

on the wrong scent, Mr. Bryan's editorial on "The Candidacy of Mr. Hill" will be pretty certain to do so. It is moderate in tone, comprehensive in matter, clear cut in statement, complete in argument, acute in political perception, sincere in spirit, definite in purpose, and thorough in its dignified castigation of this played-out pretender. In his whole career Mr. Bryan has never done a better piece of politico-editorial work.

One of the most pronounced plutocratic Democrats of the country is St. Clair McKelway, editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, which he conducts against the policy and principles but in the name of the Democratic party. His constant cry is that the Democratic party should be "affirmative" and not "negative;" his idea of affirmative being "the going thing," right or wrong. Were Mr. McKelway to fall out of a third story window it is to be supposed that he would scorn to catch on to the sill and climb back, because that would be in the nature of "negation." His frequent repetition of his poll parrot criticism of the Democratic party has drawn out the following thoughtful rebuke from the Albany Argus:

If Mr. McKelway demands something new of the party, as the price of his support, he ought to give us something new himself, and not a rehash of Republican criticisms of the Democratic party.

Senator Hoar has made it pretty clear that he, for one, will not support the proposed amendment of the Constitution for the election of United States senators by the people. As he has only informally expressed his hostile views, and the resolution is still buried in committee, no special reply is called for at this time. But an objection has been proposed by a Washington paper called the Savings Journal, which might prove useful to Mr. Hoar and the other senators on his side of the question. We quote:

When a man owes his election to Congress directly to the people, he feels under obligations to those people and he realizes that, if he fails to do what they desire, he probably

will not be reelected. So there has arisen in the national house of representatives a tendency to shirk certain unpopular legislation by forcing the Senate to take the definite steps. If the senators should be elected by the direct vote, they would probably be as chary of unpopular measures as the representatives now are.

Nothing is lacking to make this point, decisive except an explanation of why, under "a government of the people, for the people and by the people," legislative bodies should not be "chary of unpopular measures."

Senators Bacon of Georgia, and Patterson of Colorado, are presenting a vigorous and intelligent opposition to the Hoar "lese majesty" bill. This bill appears upon its face to be simply a measure to punish, in Federal tribunals, murder committed or attempted upon a president or any person in succession to the presidency. But a moment's reflection will show that it is essentially a measure to define and punish as treason, acts which cannot be made treason. The bill does not confine its proposed pains and penalties to attempts upon the life of a president made in resistance to the exercise of his lawful authority, but applies them to such attempts upon him personally without regard to whether they are made in resistance to his lawful authority or not. In the case of officials in succession, no question of resistance could be involved. The bill is therefore not at all like the familiar laws for punishing assaults upon marshals, mail carriers, etc., to obstruct them in the performance of official duty. It would not be a special law for the protection of an official function; it would be a special law for the special protection of one special class of persons. It would create a sort of sacred royal family, to attack whom would be treason even if not so named in the law.

While Congress is thus considering the propriety of creating a species of treason which the constitution forbids, the legislature of New York is diligently trying to throttle free speech. The judiciary committee of the state senate has reported a bill for

the repression of anarchy. That it does not aim merely at physical force anarchy—nor at all, for that matter, since the crimes which this involves are already covered by the penal code—but at the suppression of legitimate freedom of speech, is not left to conjecture; for the judiciary committee, in its report upon the bill, boldly un-masks its purpose. Says this report:

Organized government must be maintained. To attack it, to preach the doctrine that it should not be maintained, is not the right of any one. On the contrary, such attack threatens the liberty and safety of every citizen and is more dangerous to the people of the republic than would be the repeal of the constitutional guarantees themselves.

Accordingly this vicious bill would make what it calls anarchist meetings unlawful, irrespective of the question of whether disturbance or force is resorted to or even contemplated. It would also make it criminal to advocate the doctrines of extreme individualism, either by speech or writing. As a rule, legislation of this sort meets with such unqualified approval from the Republican press that it is a pleasure to quote a prominent Republican paper against it. The quotation is from the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Times of the 7th. It might be expedient, observes that paper, before enacting the bill—

to go through the preliminary formality of submitting to a vote of the people, by the usual method, a resolution amending the state constitution by eliminating section 8 of Article I., which ordains that "every citizen may freely speak, write or publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press."

What follows in the same paper is even more gratifying as an indication of a revival of democratic theories of republican government in political places where they have recently seemed to have become asphyxiated:

It is needless for the Brooklyn Times to disclaim any sympathy for the doctrines of the anarchists; equally needless to waste space at present in denouncing them. But indeed the suggestion that "the repeal of the constitutional guarantees" of our liberties would be preferable to the toleration of

doctrinaire attacks on accepted theories of government—the suggestion embodied in this precious report—savors more strongly of anarchy than anything that the avowed anarchists have recently said in public. . . . Society and organized government have nothing to fear from the open discussion of the theories of the anarchist, for when he is required to define his ideas and formulate his plan of social life in a community with no law but the will of the individual, the impracticability of the proposition readily becomes apparent even to himself; it is the attempt at forcible repression of the ideas of anarchy that has enabled it to gain such foothold as it has, and given it the character of a murderous conspiracy against life and property, against religion and order. The law should be so framed as to make every incitement to crime or immorality a crime punishable with severe penalties, but the law will defeat its own purpose and strengthen the evil it is intended to cure if it goes further than this, and makes open philosophical speculation and debate a crime. The attempts to overthrow the safeguards which the framers of the constitution placed around the right of the people to free thought and free speech, so long as there is no incitement to disorder, and no infringement of the rights of others, is in itself an offense of no inconsiderable magnitude. The Times does not permit itself to doubt that the free citizens of New York will be prompt to rebuke and defeat it.

In one of the committees of the Senate there is a resolution, introduced by Senator Bacon, which should be dug out and acted upon at once and favorably. It is intended to authorize the distribution of the Congressional Record at the rate of \$2 for the long session and \$1 for the short session. The present price is \$8 for each session, a price so high that few persons get the publication except through the personal favor of congressmen, who are entitled ex-officio to a limited number of free copies. If the price were reduced as proposed, this much sneered at but most instructive public document would be more extensively circulated and more generally read. We know of no better means of education in the politics of popular government than the Record offers. Few would care to read everything in it. Fewer would have the time. And to no one would this task be of any reasonable use. But general

familiarity with the Record, and verbal reading of its more important contents, are necessary to make an intelligent citizen. The newspaper reports of congressional proceedings are not a good substitute. If the Record were more generally read, congressional proceedings would be better understood by the people and congressional standards would consequently improve. By all means let the Record be published at popular prices.

THE CLIMAX OF THE PROTECTIVE SUPERSTITION.*

At the risk of being suspected as a Greek bearing gifts, I should like to ask protectionists—those who believe in protectionism upon principle, of course, and not the trusts that seek protection merely for their own interests, and whose members greedily appropriate its benefits to their own private use—to consider very thoughtfully the probable effect of ship subsidies upon the popularity of their cherished doctrine.

Subsidies are unquestionably in line with the protective idea, for they are one of the modes of "encouraging domestic industry" by means of taxation. But they are altogether too candidly direct in method and too recklessly transparent in purpose. The masses of the people may feel their burdens, even under our indirect system of taxation; and are certain to recognize their plundering character. Is it wise, then, for sincerely philanthropic and patriotic protectionists to risk the possibilities of exposure of the essential nature of protection to which this all too candid mode of application will subject it?

For my part, I am quite willing to concede the superiority, for the purpose of protection to home industry, of subsidies paid directly out of the public treasury, over subsidies paid by consumers of domestic goods indirectly to the beneficiaries under compulsion of protective tariffs. The direct subsidy is better for many reasons.

In the first place, it is open and above board. Everybody can know

who gets it, and how much he gets. Everybody can know, also, whether those who do get it divide up fairly with their workingmen, according to the true intent of the law. Of the indirect, or protective tariff subsidies, that is not true. The beneficiaries can, and in practice actually do, conceal their plunder. It comes from so many individual sources, and in ways so various and complicated, that no one can keep track of it except the beneficiaries themselves. In consequence, their workingmen are systematically robbed of the share which protective laws design that they should receive. The only recourse of workingmen is to strike when they suspect an unfair division, and that is very unsatisfactory all around. In this respect alone, the direct subsidy has marked advantages over the protective tariff subsidy.

Another of its relative advantages is its effect upon the public at large.

The object of both methods is to encourage domestic production. But here the tariff method operates with great and harassing awkwardness. In order to encourage the production of woolen goods, for instance, obstructions are put in the way of the importation of foreign wools. Those that are imported commercially are subjected to import taxes, which increase the price not only to the amount of the tax but also to the amount of several commercial profits upon the tax; while those that are imported by travelers cause their owners no end of annoyance, to say nothing of the expense, when they land at a home port.

All this extra cost and annoyance must be submitted to until the domestic product has been brought up to the standard of the competing foreign article. Nor does the burden fall off then. For when the domestic product reaches the foreign standard of quality and price, its protected manufacturers insist upon having the protective tariff continued, to enable them to "invade" foreign markets in the name of American enterprise, this invasion consisting in selling their goods at free trade prices abroad, while maintaining protection prices at home.

And that is not all. Sheep raisers clamor for protective tariffs on wool, to enable them to force their prod-

*Written for and published by the American Free Trade League, Tremont Building, Boston, being No. 30 in its series of syndicate articles for 1901-02, and bearing date Feb. 17, 1902. By Louis F. Post, Editor of The Public.