 per cent they have been reduced. In actual operation the showing would be even worse. For instance, the book of comparisons takes no account of the additional duty of one cent a square yard on mercerized fabrics, which constitute a large proportion of the cotton importations. It makes no allowance for the heavy increases concealed in the cotton schedules which were exposed by Senator La Follette and Senator Doolittle. Further, it ignores the proposed new basis of valuation which Senator Aldrich estimates will add \$5,000,000 a year to the customs receipts, and so will be equivalent to a horizontal increase of nearly 14 per cent on all schedules. Against this showing the statement of the finance committee that it has made 400 decreases in schedules to only 40 increases is of small value. The decreases generally affect unimportant items. Thus, in the linen schedule there are 172 reductions and only one increase. But the reductions are chiefly on numerous varieties of threads and twines, on which the imports range from \$2 to \$500 a year. Altogether they affect imports valued slightly in excess of \$600,000. The single increase is on woven fabrics, of which \$5,000,000 worth were imported in 1907. The average decrease was 18 per cent. The single increase was 27 per cent. Here is real revision upward, where a mere glancing at the figures would naturally infer that there had been revision downward.

"Unfortunately, no similar compilation has been made for the duties in the house bill. It contains a few spectacular reductions. Iron ore, hides, and bituminous coal are on the free list in the house bill, while in the senate bill there is a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore, 15 per cent on hides, and 50 cents a ton on coal. The house duties on leather goods, lumber and lead products are materially lower than those of the senate. On cotton goods the house retains the Dingley rates as applied by the courts. The senate, under the pretext of restoring the original Dingley rates, has materially increased them above the rates now collected. On certain articles in the glass and steel schedules, and on gloves and hosiery, the senate rates are lower than those imposed by the house, and the senate has amplified the house provision for free works of art.

"While no accurate compilation is available, an expert's opinion is that with over ninety per cent of the imports the house bill either leaves the duties untouched or raises them. This review of the bills ignores the possibility of material increases should the maximum provisions go into effect against one or more of the larger nations of Europe. Should France or Germany be penalized, the result would be a material increase over the duties of the existing law.

"The president has steadily refused to interfere while congress was at work on the schedule. He has assumed that his views were known and that it was unnecessary to emphasize them. Now the president's influence is limited by the new tariff bill. It is possible that a better measure than either the Payne or the Aldrich bill may be agreed upon.

Rose That Changes Its Color.—White in the shade, red in the sun, such is the

Miscellaneous Reading.

THE NEW TARIFF BILL.

Outlook Gives Interesting Summary of Its Purport.

The tariff bill passed the senate on July 8, by a vote of 45 to 34. It contains about 400 paragraphs. The senate made 840 amendments to the house provisions. As the bill now stands instead of being a revision downward as promised by the Republican party, it is wholly to the advantage of all manufacturers and the trusts, and an increased expense is thrown upon the consumer. The daily press of the country is seldom so solidly arrayed against anything as it now is against this tariff bill of Mr. Aldrich's. The president has intimated that the bill will have to fulfill the promises of his party, when it is ready for final adoption.

The tariff law will be made in the conference between the two houses of congress. Until this measure is passed, it will be impossible to arrive at a final estimate of the revision accomplished. Meanwhile the "Outlook" has summed up what has been done by congress during the last four months recognizing the enormous complexities of a general tariff measure and the lack of adequate information available. We quote the following abstracts:

"In the latter part of May a table was given out by the treasury department to show the amount of duty that would be paid on certain necessities of life under the Dingley law, the Payne bill, and the Aldrich bill. On clothing valued at retail at \$97, the Dingley act imposes duties to the amount of \$32.12. On the same clothing, according to the table, the duties under the Payne bill would be \$32.26, and under the Aldrich bill \$32.95. In other words, the net result of the revision on nearly \$100 worth of medium quality clothing would be to increase the tax 14 cents under the Payne bill, and to decrease it 7 cents under the Aldrich measure. Practically the same results are disclosed on household furnishings valued at \$85 included in the same table. The amount of duties under either the Payne or the Aldrich bill differs by only a few cents from that under the Dingley law.

"Obviously, these figures cover only a fraction of the items of a tariff measure, so that it would be unjust to generalize from the above. But the careful student of the proposed revision does not materially alter the impression which these figures create. At the request of Senator La Follette, the bureau of statistics has published a valuable book comparing the senate bill, as originally reported from the committee on finance, with the Dingley law. This volume is based on the figures furnished by the finance committee, and makes a showing much more favorable to the principle of downward revision than the facts now before the public. For many years a revision in duty has been skillfully concealed in changes in classification. Waving these increases, however, the summary shows how insincere has been the senate's attempt to keep the campaign pledges. The imports of 1907, exclusive of those from Cuba and the Philippines, have been taken as a basis. On 75 per cent of the valuation of imports for that year the duties have been left undisturbed, on 15 per cent they have been increased, on 9 per cent they have been decreased. That is, on more than 90 per cent of the duties have been left unchanged or raised. On less than 10 per cent they have been reduced. In actual operation the showing would be even worse. For instance, the book of comparisons takes no account of the additional duty of one cent a square yard on mercerized fabrics, which constitute a large proportion of the cotton importations. It makes no allowance for the heavy increases concealed in the cotton schedules which were exposed by Senator La Follette and Senator Doolittle. Further, it ignores the proposed new basis of valuation which Senator Aldrich estimates will add \$5,000,000 a year to the customs receipts, and so will be equivalent to a horizontal increase of nearly 14 per cent on all schedules. Against this showing the statement of the finance committee that it has made 400 decreases in schedules to only 40 increases is of small value. The decreases generally affect unimportant items. Thus, in the linen schedule there are 172 reductions and only one increase. But the reductions are chiefly on numerous varieties of threads and twines, on which the imports range from \$2 to \$500 a year. Altogether they affect imports valued slightly in excess of \$600,000. The single increase is on woven fabrics, of which \$5,000,000 worth were imported in 1907. The average decrease was 18 per cent. The single increase was 27 per cent. Here is real revision upward, where a mere glancing at the figures would naturally infer that there had been revision downward.

"Unfortunately, no similar compilation has been made for the duties in the house bill. It contains a few spectacular reductions. Iron ore, hides, and bituminous coal are on the free list in the house bill, while in the senate bill there is a duty of 25 cents a ton on iron ore, 15 per cent on hides, and 50 cents a ton on coal. The house duties on leather goods, lumber and lead products are materially lower than those of the senate. On cotton goods the house retains the Dingley rates as applied by the courts. The senate, under the pretext of restoring the original Dingley rates, has materially increased them above the rates now collected. On certain articles in the glass and steel schedules, and on gloves and hosiery, the senate rates are lower than those imposed by the house, and the senate has amplified the house provision for free works of art.

"While no accurate compilation is available, an expert's opinion is that with over ninety per cent of the imports the house bill either leaves the duties untouched or raises them. This review of the bills ignores the possibility of material increases should the maximum provisions go into effect against one or more of the larger nations of Europe. Should France or Germany be penalized, the result would be a material increase over the duties of the existing law.

"The president has steadily refused to interfere while congress was at work on the schedule. He has assumed that his views were known and that it was unnecessary to emphasize them. Now the president's influence is limited by the new tariff bill. It is possible that a better measure than either the Payne or the Aldrich bill may be agreed upon.

Rose That Changes Its Color.—White in the shade, red in the sun, such is the

Miscellaneous Reading.

THE NEW TARIFF BILL.

Outlook Gives Interesting Summary of Its Purport.

The tariff bill passed the senate on July 8, by a vote of 45 to 34. It contains about 400 paragraphs. The senate made 840 amendments to the house provisions. As the bill now stands instead of being a revision downward as promised by the Republican party, it is wholly to the advantage of all manufacturers and the trusts, and an increased expense is thrown upon the consumer. The daily press of the country is seldom so solidly arrayed against anything as it now is against this tariff bill of Mr. Aldrich's. The president has intimated that the bill will have to fulfill the promises of his party, when it is ready for final adoption.

The tariff law will be made in the conference between the two houses of congress. Until this measure is passed, it will be impossible to arrive at a final estimate of the revision accomplished. Meanwhile the "Outlook" has summed up what has been done by congress during the last four months recognizing the enormous complexities of a general tariff measure and the lack of adequate information available. We quote the following abstracts:

"In the latter part of May a table was given out by the treasury department to show the amount of duty that would be paid on certain necessities of life under the Dingley law, the Payne bill, and the Aldrich bill. On clothing valued at retail at \$97, the Dingley act imposes duties to the amount of \$32.12. On the same clothing, according to the table, the duties under the Payne bill would be \$32.26, and under the Aldrich bill \$32.95. In other words, the net result of the revision on nearly \$100 worth of medium quality clothing would be to increase the tax 14 cents under the Payne bill, and to decrease it 7 cents under the Aldrich measure. Practically the same results are disclosed on household furnishings valued at \$85 included in the same table. The amount of duties under either the Payne or the Aldrich bill differs by only a few cents from that under the Dingley law.

"Obviously, these figures cover only a fraction of the items of a tariff measure, so that it would be unjust to generalize from the above. But the careful student of the proposed revision does not materially alter the impression which these figures create. At the request of Senator La Follette, the bureau of statistics has published a valuable book comparing the senate bill, as originally reported from the committee on finance, with the Dingley law. This volume is based on the figures furnished by the finance committee, and makes a showing much more favorable to the principle of downward revision than the facts now before the public. For many years a revision in duty has been skillfully concealed in changes in classification. Waving these increases, however, the summary shows how insincere has been the senate's attempt to keep the campaign pledges. The imports of 1907, exclusive of those from Cuba and the Philippines, have been taken as a basis. On 75 per cent of the valuation of imports for that year the duties have been left undist