MAINE AND AFTER.

Democratic gains were generally expected in Monday's election in Maine, and it was thought possible that a Democratic Governor might be chosen by a narrow plurality; but the most sanguine did not look for such a tremendous overturn as the Republicans actually have suffered. They have lost the Governorship for the first time in thirty years—and even in 1880 the Democratic-Greenback fusion won only by a squeak and a "duck," the State going Republican in the Presidential election in the following November—and that by a majority little short of 9,000. Until two years ago, the Republicans regularly elected their Governors by majorities of from 25,000 to 34,000. Even as compared with 1906 and 1908, when the majorities dropped to 8,000, Mr. Plaisted's winning this year takes on the proportions of a political revolution. Maine's vote is not large, the total being about 142,000. A gain of 17,000 on that basis is a very high percentage. Applied to New York, it would mean a Democratic majority of 150,000 or so. And the result in Maine cannot be explained, as was that in Vermont, by Republicans staying at home. The Republican vote fell off, but the Democratic went up. There was an actual change of parties by many electors. Even after due allowance is made for the effect of the liquor issue and for changes in the population in some Maine cities, the election of Plaisted by an unexpectedly large majority will be everywhere regarded as a political portent. If the Vermont barometer was set for foul Republican weather, the Maine indications are for something like hurricane conditions.

The Republican upset seems even more disastrous when we turn to the figures for Congressmen and for the Legislature. Two Republican Representatives, in districts which have been thought absolutely "safe" from time immemorial, are defeated by majorities of 2,000 and 3,000, while the other two pull out, if the final returns show that they have pulled out, by pluralities of the most meagre sort. This is sufficiently astounding, but the news that the Democrats have triumphantly carried the Legislature also, and will elect a United States Senator to succeed Senator Hale, is fairly amazing. As a dazed Republican in Washington exclaimed, when he heard of the Maine election: "If the Democrats have carried the Legislature, too, the world will come to an end."

Everywhere it is admitted that the sweeping Democratic victory in Maine is not due to "local causes." These concededly entered into the campaign, but did not determine the result. That is too large, too pervasive throughout the State, where the country districts were affected as well as the cities, to be accounted for by anything except a general cause. That cause was undoubtedly intense dissatisfaction within the Republican party. Specifically, it was dissatisfaction with the Republican tariff. High prices and the increased cost of living have made the people, even in protected Maine, restless and angry, and have led them to question the wisdom of the policy of taxing ourselves rich more sharply than ever before. The whole brunt of the fighting, at least in the Congressional districts, was against the Payne-Aldrich tariff. Democratic campaigners were even so sacrilegious as to talk of the advantages of free trade, and thereupon the Republican managers thought the Lord had delivered those Philistines into their hands. No candidate for Congress in Maine could utter the words "free trade" and live, they joyfully said. But they are wiser now. As for the Republican Representatives, Messrs. Swasey, Burleigh, and Guernsey, who had voted for the high-tariff law, they were savagely heckled by the most direct and awkward questions. On one widely circulated campaign card, such ugly queries were put to them by some as the following:

Why did you vote to admit raw silk free and only place a duty of 54 cents per pound on the manufactured articles, at the same time placing a duty of 135 cents per pound on woollen or worsted cloth valued at not more than 40 cents a pound? Was it because silk is used by the greater number of your constituents and woolen and worsted only by a few?

Why did you vote to tax champagne from 54 to 66 cents per gallon and wearing apparel at 89 to 92 cents per gallon? Was it to encourage your constituents to drink champagne and to discourage them from wearing woolen clothes?

Why did you vote to tax hats bringing not over $1.50 per dozen at 77 per cent, and those valued at more than $1.50 per dozen only 47 per cent? In whose interest was this done, your poor or rich constituent?

There must be a reason for your vote. Will you kindly give it to your constituents before they vote, September 12?

Look at the surprising figures from Maine as they will, Republicans are unable to see in them anything but a gloomy prophecy of disaster in the November elections. In short, we have today conclusive evidence that President Taft was right when he said last winter, with appalling frankness, that the signs were plain that his Administration was not popular, and that the Democrats would elect a majority of the next House of Representatives. The business world has pretty plainly settled down to that belief. All along, it has been in the air; the Maine election crystallizes it into figures which not even the blindly partisan can misread.

WHITHER IS ROOSEVELT DRIFTING?

That Mr. Roosevelt has appropriated virtually the entire Bryan baggage, with the exception of the defunct free-silver issue, has become one of the accepted commonplace of American politics. We do not remember that the assertion has ever been seriously denied. But there is a matter of far greater importance than any mere question of originality, or priority, or plagiarism. The fact is that Mr. Roosevelt has done much more than make his own the specific purposes for which Mr. Bryan stood, many of which were wholesome and necessary. He has adopted Bryan's attitude toward the great underlying problems of the economic organization of society; has adopted that attitude and gone much farther with it than Mr. Bryan ever undertook to do. What that attitude is, it would be difficult to define; but its essence consists in a readiness to assume as a governmental function the task of remediating economic evils or anomalies, however deep may be their foundation in the inmost structure of our economic life, and however violent may be the departure from the established principles of our government which that task inevitably involves. In this direction, Roosevelt has utterly distanced Bryan; and in his Osawatomie speech he gave the clearest possible indication that what he has thus far done and said is but an earnest of what he stands ready to say and do in the future.

These things being so, it is extremely instructive to turn back to the record of the time when Mr. Bryan was making his first great fight, and when Mr. Roosevelt was making speeches against
The Nation.

The Fisheries Decision.

The full meaning of the award handed down by the Hague Tribunal in the Newfoundland fisheries arbitration can be attained only by considering certain circumstances of which the court and the court’s opinion seem to have taken no official cognizance. Even Washington concedes that on the face of the award Great Britain has won a substantial victory. Of the seven questions submitted for adjudication the two principal ones have been decided in her favor. Of the five minor points decided in favor of the United States, several bear conditions and limitations; so that here, too, Great Britain has not lost everything. The two points on which she won declare that Great Britain is entitled to make local fishing regulations without the consent of our government, and that the three-mile zone from which American vessels are excluded shall be measured from a line stretching across the mouth of open bays instead of following the windings of the shore line of the bay. Under the American contention it would have been possible for our fishermen to enter bays more than six miles wide and three miles deep. By the Hague award they may not enter any bay, no matter how broad and deep it may be.

Here, apparently, is a heavy setback for our fishermen, to be thus excluded from waters which at certain seasons constitute the most valuable fishing grounds. But here, too, enters the highly important fact that this American fishery over which we have been at odds with Great Britain from the very first years of our national existence, has, for the last half-century, been no fishery at all, but a branch of international trade. We have, before this, quoted the succinct statement by a Newfoundland journalist, that “the practice of fifty years has been for American vessels to visit the coast and purchase cargoes of these herrings from resident fishermen who actually caught them and sold them to the American crafts as a matter of ordinary commerce.” Hence to be excluded from certain valuable coast waters or not to be excluded, makes comparatively little difference to our sturdy American fishermen for whose benefit the heavy duty on foreign fish is writ-