

controlled; or the product of all foreign producers must be shut out from the markets of this country. The first result is not attainable. It would be obviously impracticable to induce all the manufacturers of starch, for example, in all the different countries of Europe, to unite and put the control of their business in the hands of trustees residing in the United States. The second is made not only possible, but effective in the highest degree, by the imposition of tariffs, or duties, on the importation of the articles in which the trusts are especially interested, so high as to completely bar them out of the American market. These duties the McKinley Tariff Act provides. (The Dingley Tariff reenacted or increased them.—Ed.) It thus becomes the creator and the preserver of trusts and monopolies, the like of which cannot and do not exist under the tariff system of Great Britain, as the Starch Trust, Plate and Window Glass Trust, Nail Trust, Linseed Oil Trust, Lead Trust, Cotton Bagging Trust, Borax Trust, Ax, Saw and Scythe Trust, Cracker, Cake and Biscuit Trust, Rubber Boot and Shoe Trust, and many others; all of which, freed from foreign competition, are advancing prices to American consumers to an extent that will afford them from fifty to one hundred per cent more profit than can be fairly considered as legitimate, but in which profits their employees do not participate. There are more than one hundred trusts in the United States that could have no existence except for the high duties that have been enacted or kept on, in order to maintain and protect them. How did your representative in the last Congress vote?

Did he vote for the Salt Trust, protected and alone made capable of existence by the duty of from 44 to 85 per cent?

Did he vote for the Window Glass Trust, with a protection of from 120 to 135 per cent?

Did he vote for the Linseed Oil Trust, with a protection of over 90 per cent?

Did he vote for the White Lead Trust, with a protection of 75 per cent?

Did he vote for the Starch Trust, with a protection of over 90 per cent?

Did he vote for the Steel Trust, with a protection running from 40 to 115 per cent?

And so of all the other trusts protected by the tariff and especially by the McKinley Bill. (and the Dingley Bill.—Ed.) Look them up, and if you find that your representative voted for such an imposition of taxes as alone permits them to exist, make him explain why he did so.

DAVID A. WELLS.

**HEREDITY AND HUMAN PROGRESS.**

Since the future of the human race depends on the kind of people that are born into the world, such books as that

by Dr. Duncan McKim, bearing the above title, in which the question of what people should be allowed to be born is investigated, must be of the highest interest. We would be glad, sometime in the near future, to review more carefully than we can do at present this thoughtful and courageous book. The problem that lies at the root of it is one which is more and more engaging the attention of people of intelligence; but the great difficulty, that of bringing to practical application the reforms which it is easy to demonstrate to be desirable, we hardly think has been solved by this author with more success than by his predecessors in this line of research.

Doctor McKim confronts his question squarely, and goes direct to the core of it; he recommends "a gentle, painless death" for all such members of the race as are palpably unfit to be represented in the coming generations by descendants of their own. As such he would rank idiots, imbeciles, epileptics, habitual drunkards, nocturnal housebreakers, most murderers, and insane, incorrigible and very dangerous criminals, whatever their offense. He brings many things up for our consideration in connection with the enormous taking of life which this plan would entail. Among them is this, for example; every year some 14,000 murders are committed. Which were better, to have these 14,000 executions performed haphazard, as at present, and often by the worst of men upon the best, or to have them dealt out deliberately by society in accordance with some definite plan, wisely calculated to promote the greatest good of the greatest number?

As to the great question, that of the mode of selecting the victims, Doctor McKim has devised a way which at first sight seems plausible enough; he would take only "the very weak and the very vicious who fall into the hands of the state, for maintenance, reformation or punishment," thus practising a kind of skimming process upon such unfortunates as are brought to the surface by systems already in operation in every community. But when looked at more closely this seems not so simple a matter either, but only a throwing of the responsibility upon other shoulders. For what one of our minor magistrates or tribunals, such as now consign men and women to the penal or reformatory institutions in question, would operate so freely if such consignment were in effect a sentence of death?

**AN EXTRAVAGANT ADMINISTRATION.**

The American people hardly realize what an inordinate expenditure of money has taken place under the McKinley administration. We cannot do a better service to the public interest than to put the facts in cold figures. In

making a comparison of the national expenditures under different administrations, it is necessary to reckon by fiscal years, for although the president comes into power on March 4, and the fiscal year does not begin till July 1, the interval properly belongs to the financial record of the outgoing president. Thus the expenditures which are fairly chargeable to the policy of President McKinley start on July 1, 1897, at the opening of what is officially known as the fiscal year 1898, and run to April 1, 1900, that being the latest date covered by the monthly returns. This is a period of two years and nine months, or two and three-quarters fiscal years. In that period the national expenditures have been as follows:

FISCAL YEAR.	EXPENDITURES.
1898.....	\$438,819,214.54
1899.....	605,072,179.85
1900 (nine months).....	372,861,882.95
Total.....	\$1,416,753,277.34

Of these enormous expenditures, \$593,285,101.64 has been for the army and navy, \$20,000,000 for the Philippine indemnity, \$393,766,227.35 for pensions, and \$108,906,835.66 for interest, an aggregate outlay of \$1,115,957,264.65 for old and new wars in the short space of two years and nine months.

Of this money, \$1,276,445,547.98 was obtained by taxation, \$72,000,169.63 was received from payments on account of debts due by the Pacific railroads, and the balance, \$68,307,559.73, formed part of the proceeds of the \$200,000,000 war loan, the remainder of that loan, on which the government is paying interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, being substantially held on deposit by the national banks free of interest.—Boston Herald.

**NO PLACE IN HISTORY.**

Mr. Bryan is "doing" the Pacific northwest states. He is making many speeches, but is getting small attention. The reason is that he is not a thinker. His speech is chaff. Nothing he is saying or ever has said will be remembered. His speeches will have no place in the history of our literature on statesmanship. Who will be quoting Mr. Bryan fifty years hence, or who except the special student of our politics will know that he ever existed? He is contributing nothing to the sum of human knowledge. All he says is merely superficial, and only darkens counsel. He has ready and easy speech, but never goes to the bottom of anything, and what he says is not for propagation of "truth that lives to perish never," but is uttered merely for the temporary interests or purposes of personal and party politics. Men of sound thought and rational purpose are not with him. He presents nothing that appeals to them. They see nothing in him but multifarious superficiality. This is the country's estimate of Mr. Bryan.—Portland Oregonian.