

speeches for and against woman suffrage in Great Britain there run chords of thought to which the American reader is no stranger.) Considered historically, Mrs. Mead, whose recent discussion of the subject in the Independent we reproduce this week in our department of Related Things, has left nothing of moment unsaid.



### Discriminatory Panama Canal Tolls.

Americans with a sense of national honor should blush at the efforts of some of their representatives to pettifog something into a treaty which isn't written there, wasn't intended to be there, and couldn't have been put there by agreement when the treaty was signed. We refer to the move to refund canal tolls paid by American vessels.



The argument that this would be a "subsidy" in the sense in which Great Britain subsidizes ships, is too gauzy for more than passing mention. If the United States were to reimburse out of its own governmental treasury the amounts paid for Panama Canal tolls by American vessels, *that* would be a subsidy, which, merely as an international question, the American government would have a clear right to grant. But in such case the money would go out of the general treasury, whereas the proposed remission of tolls would take the money out of the canal fund.



On questions of international law, the experts must of course decide; but it seems to be conceded all around that the final experts—the Peace tribunal at The Hague—would probably decide against the United States if tolls were refunded out of canal receipts to vessels of the United States. In common sense there would seem to be no escape from that conclusion under this clause of the treaty:

The Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

And did not Senator Bard of California, when the treaty was before the Senate—did he not offer an amendment reserving to the United States the right to discriminate in favor of American vessels, and was not that amendment defeated by 43 votes to 27? Inasmuch, then, as the treaty would probably stand in the way of the discriminatory

tolls Low proposed, were the question to go to The Hague, our government is urged to make the discrimination nevertheless and to defy The Hague tribunal. Right there is where the national blush should come in.



One of the reasons given for an act that would rival Roosevelt's Panama-republic performance, is the intimation that Great Britain, in protesting, has been influenced by American railroad interests. There is a worm at the core of that apple of argument. It is the theory that the American railway monopolists would be shielded from water competition if American vessels paid tolls, but would be disadvantaged by that competition if the tolls were remitted. This argument, which looks smooth on the surface, would offer no reason for the bad faith proposed in our international relations, even if it were sound to the core. But it is not a sound argument. Much more likely would railroad monopoly be to profit by the proposed discriminatory tolls, than if the tolls were the same on all vessels or there were no tolls at all. If there were no tolls, world-wide competition would tend to keep water freights close to the level of cost, leaving no margin for railway monopolies to prey upon. If tolls were equal, the same world-wide competition would tend to keep water freights close to the level of cost plus tolls, likewise leaving no margin for railway monopolies to prey upon. But if foreign shipping paid tolls while American shipping paid none, American shipping would have a margin of profit—limited on the one hand by cost of carriage and on the other by that cost plus tolls—upon which railway monopolists might prey.



### MAKING WORK.

The protective spirit, as Buckle well named it, finds many manifestations, graduated all the way from a protective tariff to a franchise monopoly, and from the closed shop to the licensed lawyer or doctor; but one of the strangest yet noted is that discovered by a writer in a recent number of *Lippincott's*. The claim is made that burglary in the United States furnishes employment for 75,000 honest people; which, allowing six hundred dollars a year to each, means a salary list of \$45,000,000. And after showing in detail how conservative this claim is, the writer asks: "What would become of these men and women and all the millions of invested capital should the burglar hearken to the teachings of morality and religion, cease stealing and turn to honest pursuits?"

Here is a clean-cut proposition.

There may be some excuse for the confusion of the average citizen when he attempts to unravel the protective tariff snarl—for there have been so many interested in “mussing it up”—but this is a simple, concrete statement that should come within the mental grasp of all. Behold! If there were no burglars there would be no need of the “25,000 good American citizens earning their livelihood as private watchmen.” Nor would there be any occasion for the manufacture and sale of the burglar alarms, burglar-proof safes, etc., etc. Hence, it is as plain as a pikestaff that since it is desirable that honest men should be employed, burglars are a benefit to society.

The converse also is true:

Whoever reforms a burglar, or in any way discourages burglary, strikes at the welfare of seventy-five thousand honest American citizens. And as it is a fact recognized by all Protectionists that the Freetrade advocates in this country are in the pay of the Cobden Club and other foreign organizations that are seeking to destroy our industrial system, so it is equally clear that the men and women who are engaged in the work of reforming burglars are in the pay of the enemies of this Republic.



An excerpt from the article in question is quoted in an editorial by the New Orleans Picayune, one of the papers that has made such an ado over the proposed free sugar bill in Congress.

To remove the duty on sugar, says the Picayune, means the throwing out of employment of many thousands of honest men and the annihilation of many millions of capital. And why should this be? Because God has been so partial in making sugar lands that whereas the cane has to be planted about every nineteen years in Cuba, it must be planted every two or three years in Louisiana. Therefore, every washerwoman and every day laborer throughout the country who would sweeten a cup of coffee must pay six cents for four cents' worth of sugar.

That is to say, should one boat persist in steaming up the middle of the river where the current was four miles an hour, while another hugged the shore in a current half as strong, it would be necessary to protect the former from the competition of the latter. To prevent shippers from giving all their patronage to the cheaper boat the state would have to add a special tax to its rates. It would require more boats and more men to carry the freight up the middle of the river; hence, it would be the part of wisdom for a paternalistic govern-

ment to see that the cheaper boats were properly handicapped.

It may be noted in passing that there is a peculiar fitness in the sugar duty. Being the largest single item of import revenue, it is fitting that it should be levied upon citizens not in proportion to their ability to pay, nor yet according to the benefits received from the government, but according to their necessities. Thus, the laboring man uses as much sugar as the millionaire, and hence, will contribute as much toward the maintenance of the government—and the support of the Louisiana cane- and Colorado beet-growers. Indeed, the poor man, or the washerwoman, with several children, will contribute a good deal more than the millionaire bachelor. This is according to the eternal fitness of things; for, as the peculiar development of flesh on the person of the child shows nature's intention that it should be spanked, so the broad back of labor proclaims that it was intended to be taxed.



It is inspiring to contemplate such profound thoughts as the sugar bounty, and the protection of burglary. Once before, the protective spirit stirred a man into the utterance of a similar great truth. It was when the head of the Knights of Labor advised the Knights to break the beer bottles after emptying them. This, he said, would make work for the bottle blowers. Here was another simple proposition that proclaimed a great underlying principle. When you have finished dinner, smash the plates; after a spin in your auto, dump it in the ditch; when you have used a horse, kill him. Thus you will make work for labor and so promote the prosperity of the country.

In trying to determine the nature of a distant object some are disposed to look into the small end of the spy-glass. But not so the Protectionist. He insists upon putting his eye to the large end of the glass. And then, because the object looks so far away, he insists that his brother man shall carry him to it.

STOUGHTON COOLEY.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### PROGRESSIVE POLITICS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Grasmere, England, July 6.

The nomination of Woodrow Wilson has caused great satisfaction in England, especially among those whose sympathies are with the great democratic upheaval which is in progress the world over. This happy development in America is paralleled on