

ters race hatred makes himself an originating cause of race outrages. As the Jew haters of Russia, no matter where they live, are morally responsible for the massacre at Kishineff, so the Negro haters of the United States, North as well as South, are morally responsible for the outrages of white brutes upon Negroes. Such outrages could not occur if public opinion everywhere were as sensitive to the rights of Negroes as to the rights of white men.

The whole history of the relations of whites and Negroes affords overwhelming proof of the incompetency of white Americans to protect the rights of black Americans. If the Negro is to be protected equally with white men, respecting his life, his liberty, his pursuits and his property, one thing is certain, however uncertain other things may be. It may be doubtful if the Negro is capable of protecting these rights for himself; but it is absolutely certain that the white race cannot be trusted to do it for him.

And that answers the question we have propounded: Should the power to protect the black race be lodged with the white race? The answer must of necessity be, No. The white race cannot be trusted either to exercise it faithfully, or to try to exercise it faithfully.

But there is only one alternative. We must either lodge this power with the white race, or else make Negro suffrage secure, so that the Negro himself may use it to protect his own rights. If the first horn of this alternative must be rejected—and who with a conscience has the temerity to argue for its acceptance—then the second must be adopted. It must be adopted, that is, by those who recognize the Negro's right to be protected.

Wherever the Negro has been divested of voting power, partially or wholly, the white men of that community must either insist upon its full restoration upon equal terms with whites, or by their refusal confess that they do not believe the Negro ought to have, either in principle or practice, the same rights to life, liberty, pursuits and property that they claim for themselves.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, June 4.

Great Britain is stirred from Lands End to John O'Groats, by a political agitation of the first magnitude. It is due to nothing less than a proposal, made by Joseph Chamberlain, the British secretary of state for the colonies and leader of the Unionist faction of the Conservative party, seconded by Arthur J. Balfour, the British prime minister and Conservative leader, that Great Britain abandon her policy of free trade and return to the policy of protection.

This proposed change of front with reference to an economic policy that dates back to the days of Cobden and Peel, in the 40s. when Parliament began the abolition of tariff taxes on imported food, is urged as a necessity for the maintenance of British imperialism. But it is believed to have been inspired in no little degree by the seeming necessity for raising a new patriotic issue to save the Conservative party from disaster.

That suspicion is reenforced certainly by the manifest decline of this party in popularity since the close of the Boer war (vol. v., p. 264), with its incidental advantages as a political issue to the party in power. Several by-elections, this Spring, to fill vacancies in Parliament, have been badly disappointing to Conservative hopes. The only one in which Conservatives even pretended to find consolation, had returned the Unionist candidate by only half the usual majority; and this poor consolation was more than neutralized by the triumphant election of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, a thorough-going "Little Englander." His majority was several hundred larger than the Liberals usually poll in his constituency: notwithstanding that Mr. Chamberlain forced the Boer war question against him in the contest and that he responded by placarding the district with a strong denunciation of the annexation of the Boer republics. These Liberal successes created a widespread impression that at the next general elections the Conservatives would be retired from power.

About this time the first clear intimation of the new tariff policy was made. A large and influential dele-

gation of Unionist members of the House of Commons, supported by members of the Lords and delegates from chambers of agriculture and of commerce, waited upon Mr. Balfour on the 15th of May to protest against remission of the war duties on grain. Mr. Balfour is reported to have made a long and groping argument in reply to their representations. He explained that this grain tax had accidentally and without the slightest intention on the part of the ministry, given some protection to millers and thus indirectly and unexpectedly helped farmers, but that inasmuch as the measure was never intended to be protective, the ministry must not be blamed for now remitting the tax. He urged them to consider, also, that protection cannot be introduced silently, as if by accident and without a broad public indorsement of such a change in the national policy. at the same time assuring them that he must not be understood as saying that the existing policy must necessarily be permanent. On the contrary, he thought it must be recognized that new conditions have arisen since the old free trade policy was adopted, and he could imagine circumstances under which Great Britain would no longer consent to be made a passive target for other countries living under different conditions. While he believed in universal free trade, he realized that at present every country except Great Britain is protected. In conclusion, he said that he would welcome a closer fiscal union of the motherland and the colonies, but that the movement would be extremely difficult to carry out, and must come from the heart, conscience and intellect of the great masses of the people.

On the very day of that conference with Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain addressed a great Unionist mass-meeting at Birmingham, making the abolition of British free trade the burden of his speech. As this speech was cabled, Mr. Chamberlain declared—

that England had reached the point in her career where she must abandon the policy of free trade or lose her colonies; that on imperial policy for the next few years depended whether the British empire should stand together as a free nation against the world, or fall into separate States, each selfishly seeking its own interests and losing those advantages which unity alone could give; and that the policy of dictation and interference by foreign Powers was justified by the be-

lief that England was so wedded to the policy of free trade that she would not even defend her own colonies. He advocated, consequently, a departure from the existing interpretation of free trade, proposing the establishment of preferential tariffs between the colonies and Great Britain. His main point was that England's present condition in this respect is absolutely new and that this new situation must be met by a new policy. Referring to Canada as in the full swing of extraordinary prosperity, which he hoped and believed would result in a great increase in population, strength and importance, he recalled the fact that Canada in 1898 voluntarily gave Great Britain a preference of 15 per cent, which it afterward increased to 33 1-3 per cent, and stated that Canada is now willing to go further, especially regarding goods in which the British compete with foreigners, if Great Britain will give her a drawback or a tax of a shilling per quarter on grain. The government has had to refuse the offer, because the established fiscal policy binds it to keep the British market open for all the world, even though other nations close their markets against Great Britain. England, he said, could not offer any favor to her own children or make any difference between those who treat her well and those who treat her badly. That was the accepted doctrine of the free traders. He himself was a free trader, but he doubted whether the present interpretation of the term was the true one. Continuing his speech, he said: "I am no protectionist, but I want to discover if the true interpretation of free trade is that it is our only duty to buy in the cheapest market without regard to whether we can sell there. If that is the theory of free trade, and if it finds acceptance here and elsewhere, then you will lose the advantage of the further reduction in duty which Canada offers to the manufacturers of this country, and you may lose a great deal more, because the minister of finance in Canada told the Canadian parliament the other day that if they are told definitely that the mother country can do nothing for them in the way of reciprocity they must reconsider their position and reconsider the preference they have already given. The policy which prevents us from offering an advantage to our colonies prevents us from defending them if they are attacked. We may well have supposed that an agreement of this kind, by which Canada does a kindness to us, was a matter of family agreement concerning nobody else. Unfortunately, Germany thinks otherwise. Germany insists upon treating Canada as though it was a separate country, and has penalized Canada by additional duties on Canadian goods. German newspapers frankly explain that this is a policy of re-

prisal, and that it is intended to deter other colonies from giving us the same advantage. This policy of dictation and interference is justified by the belief that we are so wedded to our fiscal system that we cannot defend our colonies, and that any one of them which attempts to establish special relations with us will do so at its own risk and must be left to bear the brunt of foreign hostility. That is putting us in a humiliating position. If we allow it to prevail how can we approach the colonies with appeals to aid us in promoting the union of the empire, or ask them to bear a share of the common burdens? Is it better to cultivate the trade of your own people, or let that go in order that you may keep the trade of those who rightly enough are your competitors and rivals? That is the new position which the people of this empire have to consider. I do not want to hasten their decision. They have two alternatives. They may maintain in its severity the artificial and wrong interpretation which has been placed upon the doctrine of free trade by the small remnant of 'little Englanders,' who profess to be the sole repositories of the doctrines of Cobden and Bright. In that case they will be absolutely precluded either from giving preference in favor to the colonies abroad, or from even protecting the colonies when they offer a favor to us. The second alternative is that we must insist that we will not be bound by any purely technical definition of free trade; that while we seek a free interchange of trade between ourselves and all nations of the world, we will, nevertheless, resume the power of negotiation, and, if necessary, retaliation, whenever our interests or our relations with the colonies are threatened by other people."

On the 20th, Mr. Chamberlain made two speeches of the same tenor in London, one at the Guildhall, upon receiving congratulations upon the results of his mission to South Africa, and the other at the Mansion House, at a luncheon given to him and Mrs. Chamberlain by the Lord Mayor.

The subject came up in the House of Commons on the 28th. Sir Charles Dilke, of the Radical faction of the Liberal party, interpellated the ministry with a question regarding the significance of Mr. Chamberlain's speeches. He asked—

whether Mr. Chamberlain, in advocating something in the nature of a protective tariff, spoke with the authority of the financial department or of the whole cabinet, and also whether negotiations had been opened with the colonies.

He reenforced his questions with an

effective speech. In reply, according to the cable reports—

Mr. Balfour deprecated "the waving of the ragged, moth-eaten flags of either the protectionist or the free trader in the controversy now as far removed as the poles from the controversy of half a century ago." A part of the speech of the honorable baronet, the Prime Minister said, had been devoted not to the fiscal policy of the country, but to the less elevated object of making mischief between Mr. Chamberlain and himself. Continuing, the Premier asserted that the position of the British islands is entirely different from what it was in 1846 and 1847. It is different from what the free traders supposed it would be. They predicted that free trade would become universal, but they were wrong. England is the only free trade country in the world, and if the present condition of things continues, the time must come when England's only neutral markets will be the Turkish empire, the British protectorate and crown colonies, and India. England would then be in a position where she would be obliged to import a large proportion of food stuffs and raw material and would have to pay for them with exports which she would find it extremely difficult to dispose of in any but the countries he had named. He therefore urged "that the time has come when it should be publicly discussed whether the doctrine that revenue was never to be raised except for purposes of expenditure must not be abandoned."

With reference to negotiations with the colonies, he said that if foreign countries were to be allowed to treat British colonies as foreign nations, England must be forced by patriotic motives and a regard for her colonies to retaliate. Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and India were parts of the empire, and it would be absurd for them to be treated as separate aggregations because they had been given self-government. If preference was to be given to imports for the benefit of the colonies, they, in exchange, would mitigate the severity of their hostile tariffs against England. That could only be done by taxing the food of the people and raw materials. The Premier said that he did not think it would be wise to tax raw material. He did not know whether a tax on food would be accepted, but unless something of the kind was accepted the scheme could not be carried out. He did not feel sure that certain wealthy classes in England would repudiate the suggestion, as had been intimated. He did not know whether the working classes of the country or whether the colonies would accept the proposed tariff modifications, as had been asked, although he knew the traditional objections of the for-

mer to taxation of food and of the latter to abandoning protection. If these objections could not be overcome, this plan would have to go. It was not the case that the plan had been originated by Chamberlain as a policy of his own without consulting his colleagues. He, himself, was in agreement with the colonial secretary, and if this scheme or some other were not practicable the empire could not be brought to that stage of fruition that had occurred in the United States of America.

When the Premier had finished, Mr. Chamberlain took the floor. He expressed surprise at the special attention his Birmingham speech had attracted, remarking that it was absolutely the same in substance as speeches delivered before by Lord Salisbury and by Mr. Balfour, between whom and himself there was no difference of opinion. There was no intention, he insisted, of reversing Great Britain's fiscal policy, if Cobden's definition of free trade as "a free exchange of commodities at their natural prices" is accepted. But—

Although nothing is now suggested in the nature of a reversal of Great Britain's fiscal policy, it is certain that a mandate must be given the ministry if the suggestions he had thrown out are to be carried into effect. He would do his utmost to bring this question in all its bearings before the people. Thus far he had only raised a principle and had not formulated a plan. If there was to be no change in the fiscal system the country would have to give up all hope of closer fiscal relations with the colonies and must abandon all idea of securing at any time closer political relations with them. If the ministry receives a mandate he will produce a plan. He would call another colonial conference; but he cannot negotiate with the colonies before the people have given a mandate. Everything depends upon what the country has to offer. In the first place, however, he must learn from every manufacturing district what articles made in those districts could be more largely sold if there were preferential rates in the colonies. What Great Britain would have to give is preference on great colonial products, and that preference will have to be on raw material, on food, or on both. He agreed that it is undesirable to tax raw material, because Great Britain would be required to give drawbacks on the finished article, which is a complicated system, and he preferred the simple method of taxing food. The workman's dislike to taxes on food had no terrors for him. He was prepared to go into the homes of the laboring men and argue the subject with them. He

would give them a table showing how much beer and bread they used and exactly how much duty they would have to pay if this policy were carried out. He would also give them a table showing how much extra wages they would require to earn. If the opposition were able to show that it meant greater cost of living with no increase of wages their optimism would be justified, but if he was able to show greater increase of wages than loss on food then "I think I shall have a chance." It was inevitable, if preferential duties were levied, that a tax be placed on foodstuffs, and as the working classes would pay three-quarters of such a tax, it was only fair that this money and the one-quarter paid by the rich classes should be applied to social reforms, like old age pensions. Such a tax is not protective in intention, but, incidentally, it would be protective. He would say to the workman: "Not only do you get back in benefits the whole sum you pay, but also all that is paid by the richer classes. In addition to that, you receive higher wages, and it will be possible to press forward other social reforms, which are at present impracticable for lack of money." He observed that the grain tax, though not intended to be protective, had incidentally protected the farmer. If food were taxed in the future it would not be an unmixed evil, because it would help the depressed industry of agriculture and increase Great Britain's home supply of food. More than that, it would enable her to deal with Germany in defense of Canada. We should not enter on war tariffs, but I would say to Germany 'I am afraid if you cannot meet us in this matter I may be compelled to put a duty on that.'" The Colonial Secretary said repeated representations had been made to Germany in regard to Canada, but he did not see what Germany could do to meet the British views until Great Britain was in a position to touch the pockets of the German people. "Is it not also conceivable," asked Mr. Chamberlain, "that Great Britain would have to defend her trade against unjust competition, such as that of the trusts of America and the continent? At present Great Britain is the one open market of the world, and therefore a general dumping ground. If dull trade comes, the trusts will flood our markets and the markets in which we compete with iron and steel at prices that we cannot meet. If that happens nothing will prevent the people from putting on a duty to protect our staple industry." Mr. Chamberlain concluded with an emphatic assertion that he intended to press the matter on public attention.

With a view to making good the final assurances of this speech in the

Commons, Mr. Chamberlain has invited 6,000 of his constituents to a garden party at Birmingham on the 20th, when he is expected to make another address on his tariff proposals. The cooperative societies of the United Kingdom have formally denounced the proposals. At a delegate convention at Doncaster on the 2d, attended by 1,500 delegates, a resolution emphatically protesting against "any tampering with the free trade policy of this country by preferential tariffs" was adopted with only three dissentient votes.

The principal item of American political news is the assembling of the Republican State convention of Ohio, at Columbus on the 3d. It was in session only an hour on that day. But permanent organization was effected, the usual convention committees were appointed, and the new State central committee was elected. Senator Hanna is reported to have been from the opening in complete control. Of the 21 members of the new State central committee, 17 are described as Hanna men. Senator Hanna presided as temporary chairman. His speech appears to have had reference wholly to national issues, nothing in the reports of it showing that he considered State issues at all.

A judicial election for Cook county (Illinois) judges (p. 81) was held on the 1st, each of the principal political parties presenting a full list of candidates. The result was as follows:

Superior Court:

Republican — Theodore Brentano (reelected).

Circuit Court:

Democrats—Edward F. Dunne (reelected), Murray F. Tuley (reelected), Francis Adams (reelected), Richard W. Clifford (reelected), Charles M. Walker, Frank Baker (reelected), Thomas G. Windes (reelected), Lockwood Honore, Julian W. Mack, Edward Osgood Brown and George Kersten.

Republicans—Richard S. Tuthill (reelected), Frederick A. Smith (reelected), and John Gibbons (reelected).

Three other judges of the Circuit court were voted for under an act of the legislature which has been repealed, but regarding which the repealing act is claimed to be unconstitutional. Those elected were—

Democrats — Thomas M. Hoyne, George Mills Rogers and Joseph A. O'Donnell.

Socialist and Prohibition candidates