

nation. Of these 203,000 votes at least one half must have been cast by voters who do not want to accept protection as a fixed policy of the nation or as any other kind of policy. The fact that Robins received nearly 90,000 more votes than the next highest candidate on the Progressive ticket shows that many of his 203,000 votes came from democratic Democrats who voted for no other candidate on the ticket. Besides these there must have been some thousands of other Democrats, equally democratic, who, besides voting for Robins, voted for other Progressives, so that fully half of the Robins vote must have come from free traders, if indeed much more than half was not a free trade vote. A similar situation exists in the party's banner State, California. There many of the voters who so overwhelmingly re-elected Governor Johnson helped to elect a democratic Democrat, James D. Phelan, as United States Senator in preference to the Progressive candidate. These voters are surely not to be held by declarations in favor of an outrageous predatory measure as a fixed national policy. s. d.



Settling the Balance of Trade.

Those confiding citizens who began by gloating over the "favorable" balance of trade, and then became embarrassed when questioned as to how it was settled, will find some food for thought in a recent speech by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, David Lloyd George. The protectionist assumed that it was more advantageous to sell than to buy; hence, when the exports from this country exceeded the imports, he thought the country was on the road to prosperity, the assumption being that the difference was paid in gold. Just why a dollar's worth of gold was worth any more than a dollar's worth of pig iron he never deigned to explain. But when he was confronted with the treasury statistics, showing that we also exported more gold and silver than we imported, he fell back upon the vague and uncertain explanation that we were holding obligations from Europe that by and by would be paid, and that meantime gave us an income. How this indebtedness was expressed, and which of our citizens held it, has never been made known. But the British Chancellor in his recent speech throws some light upon the subject. In enumerating the resources of Great Britain for the purpose of showing the empire's ability to stand the drain of war, Mr. Lloyd George placed among them the statement that America owed England \$5,000,000,000. And Mr. Lloyd George is a careful man when it comes to

statistics. It may be doubted, indeed, if there is another man in the world so well qualified to pass upon this question. As his statement conforms in general terms with those of other experts it may be accepted as approximately correct.



The question arises, How is it possible that America has sent to England as well as to the world at large more merchandise, more gold and silver, and now owes England \$5,000,000,000? A glance at our history and a little reflection will make it plain. For many years America has been a fruitful land for foreign investments, and the largest investor has been England. Whenever an Englishman was able to save a dollar for investment, he was very apt to send that dollar to this country, which was young and in need of development. A dollar or two would buy an acre of land. A few dollars would buy a tract of mineral land. A few dollars more would buy a railroad. This was because the population was sparse, and the country undeveloped; but as population increased and the country grew in wealth the land that had cost the Englishman a dollar or two became worth ten, twenty, fifty or a hundred dollars. A city lot bought for twenty-five dollars became worth twenty-five thousand dollars.



Note, however, the result in the statistics of exports and imports. The imports showed one dollar coming into the country. Next year the exports showed six or ten cents—interest on that dollar—going out of the country. And as the value of the property purchased with that dollar grew, the income to the foreign holder soon amounted to more annually than the original investment. That investment of one dollar may now stand as a hundred dollars, and the annual interest, which is not based upon the original dollar, but upon the present hundred dollars, is represented in the item of exports. One dollar of imports, hundreds of dollars of exports. Hence, the "balance of trade." Our balance sheet of international trade shows a great excess of exports over imports. England's balance sheet shows an excess of imports over exports. Which country is really growing in wealth at the expense of the other? s. c.



National Resources.

The remark of Napoleon, or some other epigrammatist, that an army moves on its stomach is as applicable to countries. The war has given

rise to much speculation as to how long Germany and Austria with outside communication cut off can feed themselves. Apparently in anticipation of this question Nat C. Murray and Frank Andrews of the United States Agriculture Department give in Farmers' Bulletin number 641 a statement of the food production and requirements of the various countries. According to this report England produces 53 per cent of her food requirements; Belgium, 57; Germany, 88; France, 92; Austria-Hungary, 98; Russia, 110. Canada produces 24 per cent more food than she consumes; Argentina, 48; and the United States just about balances her exports and imports of food-stuffs. It may be seen from this that if the war can be kept out of Germany a little care in the use of food and a great deal of labor of women and children in the fields will enable that country to support itself indefinitely; and the siege would have rather the effect that the wars of Spain had upon that nation, the wearing down of its physical manhood.

S. C.



Lo, the Poor Indian.

In nothing has the white race shown its moral limitations more clearly than in its treatment of the American Indian. A few, like the Quakers, by treating them in good faith, won good faith in return. The mass of whites, however, treated them unjustly, and reaped what they had sown. Whether it was Pizarro butchering the Peruvians, Cortez slaughtering the Aztecs, or the French and English pitting the tribes against each other in North America, the story varies only in detail; the substance is the same. Nowhere had the natives of the country any rights that the invaders were bound to respect. One of the evidences offered to prove that Mexico is barbarous was its treatment of the Yaqui Indians. And what defense could Mexico offer? What defense can any nation claiming to be civilized offer for a betrayal of its wards?



And now comes Miss Kate Barnard, Oklahoma's commissioner of charities, whose position makes her the official protector of the Indians in her State, charging that a clique of grafters in Oklahoma and Washington are about to filch from the Indians \$200,000,000. Miss Barnard's exposure and opposition has led to various attempts to keep her quiet while the robbing is going on, even to withholding the appropriation by the legislature for her department. But this commissioner is not one of the perfunctory sort. She is supporting the

Department of Charities by means of contributions from philanthropists and humanitarians, and declares she is in the "fight to a finish."



This all comes of putting a woman in office. What if the State probate courts do permit the selling of an Indian minor's land in such a manner that the minor gets but twenty per cent of it? What if one of the principal newspapers of the State does sell worthless stock to minors? Why make a fuss because one man is guardian for fifty-one Indian children—heirs to valuable lands—for whom he charges most liberal amounts for "schooling" and "general care," when he does not even know where some of them are, and when three are found sleeping in a hollow tree and eating at farm houses? Men have held such places without having trouble with those who seek to separate the Indian from his money. Besides, how are we to point at barbarous Mexico, if Miss Barnard stirs up such things in Oklahoma? Had Miss Barnard remained in the home, where the politicians say woman belongs, we should have been spared this humiliating demonstration of civic unfitness. What shall we expect from the women who are going on the police force, and into the various departments of civil government? Is the grafter to have no field he can call his own? Fie, fie, woman! Have a heart.

S. C.



Colorado's Inconsistent Mine Owners.

Colorado's mine owners are still sending out literature to show how unjust and unreasonable were the demands of the United Mine Workers. This makes one wonder why a group so sure of being able to prove itself in the right should so strenuously object to arbitration. There would be more cause for confidence in arguments submitted so liberally to the press if those submitting them would be willing to abide by the decision thereon of an impartial tribunal.

S. D.



Unsafe to Trust Franchise Corporations.

The "mere scrap of paper" argument is being used by the Illinois Telegraph and Telephone Company concerning its contract with the city. This contract binds it to forfeit its automatic telephone plant and franchise whenever it serves less than 20,000 bona fide subscribers. It admits that it is serving less than that number but holds that its contract does not mean what it says, although if it does not the city must have been tricked when