

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.