

majority. The loss of Ohio would not be enough in itself. It would take almost a miracle, as matters now look, to deprive Wilson of the majority given him in the estimate; and the election of either Roosevelt or Taft by the Electoral College is well out of the jurisdiction even of miracles. The fight is not between Wilson and Roosevelt, as Roosevelt's speeches have it; nor between Wilson and Taft. It is between Wilson and the present Vice President, Mr. Sherman. How so? By no reasonable probability can either Taft or Roosevelt get a majority of the Electoral College, whatever happens to Wilson. This must be conceded by anyone who scans the foregoing estimate. But Wilson's loss in the Wilson list above, of New York, or of Indiana and New Jersey, or of Ohio and any other State, would relegate the selection of the next President to the present House, where the vote would be not by members but by State delegations. As the House is equally divided politically, the *North American Review* fairly concludes that the new Vice President would become President on the 4th of March; and that in all probability, under those circumstances, the new Vice President, and therefore the next President, would be James S. Sherman. Its reasons for the latter part of that conclusion are that under the Constitution the Senate would choose the Vice President if the Electoral College did not, that it would be restricted in its choice to Marshall and Sherman, and that the Republicans would probably be strong enough to choose Sherman.



Vermont and the Progressive Party.

Out of its baptism of ballots at the State election in Vermont last week, the Progressive Party came with fair assurance of reality as a party. To be sure, it was only third; it should have been second if it is to count for more than a Republican "bolt." But it was a big third. If it had come out of the Maine election this week with as good an account of itself, it would have won its spurs; but as it had no candidates in Maine, its vote merged with the Republican party. There is reason to believe that the Maine election is prophetic in that respect of the future of the Progressive Party.



THE DECADENCE OF AMERICAN SHIPPING.

Has any one marked, in these days of spread-eagling, the pathetic silence of the Protectionist regarding our shipping? The American ship bids fair to have a summing up as brief as that of the

famous chapter on the snakes of Ireland. It may be recalled that the chapter in question consisted of six words: "There are no snakes in Ireland."

What calamitous circumstance could have brought American shipping to this pass?



Time was, and that too within the memory of men now living, when our flag was to be seen upon every sea; and its presence proclaimed the largest, the fastest, and the best ships. As far back as 1800, when the nation was scarce out of its swaddling clothes, the flag covered a tonnage of 970,000 tons, while the British scarcely doubled it with 1,856,000. The Americans steadily gained on the mother country till, in 1860, our shipping amounted to 5,350,000 tons, while that of Great Britain, including her colonies, was barely 5,713,000.

With what pride does the American school boy scan the figures! And how eagerly does he turn to the next decade to see his country's flag the first in all the world!

Alas, for those who pin their faith to Protective tariffs! And woe unto them who would lift themselves over the fence by pulling on their boot-straps! American shipping had reached its zenith, and started on its decline.

In 1888 it had fallen to 4,310,000 tons—less, actually, than thirty years before—while the British tonnage had mounted to 9,050,000.

Even those figures do not convey the full truth. for part of the tonnage was steam, and as steamers can make quicker voyages they are reckoned at a higher carrying capacity. America in 1860 had steam tonnage to the amount of 870,000 tons, while England had only 502,000; which made the actual carrying power of the two countries in that year—America 7,960,000; Great Britain 7,219,000. The American flag really covered more commerce than did the English flag.

Since 1888 American tonnage has increased somewhat, owing to our coasting trade. The law forbids any foreign ship from carrying freight or passengers from one port in the United States to another port in the United States, so that there are more ships in that trade now than formerly. But in our overseas trade, or foreign commerce, our shipping has dwindled from 2,379,396 tons in 1860, to 863,495 in 1911, while our foreign commerce in the same period increased from \$689,192,176 to \$3,576,546,304. In other words, our shipping decreased to one-third while our trade increased five fold.



Let it be viewed from another point.

Of our total imports and exports in 1860, sixty-nine per cent were carried in American ships, and thirty-one per cent in foreign ships. In 1870 the proportions were reversed, thirty-five per cent of our foreign commerce being under the American flag, and sixty-five per cent under foreign flags.

The Civil War might be the cause of part of the loss. But in 1880 the percentage of our foreign commerce carried in American ships was only eighteen per cent. And it has continued to dwindle year after year, until in 1911 it had shrunk to [Put this, Mr. Printer, in your smallest type.] less than nine per cent.

That is to say, under a high protective tariff American shipping engaged in our foreign commerce has fallen off from eight-twelfths to one-twelfth.



Lest some deluded citizen should still doubt the efficacy of our tariff system, let one more fact be given.

During the fiscal year just closed our trade with the port of London amounted to nearly 212 million dollars. And during that year the American flag on a merchant vessel was seen in that port [There are no types small enough for this.] not once.

Think of it, O ye children of American sailors! Fifty years after the American flag had become the first on the seas, and while our commerce increased five-fold, not a single American merchant ship visited the largest port in the world in a whole year!



At the time when America was running bow and bow with Great Britain in the race for supremacy on the high seas; nay, when we had actually passed her in carrying power, our so-called free trade tariff was in force. Then came the Civil War—and a Protective tariff.

It was but natural that our shipping should fall off during hostilities. Ships of the South took out foreign registry to escape the Federal navy, while ships of the North went to foreign flags to escape Confederate privateers. All intended to return at the conclusion of peace. But they counted without their host. While the country was in the throes of civil strife, and men were laying down their lives for a principle, others of our citizens were seeking Congressional largesses. And not the least of these were the ship builders.

Not content with Protection that denied American registry to any foreign-built ship, and forbade any but American ships to engage in the

coasting trade, they nagged at Congress till they secured a law that withheld the American flag from any ship that ever had flown a foreign flag. This barred all the ships that had taken out foreign registry during the war. Hence, the drop during fifty years of high tariff from 69 per cent of our foreign commerce in American ships to 9 per cent.



And now men talk of reviving American shipping by means of subsidies! Having strangled it with Protection, they would revive it with a subsidy.

Can human fatuity go farther?

There were no subsidies when those white-winged messengers of peace dotted every sea, and the American flag was seen in every port of the world. To talk now of subsidies is enough to make the old sailors turn in their graves.

Ship subsidies, indeed! The disappearance of the American flag from the high seas does not mean that there is no American capital in the carrying business. Some of the largest companies are owned in this country. But our antiquated laws compel them to sail under a foreign flag. And in the event of war they would serve our enemies. Why, when our fleet of battle ships sailed around the world, they were coaled by foreign ships that would have deserted the fleet at the first shot!



Fifty years of high tariff, and American shipping in our foreign trade drops from eight-twelfths to one-twelfth. Great is protection! And great is the credulity of him who would enrich himself by taking money from one pocket and putting it into the other!

STOUGHTON COOLEY.

CONDENSED EDITORIALS

SIDE-TRACKING THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

Charles E. Merriam in the Chicago Daily Press of August 31.

The only open and active opposition to the Initiative and Referendum at the last session of the Illinois legislature came from the Chicago Civic Federation.

Now the Civic Federation is endeavoring to secure signatures for a petition to place upon the ballot three propositions which are designed to crowd out and prevent a vote upon the Initiative and Referendum. In the last session of the legislature they urged the necessity of amending a taxing clause of