

able women away. What would become of manhood suffrage if it were subjected to that test? In our cities meretricious men have often crowded around the polls and sold their votes to unconscionable candidates. Shall we therefore disfranchise all men?

Woman suffrage in Colorado has been misrepresented. Instead of lowering it has elevated the political sentiment throughout the state. True, it has turned neither men nor women into angels. That was not to be expected. But it has checked some of the political devilry of the men. And it has advanced the intelligence and stimulated the conscience of the women themselves, regarding public affairs. All this is appreciated by the women, and a proposition to abolish woman suffrage in Colorado would command very few of their votes.

Some suggestive correspondence, which has not received the attention it deserves, was carried on in September between the president of the New England Free Trade league and the American members of the Joint high commission which is considering the preparation of a treaty for trade reciprocity between the United States and Canada. At the time of the correspondence the joint commission was in session at Quebec, and various monopoly interests on this side of the line were importuning the American members to perpetuate them. This led the New England Free Trade league, which represents no "interests," except common interests, to solicit a hearing in behalf of American consumers, a term that includes the whole American people. But the American commissioners, protectionists for revenue, had no mind to listen to any free trade arguments. So they wrote that "there would be no opportunity for further hearings, with a few exceptions made for special reasons." As one of these exceptions proved to be in favor of the notorious Home Market club, of Boston, the Free Trade league suggested that it

would be only fair to make one in favor of the league. To this the commissioners replied that "the hearing given the Home Market club of Boston was to be an exception made in fairness to the interests represented by that organization, because the free trade interests centering in Boston had already been given an extensive hearing." The significance of that reply is in its application. It was "the free trade interests centering in Boston" and represented by the Boston chamber of commerce, that had been heard and to which the Home Market club was accorded the exceptional privilege of a reply. But the "free trade interests centering in Boston" are only another species of protective interests. There had been no hearing in behalf of the general free trade principle — the principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Such a hearing, and not a defense of local interests, whether labeled "free trade" or "protection," was what the Free Trade league solicited and was denied.

But though the New England Free Trade league was not accorded an open hearing before the American commissioners to Canada, it was allowed to file a printed argument, and of this privilege it made good use. The argument is signed by Henry W. Lamb, president of the league. At the outset he reminds the commissioners of the naturalness of free trade. "The people of the United States," he says, "desire to trade with the people of Canada, and they need Canadian products. The desire and the need are so strongly returned, that, in spite of tariff barriers, there has been a large commerce between the countries." He then calls attention to the general belief in this country that the annexation of Canada would be good for our trade, and follows up that idea with the proposition, which should be kept always before the people, that "if all tariff barriers to the full exchange of American and Canadian products should be completely removed by treaty instead of annexa-

tion, substantially the same trade benefits to both people would result."

Some of the republican papers are sadly confused over the possible effects of annexation upon American industries. The Los Angeles Times is one of these. It is especially concerned about beet sugar. Learning that Cuban sugar can be laid down in New York free of duty at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, and be refined there for three-fourths of a cent, making the total cost $2\frac{1}{4}$ cents, whereas beet sugar cannot be made in this country for less than three cents a pound, the Times wants to know what would become of the beet sugar industry if Cuba were annexed. From the protection point of view that is a pertinent question. But what about American sugar eaters? Must they be compelled to pay unnecessarily high prices for their sugar so as to foster the beet sugar industry? Something like \$200,000,000 annually, the Times estimates, would be lost to the American beet sugar industries if they were destroyed by cheap cane sugar from our new colonies. It neglects to observe that all that was so lost, and more too, would be saved to American sugar eaters. Still, the Times does not oppose the policy of ultimate annexation. That would be contrary to the Hanna-McKinley-Elkins policy, and therefore unpatriotic. So it urges the imposition of a protective tariff upon goods from our colonies. Think of that! A tariff upon goods from territory over which our own flag floats! Could protective tariff madness go further?

When P. M. Arthur, the head of the organization of locomotive engineers, began to manage his organization "upon business principles," as the newspapers of the time naively described it, another stealthy step was taken in the direction of government by railroads. Exactly what it was that Mr. Arthur did, is not generally known. All that the public understands is that he has ever since been spoken of as a model labor leader, because he manages his organization

“upon business principles” and has no strikes; and incidentally it has leaked out that Mr. Arthur and Chauncey M. Depew, he of the Vanderbilt system, are very good friends. Another fact is known about Arthur in his home city of Cleveland. He lives upon the most aristocratic thoroughfare there—Euclid avenue—and is reputed to be a millionaire. The locomotive engineers are hardly as prosperous as Mr. Arthur, but they are kept out of strikes and their wages are not cut. From these and other facts, especially the fact that when Arthur's influence is needed for the railroads in politics he gives it, an inference amounting almost to certainty is drawn. It is inferred that Arthur's understanding with railroad magnates goes much further than the question of wages, and that he is in a combination with the great railroad magnates to give them the engineers' vote whenever it is needed to protect railroad monopoly.

That is doubtless the essence of Arthur's arrangement, whether it be manifested by a specific agreement or not. Such an arrangement would be simple. To make it effective nothing more is necessary than for the companies to leave wages undisturbed and to make no political demands so long as their privileges are not threatened by legislation; but to suggest the necessity of reducing wages, if legislation objectionable to them be carried through. Thus Mr. Arthur, getting the credit with his organization of maintaining wages, could secure perpetual reelection and be always in position to give warning, with apparent sincerity, that if political candidates or parties that were objectionable to the roads succeeded at elections it would indeed be necessary for the engineers to submit to a reduction of wages. Nothing could be simpler. Nothing has been more effective. It has been so effective that the whole organized body of locomotive engineers may, with few exceptions, be regarded as a solid voting

force which the railroads can call upon in any emergency.

And as with the engineers, so with the firemen. Sargent has about succeeded in turning them over to the roads as an additional voting force, to be called into action in the same way.

Nor does this railroad conspiracy for political ends stop with the engineers and firemen. It has worked so satisfactorily with these two branches, apparently, that it is being extended to the whole railroad system. Every employe is to be made to vote with his road. The entire body of railroad men in the United States is to be turned into a voting force to perpetuate the power of the monopoly pirates. The specific organization for that purpose is the “Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political League.” Its grand president is John W. Callahan, of the C. & W. I., and its grand treasurer is David W. Ross, secretary to the second vice president of the Illinois Central. The headquarters of the league is in the Unity building at Chicago. The dues are as low as ten cents a year, evidently for the purpose of making it impossible for employes who object to joining, but fear to refuse, to urge inability to spare the money for dues.

That this league is under the patronage of the railroad magnates, and that any railroad man who neglects to join, does so at the peril of losing his job, is not only understood among railway employes, but is evident from the circumstances. Its purpose is disclosed in a recent circular letter addressed to railroad employes, a copy of which has come into our possession. In that letter are these words: “We urge you to organize and fight legislation that will be detrimental to your interest and that of the company which employs you.” As anti-monopoly legislation is not and cannot be detrimental to the interest of railroad employes, the plain object of the organization, as here disclosed, is to whip railroad em-

ployes into line to vote against legislation that may be detrimental to the monopoly interests of their companies. It is, in other words, to turn railroad employes into voting serfs.

The circular letter of this railroad league, now before us, shows that it was written either by knaves or dupes. It asserts that legislation reducing railway and telegraph rates would cause a reduction in the number of railway and telegraph employes and thus a reduction of wages. That is absurd upon the face of it. It is an empty threat, not a rational prediction. Is there a railroad man so stupid as not to know that reduced rates inevitably make more traffic in any business, and consequently require the employment of more men? How then could the companies reduce the number of employes if rates were reduced? And if they couldn't reduce the number of employes, how could they reduce wages?

There are two interests in railroad-ing. One is the legitimate earning interests of the roads; the other is the watered stock interests. In the latter, railroad employes have no share. High dividends don't make high wages. What makes high wages is plenty of opportunities for work. When railroad employes understand this, they will not be duped by a bosses' organization like the “Railway and Telegraph Employes' Political league.” Many of them might go into the league because they feared black-listing; some of them might join in order to get near the throne; but none would be fooled by the transparently false pretense that legislation against railroad monopolies can injure the interests of railroad employes.

An example of the wondrous change that has within a few years come over the churches in their attitude toward the theater, was presented early this month in New York, when a crowd of clergymen—Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, Unitarians, Hebrews, Congregationalists and