

jectors than the grounds on which their objections rest; and it is impossible to see that they have made any point which need seriously discourage us. The constitutional provision some times quoted, that revenue bills shall originate in the house of representatives, suggesting the intention that all modifications of them shall so originate, seems to be quite sufficiently met by another constitutional provision that treaties, duly ratified, shall have the full force of law. The principle that revenue changes should not be introduced by the executive branch of government, cannot apply to changes expressly following provisions of an act of congress. The most serious objections came naturally from interests that fear a cutting down of the protective bounty they enjoy, either directly by action of the treaties, or remotely by what any relaxation of the Dingley law may at some time lead to. President McKinley, as already shown, was convinced that not a single industry would be appreciably injured by the French treaty now pending, but even supposing that some minor one—knit goods, say, or spectacles, or bogus jewelry, employing comparatively few workmen, might be disturbed a little, we surely cannot be expected to sacrifice to it the interests of the whole country, and the vast number of its laborers dependent on exports for employment. This would be like praying Providence to send us no rain, however our fields might be suffering for lack of it, because some worthy citizen might perchance be out without an umbrella. We would have no one suffer; but if some suffering must be, better it should be a slight suffering by the very few, than a general deprivation to the great majority.

“When we come to compare, with any view to deciding impartially how the facts stand, the numbers interested adversely to such a reciprocity treaty as that concluded with France, and now awaiting action by the senate, with those favorably interested, the disproportion is so enormous as to make all argument appear ridiculous. Readers of our economic literature are doubtless familiar with the demonstration often made that the number of working people now occupied in any art of which a competing foreign product could be imported, whose livelihood therefore depends on limiting foreign commerce, is after all a small number in comparison with those engaged in producing goods for export, whose livelihood therefore depends on maintaining and extending foreign commerce. The proof is plain, when once the comparative figures are studied, and quite convincing. But the case for the proposed treaties is stronger yet; they have been so drawn

—this applies to the French treaty in particular—as especially to guard those lines of manufacture in which competition is most feared by our great producers, while opening the doors to the agricultural and manufactured products we export. It may safely be said of this treaty, that those who would be better off for its ratification—whether traders, producers or manual laborers—are to those who would be worse off as many hundreds to one. In view of the high probability, which we are fully entitled to accept as a certainty, that this is our last chance for so favorable a treaty with the French republic, and that any measure hereafter drawn up must contain greater concessions for it and less for us, the delay in ratification appears nothing less than fatuous. I have spoken as though only manufacturers were concerned in exporting, chiefly because it is among them that opposition is feared. But agriculture now furnishes \$900,000,000 worth of our exports; more than three-fourths of the whole half a century ago, and still not far from two-thirds. This huge and vitally important export trade is attacked by hostile duties from many different directions (we even hear of a proposition in Holland to put a heavy tariff on our flour) and the interests of our farmers it will not do to overlook. Nor have we by any means exhausted the field in considering only the producers involved. Our people are all interested, as consumers, in securing and enjoying the widest possible source of supply through extended commerce.

“There is a double satisfaction in advancing a movement, when, as so truly in this instance, our pecuniary interests lead us in perfect accord with the drawings of Christian brotherhood. While extending our commerce, we can discharge a national obligation in one direction, and win friends for ourselves in another. ‘Our plain duty’ is no less plain in dealing with Cuba than with Porto Rico. Our arms have conquered for both islands alike a new place in the world; and, though we may continue to treat one of them as a dependency while recognizing the other as a free nationality over whose foreign relations we retain control, our responsibilities by no means differ so widely in the two cases as do the words we use. Reciprocity may be merely policy toward the other nations of the earth; it is the payment of a sacred debt to Cuba. And none the less so because, by freely extending the hospitality of our markets to her crude productions, thus furnishing the natural commercial outlet to her teeming soil, we assure ourselves another outlet at the same time for our manufactures. These we cannot sell to

people whom our policy keeps poor; to buy of us they must earn the wherewithal.

“Towards other peoples, those of Europe, when we meet on equal footing, our attitude should be that commended by Jefferson: ‘Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all.’ We do not need their kindly sentiment, I grant, for our national defense; yet there is no precaution we may despise as superfluous as a means of preventing war.

“The promotion of commerce is a far nobler and worthier aim for an enlightened government than any that can be realized by victorious warfare. Commerce, though it may have its source in self interest, is a powerful stimulus to broad human sympathy. It opens up the mental horizon, makes over the citizens of one limited country into citizens of the world, studies the common interests of mankind in providing the most advantageous division of labor, stimulates invention and promotes progress. It feeds the hungry and clothes the naked; it relieves the scarcity of one region by the plenty of another, instead of gorging the strong with the spoils of the weak; and it adds value to articles it takes and those it brings, instead of destroying or corrupting whatever it touches. Carrying, along the gospel of service, it is the messenger of practical Christianity.

“Our late president truly said that ‘Reciprocity is in harmony with the spirit of the times, retaliation is not;’ adding that the ‘ships of commerce are messengers of peace and amity wherever they go;’ and he closed his farewell address with the noble exhortation: ‘Let us ever remember that our interests are in concord, not conflict, that our real eminence rests in the victories of peace, not those of war.’”

A NEW BOOK.

The Tribune has received a copy of “Leaves from Arbor Lodge,” by Mary French Morton. This is a handsome book of some sixty pages, in a delicate pale green binding, issued by the Blakely Printing Company of Chicago, and illustrated with a dozen photographic views of spots about the historic old homestead. It contains a number of the short poems of its author. Miss Morton has contributed quite freely to The Conservative, and these brief poems of hers have attracted more attention, and been copied more widely, than her fellow-citizens perhaps are aware. There is always a peculiar satisfaction in reading a new poem by Miss Morton. They are mechanically perfect, for one thing; and there is always an idea at the bottom of them. Also the things that they deal with are things that exist. They do not go into abstractions. They are the fruits of a mature understanding, that sees the world through unglamored eyes and finds all the humor and tragedy of life in the every-day facts that lie around it. We are glad to have this much of them in permanent form.—Nebraska City Daily Tribune.