

What about payment for the balance? "We must have got it in advance." Not at all. The "favorable" balance—excess of outgo over income, gold, silver and merchandise all considered,—since 1898, is \$6,783,851,192. Since 1834 it is \$9,406,470,509. We were evidently not paid in advance. "Going to get it in the future then." But where's the evidence? American bankers' rights to draw on London, foreign stocks and bonds on our exchanges, American investments in foreign land titles—where are they all? Don't point to future payments unless you show evidence of some legal or commercial right to them; and you can't show any such rights which are not in the aggregate exceeded by corresponding rights the other way. If we have rolled up nearly 10,000 millions excess of outgo over income in the past 75 years, what reason have you for expecting a reversal of that flow, unless you can show the documents or unless you expect us to abolish Protection? And if the flow were reversed, so that our income instead of our outgo were in excess, wouldn't that be an unfavorable balance of trade?



"But freight on foreign ships, tourists' expenditures abroad, immigrants' remittances to the home folks," etc., etc., etc. Oh, yes, we hear about these often, but what are the facts? How much one-sided trading of that kind is there, and why is it "favorable" to the United States? Then "what about American shipments at American prices on paper, but at cut prices in reality, whereby the export or outgo figures are 'stuffed'?" A fact, no doubt; but how much, and why favorable to the United States? "Just one thing more: Would ground rents for American land owned abroad, and dividends on the watered stock of special privilege corporations held abroad, and that sort of thing,—would they account for our excess of outgo, for our 'favorable' balance?" Very largely, no doubt, but what are the facts and why is that condition favorable to the United States? Can only echo answer?



With Apologies to the "Lineotypeortwoster."

[Scene—White House. Secretary enters with engrossed message.] "Where do I sign?" "Right here, sir." [Signs without reading.] "Beg pardon, sir; but wasn't that a rather strong approval of free trade to sign without examination?" "Free trade! Bless me I thought it was a quit-claim to Alaska."

"THE RULE OF REASON."

As Court decisions based upon legal technicalities are not looked upon with favor, it is natural that the so-called "rule of reason" basis should produce a friendly feeling for the recent Sherman law decisions.

It is important to bear in mind, however, that reasonableness in making laws, and reasonableness in applying them, are two very different things; and that Courts have to do with the latter only.

Unfortunately what appears reasonable to one man or one body of men, may appear unreasonable to another. Thus a law-making body may consider it reasonable to broadly declare certain acts illegal, as for instance acts in restraint of trade; while a law-applying body may consider it unreasonable that such acts in all cases be held illegal. But it is not necessary to decide which opinion is correct in order to determine whether it is reasonable or unreasonable for the law-applying body to make the law conform to its own opinion of reasonableness. It is evident that in so doing it must change its own character and usurp the function of the law-making body.

The rule of reason as to law-making should be commended to the duly constituted law makers. Surely the rule of reason as to applying laws requires only that the intent be reasonably determined and put into effect.

Judges are not responsible for the making of laws, but they should be held responsible for applying them as made. It is obviously impossible to have government by the people unless this is done.

The determination of our highest Court to make laws conform to its own opinion of reasonableness, must break down the lingering opposition of real democrats to the application of the Recall to judges.

W. G. STEWART.



PRESIDENTIAL TENDENCIES.

The Taft administration, like that of President Grant, will be historically memorable as one under which the Republican party was brought to the verge of disruption. Under Taft, as under Grant, there is general complaint that the President, whose personal integrity has never been seriously assailed, and whose good intentions may be conceded, is in the hands of designing advisers. Their first interest is not to serve the public, nor to conserve the welfare and reputation of the Administration, but to promote the financial profit of the various monopolies to whose service they were