

in Monroe, La., Edmonton, Alberta, and in many other places large and small. One of the most widely advertised experiments in municipalization of public utilities is the street car system of Glasgow, Scotland, which the recent report of James Dalrymple, the general manager, shows to be an unqualified success. Not only was there an increase of \$350,000 in the earnings over the preceding year, but this result was accomplished in spite of the fact that the minimum fare of two cents had been reduced to one cent. As the two-cent fare furnished the major part of the revenue, its halving was looked upon by timid citizens as inviting disaster. The amount received from one-cent fares was \$2,114,624; from two-cent fares, \$1,827,727; three-cent, \$647,913; four-cent, \$263,476; five-cent, \$146,947; six-cent, \$82,188; seven-cent, \$79,937; eight-cent, \$13,679. It will be noted that the larger the fare the smaller the amount of revenue received, and that receipts increased through the several classes as the fare was reduced, the one-cent fare earning the largest revenue of all.



This showing of Mr. Dalrymple's report that nearly four-fifths of the total revenue was derived from the one and two-cent fares, with the one-cent fare supplying the larger part, is in keeping with the fact that it is ever the low fare that supplies the bulk of the revenue. It is so in India, in Russia, and in Europe, where the railroads derive their main support from the third and fourth class passengers, who must make up for the fine carriages occupied by the first class passengers. It is so on many of the trans-Atlantic ships, where immigrants pay for the luxurious appointments of the cabins. And it is so in this country, where the deficit of the "limited" trains, and the "trains de luxe," is made up by the people in the common coaches of the local trains. It is apparent that the average citizen is, so far as the true functions of government are concerned, in the primary class. He knows so little about the question that he falls an easy prey to the machinations of interested persons. But each new success in municipal management tends toward enlightenment of the public and an enlightened public is all that is necessary to bring about the municipalization of public utilities. S. C.



"To the Editor."

Those only who have had to do with newspaper publications know the thrills incident to the reading of the criticisms of correspondents, which

range all the way from the "stop my paper" of a fighting patriot, to the "more power to your pen" of a Singletaxer. But all are welcome. The stop-my-paper missives temper editorial conceit; they visualize to his aspiring mind the words of the preacher, "All is vanity," they jolt him out of his self-complacency; and they tend to keep his feet on the ground. And yet, when he has been utterly cast down; when his soul is sick, and three Republicans stop his paper; when the Democrats in Congress demonstrate the appropriateness of the party emblem, and he cries out in the anguish of his soul, What's the use?, there comes from Podunk, or Cherry Center, or New York, the little more-power-to-your-pen letter, and all is well. The skies brighten, the birds sing, the children laugh, and the editor sallies forth to bag another dragon.



But other letters come—for the post office censorship is by no means complete. A correspondent asks, "Why do you insist upon ending every editorial with a reference to the Singletax? Stop kicking. Forget your grouch. Give us something light and witty." These are the unreasonable readers. They would have grapes from thorns and figs from thistles. It is not every editor who can snap his fingers at Fate, or crack jokes over impending social cataclysms. There is only one W. M. Reedy to pad his kicks with witticisms and decorate his grouches with scintillating figures of speech. The rest must get on as best they can with such brains as niggardly Nature has given them. If the editorials do not sparkle it is not by design; and if merriment is too often absent from the page, remember The Public does not pose as a "funny" paper, but that it is trying to the best of its ability to aid those who are striving for justice.

S. C.



THE NEXT TARIFF BATTLE.

The Democratic platform of 1912 declares "it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal government, under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of government economically administered."

The Underwood tariff bill redeemed this pledge, so far as the Democratic Congressional caucus thought it, for the time being, consistent with this subsequent paragraph of the platform: "We favor the ultimate attainment of the principles,

we advocate by legislation that will not injure or destroy legitimate industry." In other words the destruction of the protective tariff must be brought about by easy stages, but that it must be ultimately destroyed is a principle long recognized in Democratic platforms. In 1892 the platform declared "Republican protection is a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few."



Whilst the Underwood tariff has dealt protection a staggering blow and achieved all the reduction possible in any one general revision bill, nevertheless it is framed on recognized protective principles—principles fundamentally undemocratic. This implies no criticism of the splendid work already accomplished. The platform did not intend, nor did it promise that the indefensible schedules of the protective tariff should be all wiped out at once, but its ultimate destruction is distinctly and unequivocally stated as a "fundamental principle of 'Democratic' faith. The future of the Democratic party and the Nation's prosperity demand that the party faithfully redeem a pledge that is basic to its very existence.



Before making another forward movement a new plan of attack must be decided upon. Another general revision is not to be thought of; because, bound together by a common interest the tariff beneficiaries cannot thus be further dislodged. Just as a man with a giant's strength may be unable to break a bundle of sticks, every one of which a child can easily break when taken separately, so the protective tariff, attacked in detail, schedule by schedule, can easily be destroyed. Determine the weakest point and thereon concentrate the first attack. Start on the schedules which oppress the largest number of people.

Primary necessities of life articles used by every inhabitant of the country are not proper subjects for revenue tariffs. Such are cotton and woolen goods, which are worn by every class, from pauper to millionaire. The same principle which induced the placing of the chief food products on the free list should here govern. Such taxes bear most heavily on the very poorest. Unlike the income tax, they fall on the man with a large family with manifold greater weight than on the bachelor. In short, these taxes are proportioned to the size of a man's family, proportioned to the amount of clothing he buys. Can anyone doubt that a bill placing the entire woolen and

cotton schedules on the free list would, if submitted to popular vote, command such an overwhelming majority that no party would defy public opinion by attempting its repeal? Its popularity would undoubtedly for a long time hold the Democratic party in power and give its tariff policy a stability hitherto unknown. Lack of stability is one great drawback to any tariff whatsoever. Stability is desirable in any kind of legislation, but frequent tariff changes are more disastrous to business than most any other legislative changes, and yet nowhere is change more frequent than in tariff laws. This is a very strong objection to any kind of tariff whether for revenue or protection. The best friends of the tariff admit that the ever-changing conditions of trade, manufacture and prices necessitate corresponding changes in the tariff. Hence Republicans enact a "perfect tariff law" and subsequently change it themselves. To prevent unnecessary tariff tinkering they propose a tariff commission.

A much better plan would be to change only a few schedules at a time, subject to a referendum vote of the people. If one question more than another requires to be submitted to popular vote it surely is the tariff, for the very reason that an unpopular tariff act could not then become law and a tariff known to meet with public approval will be less subject to change.



Free listing the woolen and cotton schedules cannot fail to be immensely popular, because every human being in the United States needs clothing and when these goods are placed on the free list they will not be subject to further tariff tinkering.

The tariff on woolen and cotton goods is often spoken of as the keystone of the protective arch, and just as the removal of the keystone so weakens an arch that it will fall with the least jar, so will the removal of the tariff from cotton and woolen goods so weaken the entire tariff structure that the breath of public opinion will soon shatter it to pieces.

Woolen and cotton manufacturers have been the most liberal contributors to Republican campaigns. They have subsidized the press and for almost two decades sustained the supremacy of the Republican party. When their graft is gone, with public opinion so strongly set against a woolen or cotton tariff that there can be no hope of its re-imposition the champions of protection will become advocates of free trade. They will argue that it is unfair that they should be deprived of their ancient graft whilst other indus-

tries are still favored, and just as hitherto they had been the leaders of protection, their own financial interest will now make them clamor for the repeal of all the multitudinous tariffs which help to raise the price of the raw material and machinery necessary to their own industries. Dye stuffs, stationary engines with their appurtenances, spinning machinery, etc., would be placed on the free list with practically no opposition. As the free list would thus be broadened the number of free traders would correspondingly be increased until at no distant date every vestige of protection would be wiped from the statute books.



A new source of revenue having become available through the income tax, the excuse for a revenue tariff does not now appeal with anything like the force it did a year or two ago. Should this source of revenue be insufficient to meet the expanding free list it could well be supplemented by a heavy inheritance tax. Such a tax would not discourage energy or enterprise. Moreover, it is a generally recognized fact that an inheritance, exceeding a very moderate one, is more of a curse than a blessing to its recipient. Hence taxes on such inheritances would relieve a tariff burdened people without injuring anyone.

Another principle involved, is the introduction of the Referendum into national politics. This will render the Democratic party immensely popular with that class of progressives in all parties who favor the principle of the Initiative and Referendum. Many Republicans and all Progressive Congressmen will feel in duty bound to vote for such a tariff measure, because of its influence in furtherance of the Referendum. An impulse would surely be given to this cause that its sincere advocates cannot fail to grasp. No amount of theoretic literature and speeches could give it a boost comparable with this practical nationwide application of the Referendum principle.

E. J. BATTEN.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

CONGRESSMEN AT THEIR OLD TRICKS.

Washington, July 13.

Does this Congress intend to pass a publicity law* which will enable the voters to know who is putting up the money in the election this fall?

Or have the Standpatters who control both the old-line parties through the caucus system, arrived at a quiet bi-partisan agreement that there shall be no publicity for the November election at which every seat in the House is to be filled, and one-third of those in the Senate?

Narrowing down again, is the party in power going to sidestep legislation which will give the people any of that "pitiless publicity" we have been hearing about since 1908?

Congressman Rucker of Missouri says not. During the debate in the House last Wednesday upon the bill proposing publicity for campaign contributions, replying to a question by Congressman Bryan of Washington, he said: "There is no probability of this bill becoming a law before the next election this fall."

Mr. Rucker spoke with the positive assurance of a man who knew things from "way back." As chairman of the House Committee on Elections, which reported the bill, he is in a position to know. He further warned the House that anything broader or more effective than his bill would be rejected by the Senate, and if the Senate did strengthen it, the House would not concur.

This is not welcome news to the voters of this nation, who know that the corrupt use of enormous sums of money in influencing elections strikes at the heart of popular government, and is a danger to the republic, and who, on this account, have been demanding publicity for years.

The Democratic platform of 1908 contained a plank on "publicity of campaign contributions," starting thus: "We demand Federal legislation forever terminating the partnership which has existed between corporations of the country and the Republican party." The 1912 platform reaffirmed this plank. The Republican platform of 1912 contained a plank along the same lines, but what have they done?

In 1910 the Republican Congress, under the control of the Aldrich-Cannon machine, passed a bogus publicity law, the main joker of which lay in its application only to such campaign committees as operate "in two or more states." Hence, the predatory corporations could get in their work through State and local committees without publicity. It was denounced by insurgent Republicans and progressive Democrats, but it was "put over" and has accomplished its design—nothing.

And now, after all this agitation, comes the Democratic Committee on Elections in the House, solemnly proposing to re-enact the Republican fiasco of 1910.

Last Wednesday, the day on which the bill was scheduled to pass the House, the National Popular Government League, with headquarters in this city, sent a letter to every member of the House, protesting against its passage. Judson King, the Executive Secretary of the League, eschewing the polite and diplomatic language customary among Congressmen, and using the speech of the folks back home, told the members that the bill was a plain "fake." No less strenuous speech would have produced a dent in the smooth working of the machine at that late hour. Mr. King was specific in his charges. He pointed out the following "chief jokers": The bill retained the "two States" provision; it required no publicity from State, district or local committees in primary elections, nor from persons, firms or other organizations than political committees, in primary elections while compelling the candidate himself to give publicity—a joker clearly setting free the Big Interests to work for their men in secret; it limited

*See Public of April 21, 1911, at page 369.