

GREAT FALLS DAILY TRIBUNE

W. M. SOLE, Editor
O. H. WARDEN, Manager

LEONARD G. DIEHL
Business Manager

EDITORIAL PAGE

THE ANTI-REFERENDUM CONVENTION.

According to the Helena Independent there were only 38 persons present at the meeting in Helena assembled in response to a state wide call published in all the newspapers in the state asking citizens of every party opposed to the amendment of the state primary law to gather at the state capital and organize for the opposition. Of these 21 either reside in Helena or mostly live there. Six were from the office of Attorney General Ford. Five whose names were signed were not present in person. It is a noteworthy fact that the name of Senator T. J. Walsh whose name was used by those issuing the call does not appear in the list of signers. Perhaps it was used without due authority in the first place. The list of those signing the roll call is given as follows:

Dr. O. M. Lanstrum, Helena; B. K. Wheeler, former U. S. district attorney; Miles Romney, Hamilton; S. C. Ford, attorney general; Sam Goodman, Helena; J. T. Carroll, clerk of the supreme court; Mary O'Neill, Butte; H. L. Hart, state treasurer; Dr. W. H. Hopkins, Helena; C. T. Stewart, secretary of state; "Liney" Linebarger, Billings; George Porter, state auditor; Mrs. Dolly Dean Burgess, Helena; Frank Woody, assistant attorney general; Otto Gerth, assistant attorney general; Carl Cameron, assistant attorney general; A. A. Grorud, assistant attorney general; C. N. Davidson, assistant attorney general; Rev. Joseph Pope, Billings, anti-saloon league superintendent; Thomas McCusker, Livingston; J. B. Knight, Butte; Wellington D. Rankin, Helena; Tim Nolan, Butte; W. B. George, Billings; J. M. Lewis, Helena; O. H. P. Shelley, Helena; E. D. Phelan, Helena; Associate Justice Cooper, supreme court; Tom Stout, Lewistown (not present but signed); J. M. Evans, congressman (not present but signed); Joe Dixon, Missoula (not present but signed); Tom Arthur, Billings (not present but signed); E. K. Bowman, state hall commissioner; A. W. Wieber; Gertrude A. Lutey, Butte; George A. Roberts, Helena Record-Herald; Steve Ely, Klein; John B. Tansil, Billings; R. U. Jennings, Helena; Mrs. Maggie Hathaway, Hamilton; R. C. White (not present but signed); I. R. Eidell, Helena; G. A. Willett, dentist, Helena; R. C. W. Friday, address unknown.

The news account goes on to say: "In secret session these were elected permanent officers of the organization, on recommendation of a committee headed by W. B. George; Miles Romney of Hamilton, president; O. M. Lanstrum, first vice president; Tom Stout of Lewistown, second vice president; J. M. Dixon of Missoula, third vice-president. The secretary-treasurer is to be named later by the executive committee which was elected as follows: W. B. George of Billings, Tom Everett of Blaine county, Mrs. Stranahan of Havre, Steve Ely of Klein, B. K. Wheeler of Butte, Mrs. Dolly Dean Burgess of Helena, Mrs. Maggie Hathaway of Hamilton, Dixon, Stout and Everett, who were chosen as officers, were not present."

We might be surprised that those gathered to defend the right of the people to nominate their own officers directly would not let the 38 assembled do their own nominating, but delegated this duty to a very few hand-picked bosses of the meeting. But it appears that they adopted the committee plan of making nominations, one of the worst practices of the old convention system in the days when bosses dominated the conventions, but out of date and very unpopular in party conventions in recent years where all delegates present insisted on their right to a voice in selecting nominees and officers of the convention. But that is what we expected from the crowd present.

THE NEW ARMY BILL

Secretary of War Baker who was roundly denounced as a pacifist and neglectful of his duty because he kept the army too small a few years ago by the republicans tells congress that the regular army should be maintained for the present at a strength of not less than 509,000 men. The republican house committee refuses to give him authority to recruit the army beyond 300,000 men. The republican senate thinking this too small raises the limit by amendment to 400,000 men. The house refuses to concur in this amendment, and the conference committee fixes it at 325,000 men, in which shape it passes congress and goes to the president.

This is rather an astonishing reversal of sentiment on the part of the advocates of military preparedness. Next we expect to hear that Henry Ford is in favor of carrying a big stick and the Roosevelt followers are in favor of complete disarmament and moral suasion instead of force.

The key to the puzzle is not hard to find however. The republicans wish to abolish the tax on luxuries and cut down the income tax and excess profits tax. That is a laudable ambition no doubt. Federal taxes are a heavy burden these days. And in order to make a good showing to point to with pride at the next election probably the large army and navy bills offer a good place to operate, if you take a chance and disregard the needs of the country. If we should happen to get into any serious trouble with Mexico in the next few months this policy would prove a boomerang to the republican economists it is true, and doubtless lose them more votes than they could possibly gain by it, but nothing risked nothing won in the political game, and the republican politicians are willing to take a

chance of finding the army short-handed in case of need. The chances are that the republicans are relying on the League of Nations to prevent any war in the future while denouncing it one day and refusing to prepare for war the next. We trust that they will carry this economy out all along the line, now that they have started out with the army and navy appropriation bills, but we are not optimistic on that score. They will treat each appropriation bill strictly on its merits—as a vote getter—we are sure, and there are some big appropriations desired that will disappoint many voters if they do not pass. These we expect to receive most generous and liberal support at the hands of the politicians. The army and navy bills can be cut with less resentment than most of the appropriation bills, always provided that we have the good luck not to need their services. In that event the stump orators will be able to say, see what we saved the taxpayers by refusing to listen to requests of a democratic administration or to believe in their story of the needs of the army and navy.

AN ARID COUNTRY

Beginning on July 1 the whole United States is dry, not bone dry as in Montana, but very dry from the standpoint of the man who wants an alcoholic drink. The stimulating cocktail will no longer cock its tail at the festive board, and champagne corks will not pop. In states where there is no prohibition law the thirsty soul may still quaff light beers and wines, provided their alcoholic content does not exceed two and three-quarters per cent, but that is weak comfort to the man who wants to feel the kick of a stimulant. And even in this weak and watery solution the seller and buyer takes a chance of being found guilty of being caught in a crime. The attorney-general plainly notifies them that if the courts finally determine that this or any other per cent of alcoholic content constitutes "intoxicating liquors" they will not be saved from prosecution by the fact that they thought otherwise and believed that they were inside the law. So they can only get these light wines and beers by peril of their liberty and property, if the highest court decides against their interpretation of the law. Moreover while they drink their light beers and wines in fear and trembling they have notice served on them that even this liberty will be of short duration and end January 1 next, for congress is preparing a prohibition enforcement act that cuts down the alcoholic content of liquors deemed non-intoxicating to one-half of one per cent, mere hog wash from the viewpoint of the man who wants to feel the effect of alcoholic stimulant, and that is the best they can expect from congress, but not the worst. A strong effort is being made by the prohibitionists to make the law read that it is a crime to use alcoholic liquors or to have them in one's possession after January 1. Such amendments were offered in the house committee and voted down by a small majority, but the prohibitionists say they will be offered in the house and they believe that they will be supported by a majority. In this way they point out that the sacrifice of old habits will press with equal force on the rich and poor. In fact the rich man who has stocked his cellar against a long dry spell will suffer more than the poor, for he will lose his investment in booze as well as suffer with his poorer neighbor the pangs of unsatisfied thirst. It will also give employment to many poor drunkards who can be used as bloodhounds to sniff at cellar windows and locate the contraband by a well trained nose.

There are hard times apparently in front of the man who hopes to get his daily snort. He will feel like the mariner in the drifting boat in mid-ocean, and exclaim water, water everywhere, and not a drop to drink. However we have no doubt that the optimists among the drinkers will not give way to total despair. While there is life there is hope, and a widespread want acts like a suction pump and draws toward it means of satisfaction. We hear much of formulas for making home brewed beer, and dandelion wine with a kick like a mule, and even private stills. To pass a bone dry law is one thing, and to make a bone dry country is another thing.

THE FORD-CARROLL PARTY.

(Helena Independent.) News columns of Montana newspapers this morning carry a story of a meeting held in Helena last evening for the purpose of repudiating the convention pledges of the republican and democratic parties, which pledges were made with enthusiastic support of many of the men attending the meeting in Helena Saturday.

Both parties last September promised the people of Montana to amend the primary law that the majority electors of a political party might name the candidates of the party, and otherwise make the law more economical and efficient. The meeting called by Attorney General Ford and J. D. Carroll was for the exact purpose of defeating the amendment to the primary law.

How well the Ford-Carroll party will succeed in winning support for their program may be judged from the roll call of the meeting last evening. It will be remembered that this meeting was advertised by the sponsors and the Helena evening paper as a "gathering of the representatives of all parties."

This is almost true. There were socialists, chiropractors, former democrats, former republicans, progressives, just wobbles, nonpartisans, left and right wing free thinkers, together with S. C. Ford, Wellington Rankin, Dr. O. M. Lanstrum, Judge Charles Cooper, H. L. Hart and Charles T. Stewart. But while this rather Bohemian gathering was holding its session behind closed doors, the republican and democratic state central committees, with their national committees, issued a statement which appears in the morning papers of today, appealing to the voters to redeem their convention pledges and get squarely behind the amendment to the primary law, which they explain in detail in their original statement.

THE COVENANTER LETTERS

THE AUTHORS: William H. Taft, ex-President of the United States. George W. Wickersham, formerly U. S. Attorney General. A. Lawrence Lowell, President Harvard University. Henry W. Taft, of the New York Bar.

THE PURPOSE: To discuss and make clear the various articles of the Paris Covenant for a League of Nations, now awaiting ratification by the United States Senate.

Arbitration Senator Lodge objected to the original league covenant upon the ground that it bound to submit every possible international dispute or difference either to the league court or to the control of the executive council of the league. Senator Root, on the other hand, objected that it abandoned the principle of compulsory arbitration for which the American delegation contended in the Second Hague conference, and failed to establish a permanent court of arbitration. By the revised covenant members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the council.

This provision clearly adopts the principles contended for by the American delegates to The Hague. It is supplemented by Article XIII, whereby it is agreed that whenever any dispute shall arise between members of the league, which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to the council of the league, which requires the council to formulate and submit to the members of the league for adoption plans for the establishment of a permanent court of international arbitration, which shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties may submit to it, and which may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the council or by the assembly.

Root's Criticism. Senator Root urged an amendment by which the members of the league should agree to refer to arbitration all disputes of a justiciable character, which he defined to be "disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the nature and extent of the reparation to be made for any such breach." The revised covenant, without specifically adopting that definition, in Article XIII, declares that all disputes of the character mentioned by Senator Root to be "among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration," and further, that for the consideration of any such dispute the council of the league, to which the case is referred, shall be the court agreed on by the parties to the dispute, or stipulated in any convention existing between them. If, however, the parties to any such dispute should fail voluntarily to submit it to arbitration, they are bound, by Article XV, to submit it to the council. In that event, the council is to endeavor to effect a settlement of the dispute, and if it fails to do so either unanimously, or by majority vote, publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations deemed just and proper in regard thereto. The report is to be unanimously agreed to by all the members of the council, except those representing the disputants, the members agree not to go to war with any party to the dispute until the report has been published and the members of the council also refer

any such dispute to the assembly, and shall so refer it at the request of either the council or the assembly within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the council. Defects Not Irremediable. The defect in this plan is that it fails to lay down any rule binding upon the council or the assembly with respect to the determination of disputes of a justiciable nature. This omission is somewhat emphasized by the provision in Article XV, that if the dispute between the parties is of such a nature that it is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement. In this case, the Council must be governed in its decision by international law, whereas there is no such provision in express language made binding upon the council in its decision with respect to arriving at their recommendations or report concerning disputes, even of the nature described in Article XIII, and defined by Senator Root as justiciable. It is not, however, to be imagined that the council would decide, except upon well recognized principles of international law, any dispute which involves the interpretation of a treaty, a question of international law, breach of international obligation, or damages from such breach. It also may reasonably be assumed that there will grow up in the application of these provisions a body of precedents, which themselves constitute codifications of international law, and thus carry out one of the purposes expressed in the preamble, namely, the firm establishment of the understandings of conduct among governments.

A Long Step Forward. Article XVI provided that should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of the covenants above referred to, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all the other members of the league, involving as a consequence: (1) the severance of all trade and financial relations and the termination of all intercourse between the members of the league and the covenant-breaking state; (2) the expulsion from the league of the covenant-breaking state, and (3) such military and naval action as may be agreed upon by the league. The amended covenant certainly has not weakened the provisions of the original Articles XI, XII, XV and XVI, concerning which Senator Root wrote, "I think these provisions are well devised and should be regarded as free from any just objection so far as they relate to the settlement of the political questions at which they are really aimed. The opinion of mankind, when taken together, accomplish this result are of the highest value. They are developed naturally from the international practice of the past. They create and institution through the public opinion of mankind, condemning unjust aggression and unnecessary war, may receive effect and exert its power for the preservation of peace, instead of being dissipated in fruitless protest of lamentation." Indeed, the revised covenant obviously aims at a wider field, and embraces within its scope the settlement, not only of political, but of legal questions as well. It therefore, a further improvement upon the original scheme.

HASKIN LETTER

By FREDERIC J. HASKIN RETURN OF THE PAWNBROKER.

Washington, D. C., June 28.—The city of Washington has been trying the experiment of getting along without pawnshops. For a decade, there have been no pawnshops in the nation's capital. This has a city of 400,000 people, a city which in its local affairs is virtually unaffected by politics, been made the basis of an experiment to determine whether or not the pawnshop is a necessary adjunct to its life and well being.

The answer seems to be that it is, for Washington seems on the verge of abandoning that sign of the three spheres which beckons perennially to the financially unfortunate and to the improvident.

The last of the legitimate "hook" shops in the District of Columbia passed in 1914. At that time a loan shark law went into effect which cut down the interest rate that might be charged in the district from three per cent to one per cent a month. This law killed the pawn business in the capital. With the reduced rate of interest, the pawnbrokers could not make a profit. Most of them went out of business entirely, while a few located across the Potomac river in Virginia, within a ten-minute trolley ride of Washington. One of the pawnbrokers who moved across the river has since been doing the business of a pawnshop in Washington. When one has wanted to make a loan he has interviewed a representative of the Virginia pawnbroker in Washington, and, if conditions for completing the transaction seemed favorable, he has gone across the bridge.

Now the authorities of the district favor the return of the "hook" shops. Especially is this true in view of the fact that regulated pawnshops are helpful in detecting thefts. When pawnbrokers did business in Washington more than 25 per cent of stolen goods were recovered from the second-hand stores, pool-rooms, cheap jewelry stores and other kindred places, that have illegitimately come to serve as a means by which the thief can get quick cash for his loot.

Under the old regulations which were in effect before the pawnshops were forced out of business, each pawnbroker in the district had to file with the police to the police department, listing the goods pawned and also furnishing a description of the pawn. In this way, the police were often able to trace stolen goods. In case a pawnbroker made a loan on stolen goods which were later claimed he was bound to turn the goods back to the owner, losing the sum he had advanced. With the pawn shop gone the police had a slim chance of checking up stolen goods thru the medium of the second-hand stores and similar places which have been substituted for the pawnshops. The police know that many of the second-hand stores, particularly second-hand clothing stores, do business on the "hook"

STRENGTH AND SERVICE ESTABLISHED 1891 The Working Power of Dollars Dollars that remain idle can not grow, but when placed promptly at interest, they become a strong working power. Start an account with the Great Falls National Bank. 4 per cent Interest Paid on Savings Accounts. Great Falls National Bank

Questions and Answers Q. Should farmers shoot all hawks? W. E. R. A. The department of agriculture informs us that of the fifty principal varieties of hawks, forty-seven are of benefit to the farmer since they catch great numbers of rodents that injure crops. It is even said that a hawk on the farm is as valuable as a cow. There are three varieties of hawks that are deadly to chickens and should be shot on sight. Q. Can I secure a loan on my War Risk Insurance? C. C. C. A. The policies provide for loans at any time after the first year equal to 54 per cent of the cash surrender value. Q. Did discharged men get a bonus after the Spanish American War? R. T. Y. A. The war department informs us that veterans of the Spanish-American war and the Philippine insurrection received a bonus of two months' pay. Q. What are the principal planks in the platform of the Socialists? B. N. M. A. The principal planks are opposition to war, equal suffrage for men and women; initiative, referendum, recall and proportional representation; acquisition by municipalities, states and government of grain elevators, stockyards, warehouses, railroads, etc., collective ownership of land. Q. What are the Seven Wonders of the World? L. M. A. They are the pyramids of Egypt, the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, the Colossus at Rhodes, the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, the Statue of Zeus by Phidias at Olympia, the pharos of Alexandria in Egypt. Q. What is the difference in feet between a nautical mile and a statute mile? A. C. S. A. A nautical mile or knot is 6,075 feet approximately in length and a statute mile is 5,280 feet in length.

American Bank & Trust Co. of Great Falls DIRECTORS: R. P. Reckards, H. G. Lescher, W. K. Flowerree, William Griffin, Fred A. Woehner, Charles R. Taylor, Frank W. Mitchell, Albert J. Foussek, L. E. Foster, Alfred Malmberg, Robert Cameron, Charles Hornung, Charles E. Heisey, OFFICERS: R. P. Reckards, President, W. K. Flowerree, Vice-President, H. G. Lescher, Cashier, F. O. Nelson, Assistant Cashier. Interest Paid on Time Deposits.

Bathing Caps Lapeyre Bros. PRESCRIPTION DRUG STORE New Shipment Just Arrived

LOTS Industrial Sites, Business Lots Trackage Residence Lots in all parts of the city—With Water, Sewer, Cement Walks, Boulevards TERMS 1/3 Cash, 1/3 in 1 year, 1/3 in 2 years 7 Per Cent Interest on Deferred Payments THE GREAT FALLS TOWNSITE CO. 9 1/2 Third-Street South, First National Bank Building