

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