

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

the Constitution as a means of defeating the Initiative and Referendum and now they are using the same method again. In the same way they are endeavoring to head off and defeat a vote on an amendment in favor of woman's suffrage. If they are successful in this move they will delay the vote upon the Initiative and Referendum until at least 1916 and possibly until much later.

These tricks and devices of cunning opponents of the Initiative and Referendum should deceive no one. The Civic Federation and its backers in this move are bitterly opposed to giving the people the power to veto laws or to pass laws which legislatures will not pass. They are not willing to submit the Initiative and Referendum to the people and make the campaign before them. They are seeking to postpone the vote by confusing the voter. The friends of the Initiative and Referendum should have nothing to do with this plausible plan and should refrain from signing any petition of this sort.

The Initiative and Referendum will not cure all the ills of this State, but they will help our situation. They will make representatives more mindful of the wishes of their constituents, and in that way make them more truly representative.



### WASHINGTON TAXBOLTERS.

Louis F. Post in the Chicago Daily Press of August 30.

Congress has made a pretty picture of Washington taxbolters. The camera was operated by Congressman Henry George, Jr. You can get a copy by writing your Congressman for "Report No. 1215 of the Sixty-second Congress, Second Session, House of Representatives." Ask him also for the testimony.

Like their class in every other growing community, Washington taxbolters fatten their private purses from public funds before the funds are in the public treasury. This pays better than "lifting" funds out of it. Also, it looks better. But in principle it is the same thing.

Half the expenses of Washington are paid by Congress.

As that money comes mostly from tariffs on imports, every man, woman and child in the United States who buys anything of foreign make, or anything of home-make containing foreign material, helps pay half of Washington's upkeep. They pay it in higher prices. This makes Washington a city of national pride for all of us. It likewise makes it a city of private profit for taxbolting owners of the site of it—of its building lots.

Washington building lots don't wear out as the houses do. Nor do they lose in value as houses do. While Congress pays half the city's expenses, the value of Washington building lots will increase. These values pay some taxes. But look at that Congressional report and marvel!

Owners of little homes pay on 60 per cent of value; owners of luxurious mansions with spacious grounds in choice places pay on only 30 per cent. And that isn't the worst. Monopolizers of vacant areas, who obstruct building operations with ex-

cessive prices for lots, pay on no more than 20 per cent.

If you are a tenant, you get no percentage favors at all. Your landlord includes in your house-rent enough more than the house is worth to cover what the lot is worth. Not at a 20 per cent rate, either. Nor 30 per cent. Nor even 60 per cent. But at 100 per cent.

There seems to be something wrong about all that.

Why should big owners of the site of Washington keep more out of the public treasury than small owners, in proportion to their respective values? Why, indeed, should anybody "annex" any part of the value of that site? Isn't all of it fairly a public fund?

Such privileges are the worst kind of taxbolting graft. If the law allows them, then this law, as old Bumble said of another law, must be "an ass." And there are places besides Washington where this kind of graft flourishes. If you doubt it, look at home—wherever your home may happen to be.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### THE FORTUNES OF RETIRED FARMERS.

New York.

Some years ago when I did much bicycle touring, I was often puzzled upon getting into a small town in a fairly rich farming district to learn of the number of retired farmers with comfortable little fortunes. I could not understand how they had acquired them out of such profits from farming as there had ever been in this country. Of course the conditions may have been different in the rich bottom lands of the Middle West, but east of the Alleghanies I doubt whether there has ever been a period when more than a modest competence could be amassed from farming. Yet the men I speak of had accumulated \$30,000 or so.

On one of these trips I turned up at Flemington, N. J., a typical town of the kind, lying as it does in the center of very good farming country. There would have been as much chance here as anywhere of accumulating money. It was populated to a considerable extent by retired farmers, the fiction as to whom was that they had got their money "on their broad acres." I happened to run across a business man who had lived in the town all his life and who was intelligent and well informed. Upon asking him about a number of these retired farmers, he seemed to be posted as to just what each of them was worth. He had the common idea that they had got their money off their farms, but when he came to tell their histories it turned out that in almost every case they had made their little fortunes in other parts of the country when they were young men, while their fathers were still running the farms.

This was just after the Civil War, when there was such a general developing of great natural resources not before utilized. One of the men, for instance, got hold of a coal mine in western Pennsylvania when great activity in coal mining was just beginning and the industry was still in the hands of small individual operators. Another