

be done; what it does mean is that reforms of the tariff, whether little or great, shall be made in the direction of free trade and upon free-trade principles. Any other tariff agitation is not worth the making. Protectionists are willing to reform the tariff in the direction of protection and upon protection principles. That is what they mean when they urge the reform of the tariff "by the friends of protection." And therein lies their strength. They secure the confidence and support of all protectionists; while those who propose to reform the tariff with due deference to protection and protection principles, yet as enemies of protection, antagonize protectionists and excite the distrust of free traders without awakening any enthusiasm among people who are neither the one nor the other but a little of both. What the anti-protection policy needs is to be made candidly affirmative in form as it is in substance. Some policies, though affirmative in substance, are necessarily negative in form. Circumstances make them so. The anti-imperialist policy is an example. But the free trade policy is distinctly affirmative and there is no valid excuse for endowing it with the weakness of the negative form. Let the compromisers be "anti-free traders" if they want to be; but let the men of principle, though they must needs compromise in legislation from time to time in order to make headway, keep their principles always in public sight. If they are free traders they will gain strength for their cause, even for the small advances in their cause, by honestly saying so.

Mr. Warner's spirit was expressed at this meeting also by Henry W. Lamb and Edward M. Shepard. Mr. Shepard had recently made a powerful free trade speech before the Free Trade league at Boston, of which Mr. Lamb is president, and on the later occasion he appears from the press reports to have spoken without timidity and with welcome definiteness. His declaration that "the de-

lay of the last Democratic administration in dealing with the tariff question was a lasting calamity," is as true as any words that ever fell from the lips of a public man. It embodies a condemnation of the Cleveland regime for which there was no legitimate excuse and can be no political forgiveness.

Mr. Shepard made one point regarding free trade which free trade advocates too often ignore, though it is of supreme importance. Saying that there had been three free trade periods in this country, all periods of prosperity, he referred to that from 1789 to 1812 as the first, and to the one which began with the tariff of 1846 as the second, and then for the third to the present day "when our foreign trade is dwarfed by our internal trade." "At this time," he went on, "our trade with all other lands is utterly insignificant when compared with our inter-State trade, the ratio being 16 or 18 to 1," and "no protectionist can fail to ascribe the enormous prosperity of the country to the free exchange of commodities in the United States."

It is true, if Mr. Shepard put the point exactly the way he is reported, that he made a play upon words in speaking of the present as a free trade era because there is free trade between the States. We have had free trade between the States since the foundation of the government. But even if this be word play it does not misrepresent or mislead. On the contrary, it emphasizes a fact so big and obtrusive that it would need no emphasis if the people had not been taught to forget that our system of free trade between the States is the greatest free trade experiment known in history. What Mr. Shepard evidently sought to do was to impress his hearers with what is absolutely true, the fact that our inter-State free trade is as it has always been the chief factor in producing all the national prosperity we now do or ever have enjoyed. His statement that its vol-

ume is from 16 to 18 times as great as our foreign trade is a conclusive answer to those who, boasting that we are prosperous, attribute our prosperity to the external protective system which affects only one-seventeenth of all our trade, and not to the internal free trade system which affects sixteen-seventeenths of it. This is one of the arguments which warn us of the folly of making disguised free trade fights against protection. An impressive argument when raised in support of free trade as a principle, it loses all its force when used in support of tariff tinkering policies.

Local politics in Cleveland are becoming active as the time approaches for the municipal election under the new charter. For many reasons this is likely to be the most important municipal election of the coming year. The street car interests all over the United States will in all probability combine their influence and pool their contributions to defeat Mayor Tom L. Johnson for reelection. It is understood that a regular assessment of American street car interests is being made by Mr. Hanna, and its collection vigorously pushed, upon the plea that the Cleveland fight is their fight. For if Johnson makes Cleveland a three-cent fare city the water will soon be squeezed out of all street railroad stock everywhere. The word has gone out, therefore, that Mayor Johnson must be—not may be, or ought to be, or can be—but must be defeated. Nothing will be left undone by the plutocratic interests of the country to accomplish the defeat of this man, even to the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars for corruption purposes. The clasping of hands by Hanna and McLean, the plutocratic Democrat, is also in contemplation. McLean has been admonished that now is his opportunity to get rid of Johnson and resume his place at the head of the Democratic party of Ohio; and he accordingly is adjusting things to organize a "fake" opposition to Johnson among the disgruntled and corrupt Democratic

heelers of Cleveland. Whoever imagines that plutocracy will die without a struggle makes a great mistake.

When Johnson ran for mayor two years ago upon a three-cent fare platform, the street railroad ring and its organs were content to believe that he was not sincere. They have since learned that he was so sincere that nothing could stop him but the "ripping" of the city, which they therefore accomplished. They have learned, too, that he has other weapons besides three-cent fare ordinances with which to fight monopolies, and that taxation is one of them. It is this that has spurred them on to close up the Peter Witt "tax school," one of Johnson's institutions where by the enormous favoritism in taxation which prevails in Cleveland has been officially exposed. They know, of course, that if Johnson carries the next Cleveland election, he will soon have the three-cent fare movement and the tax school under full headway again. Therefore it is that they are determined to defeat his reelection at all hazards.

In one of his sermons recently delivered on the subject of gambling, the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, defined the true objection to gambling. The usual objection is that gambling is wrong because its results are determined by chance. As Mr. Bigelow truly says this is no objection at all. Chance enters into most of the transactions of life. Moreover, whether a man shall take chances or not is a question for his own decision. What is there about gambling that subjects it properly to condemnation by society? Mr. Bigelow answers that it is the fact that success on one side in gambling depends upon failure on the other side. It is this that makes gambling un-social and therefore wrong—getting without giving, reaping without sowing, acquiring without earning. But what would become of many shining lights in our better element if getting without giving were condemned?

It now transpires that the Bucklin tax amendment in Colorado, defeated by more than two to one, according to the official report (p. 570), was defeated by only a small majority, if indeed it was defeated at all. The revelations of fraud in the count are astounding. Nor do these revelations depend upon the assertions of advocates of a defeated measure. The Denver Times, which opposed the amendment vigorously, concedes with marked reluctance enough to saturate the whole count with reasonable suspicion. We quote from its issue of the 13th, in which it compares the vote of one Denver district on the measure as returned by the judges of election, with the official abstract prepared in the county clerk's office:

FOR THE AMENDMENT.		
Precinct.	Judges' Co. Clerk's Return.	Abstract.
1	15	15
2	0	0
3	25	25
4	112	12
5	59	59
6	12	12
7	80	0
8	80	80
9	195	95
10	60	60
11	15	15
12	3	3
	656	376
AGAINST THE AMENDMENT.		
1	70	70
2	0	535
3	9	90
4	39	39
5	131	131
6	85	85
7	22	22
8	20	120
9	30	130
10	9	169
11	12	12
12	2	152
	429	1,555

Here is an aggregate change in only one district of 12 precincts which corruptly shifted the "official" vote from a majority of 227 for the amendment to a majority of 1,179 against it. In another district the vote in one precinct was changed in the county clerk's office from a majority of 35 for the amendment to a majority of 165 against it. That is, 50 for to 15 against, was altered to 50 for to 215 against.

The same paper quotes the county clerk as saying:

You may say for me that I admit the perpetration of all the frauds they have alleged. The evidence is indisputable and conclusive. I will start an immediate investigation and it will be a thorough one. Prosecutions will follow the investigation to the bitter end if I have to stand the entire expense myself.

These alterations appear to have been made most bunglingly. For the roughly written figures of the election judges were substituted neat clerical figures by the county clerk's assistants; and the forgeries were committed with ink of a different kind from that which the judges used.

It is explained by the local papers of Denver that these forgeries were perpetrated in order to keep the affirmative vote in Arapahoe county down below a certain small aggregate, some people who were in the secrets of the organization that opposed the amendment having felt so secure in their confidence that the election judges had been adequately bribed that they made bets upon the complete collapse of the affirmative vote. But as some of the judges were "not honest" enough to "stay bought," the affirmative vote as returned rose several thousand above the wagered maximum, and it was to save the bets that the county clerk's office force was set at work forging the returns by such alterations as those indicated above. This, at any rate, is the explanation; though similar frauds in other counties would indicate either that similar bets were made there or that conspiracy to defraud by forgery was general. The Denver frauds are believed to have been great enough to change a negative majority in the county of less than 3,000 into one of more than 10,000.

These forgeries were far from being the only frauds. Evidence is accumulating which goes to show that the opposition had raised a campaign fund which they used almost exclusively for the purpose of corrupting election judges. They did this in the guise of campaign contributions to