

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THE INCOME TAX.

The people will watch with no little interest the debate on the Income Tax in the U. S. Senate. It is pretty safe to predict that it will not pass. Too many gold bugs in that aristocratic body. Of course they will be a unit against it.

But what valid objections have they to offer? Not one that Lafe Pence couldn't knock out in two minutes. It is true—too true perhaps—that it takes money to make money. A man with \$1000 can make ten dollars while a man with nothing can earn one; a millionaire can gain a thousand dollars as easily as the man with the thousand can add \$10 to his wealth. And so it goes in geometrical ratio. Then is there anything unjust or unfair about a graduated income tax?

No one can successfully contradict the fact that as it now is those with small means are taxed out of all proportion to the rich. A "turn about" for a few centuries would be no more than fair. In fact it would be justice. A tax on the large incomes of the rich will not be oppressive. It will place the burden upon those best able to bear it. A tax on the incomes of the poor will almost invariably result in a sacrifice of comforts and perhaps necessities. In our view Congress can pass no bill that would bring about greater and more permanent relief than a graduated income tax. As said before, the plutocrats will fight it but let the graduated income tax plank be kept in the People's platform. We will work for it and bide our time.

CARNEGIE'S BENEVOLENCE— TO HIMSELF.

Carnegie makes a cut in wages in all his great establishments, equal to \$9000 a day, then gives \$5000 per day to relieve the poor of Pittsburg. So his laborers (by virtue of the cut) give \$9000 a day to Carnegie; the latter donates \$5000 of this to the poor, retains the other 4000 to pay

the expenses of a pleasure trip to Jerusalem and gets lauded to the skies for his princely gift. Who wouldn't be a Millionaire?

Senator Peffer says:

"The Presidents of the United States and their secretaries of finance have been and are now fastened by golden chords to a combination of the worst men in the world. They have stood and now stand helpless in the power of this imperious plutocracy." Peffer has n't put it any too strong.

The most valuable word in Jackson county's legal vocabulary is "inclusive."

Indeed it plays in to the tune of about \$1000 a letter. A treasurer skips with \$6000 (in round numbers) of the county's money. His bondsman very naturally don't like to pony up. A suit is brought against them by the county. Able (!) lawyers are secured on both sides. The pleadings are so fixed that the day that the defaulting treasurer entered upon his second term of office, and upon which day about \$11,000 were turned over to him, is left entirely out of consideration by omitting the word "inclusive." As the case now stands Bloomer owes Jackson county \$6,000. The word "inclusive" being left out in the complaint, the Judge who was both court and jury, decided that the county owes Bloomer \$11,000.

Balance due Bloomer \$5,000.

The whole affair is a first-class joke on either Bloomer, the bondsmen, the judge, the lawyers or—or—it may be the taxpayers of the county. Anyway, for "ways that are dark" etc, somebody is entitled to a cake as big as the World's Fair cheese.

DR. A. C. CALDWELL,

DENTIST,

ASHLAND, OREGON.

Office over Bank.