

ter." After explaining why he is "lukewarm or tepid" in support of it, he introduces an epigram. It is one of those Rooseveltian epigrams which are strikingly axiomatic in form but amazingly false in the application he makes of them. "Man and woman should stand on an equality of right," he proclaims, "but equality of right does not mean identity of function." Nothing could be truer. Yet Mr. Roosevelt makes an utterly false application of that truth. He implies that voting is itself a function—a masculine function. But in truth, voting is only a mechanism for the performance of public functions—feminine public functions as well as masculine. His idea is that the sole function of woman is motherhood. But motherhood means infinitely more than child bearing and child rearing. It means also citizen rearing. And then there is wifehood as well as motherhood, and sisterhood as well as both, each having civic functions. How can there be complete wifehood or sisterhood or motherhood in segregation from public affairs? In the absence of that understanding of public affairs which is bred by the interest in them which can spring only from participation, complete womanhood—which includes complete motherhood—is impossible. The mother without a voice in the fostering of the municipal family and the regulation of the national household, must be of an extraordinary type if she maintains even her own intelligence and love of citizenship. How then can she foster that intelligence and that love in her children? Mr. Roosevelt might as well expect an ill-bred woman to rear a well-bred family as a disfranchised woman to rear children of genuine public spirit.

* *

The "Suffragette" Tactics.

It is somewhat difficult to believe that some of the leaders in the disturbance tactics which London "suffragettes" have adopted are sincerely desirous of securing legislation favorable to woman suffrage. Lack of common sense would seem to be the only explanation, other than lack of good faith, for their conduct at the meeting of the Woman's Liberal League last week. The meeting was not theirs. The hall had been hired by another organization for a particular purpose, and in so far as they were invited at all it was as guests and upon the tacit understanding that they would respect the rights of their hosts. The speaker was a member of the ministry who is thoroughly identified with the woman suffrage movement, and has undertaken the task of securing the presentation by the ministry to Parliament of a woman suffrage measure. He was present on this

occasion to explain the situation to a woman suffrage meeting called by a woman suffrage organization. Yet a collection of women, professing to want what he is trying to secure, and what he is likely to be successful in securing, and was there to report to the public upon—they turn the peaceable meeting into a riotous gathering at which the speaker cannot be heard. They would deserve the severest condemnation had they done this at a hostile meeting. To do it at a meeting intended to promote the cause for which they profess to stand, adds another to the reasons for condemning them.

* *

The Steel Trust and the Tariff.

A curious fact is noticeable in connection with the tariff investigation which the House committee on ways and means is conducting in Washington. Not only are they apparently unable to draw out any information from the steel trust, but the steel magnates seem to be wholly indifferent to tariff legislation. Can it be, then, that Mr. Carnegie's recent outcome for free trade is the voice of the trust itself? Mr. Carnegie has been suspected of becoming a free trader because he no longer needs a tariff—having salted away his tariff plunder where free competition cannot break in and dissipate. But it is possible that he is only acting as spokesman for the trust. It is possible that protection is no longer of any use to them, is a positive hindrance, and that they would rather have it abolished than not. This suspicion is certainly in keeping with their behavior in giving the tariff committee a cavalier go by. And it is explainable upon the fact that the steel trust has acquired the richest sources of production on the planet. With its acquisition of the Tennessee properties for a song (p. 679) it got into a position where all the iron interests of the world are at its mercy. Why should the steel trust bother Congress for protection when it can make and enforce its own?

* *

An Abuse of Statistics.

A glaring example of a common misuse of labor statistics in support of protection, appears in a document recently submitted to the House committee on ways and means by the paper trust (p. 146). It pleads for continuance of the present prohibitive duties on news paper. The plea is of course in behalf, not of the trust but of its workmen! To show that it is the workmen that will suffer if the tariff be abolished, this document produces a page of comparative wage statistics

from the Bureau of Statistics at Washington, showing higher wages here than abroad. The comparison is made on the basis of day's wages—not piece wages, but day's wages. Yet the paper trust's document proceeds to argue from those rates of day's wages, that the comparative labor cost per ton would be so and so. Whether this estimate of labor cost per ton—showing a higher cost here than abroad—is a fact or not, the document does not state. It only infers that inasmuch as labor by the day is to a certain degree more here than abroad, therefore the labor cost per ton is to a certain degree more here than there. The inference is unwarranted. In all probability the labor cost per ton here is less than abroad, for the productiveness of labor here is greater. But at any rate the trust does not prove by its comparison that American labor would suffer by importations of cheap paper from abroad. You can no more make such a comparison of day's wages with tons produced, than you can compare apples with eggs. The trust would doubtless suffer from loss of the tariff; but its workmen would not suffer unless the trust is paying them more per ton than it has to—which nobody suspects it of doing, and least of all its own employes.

+

The point involved is well illustrated by a letter submitted through Congressman Champ Clark to the Ways and Means Committee by W. L. Crosman of Boston. Mr. Crosman states that, as he is informed, weavers in England get \$6 a week, and turn out an average of 1,100 yards of cloth; while in this country the pay is \$9 a week and the production 2,100 yards. Here we have an instance of time wages abroad being lower than in the United States, and yet of labor cost being higher abroad. In this instance a protective tariff in cloth wouldn't raise weavers' wages here. Whether Mr. Crosman is correctly informed or not as to the particular instance (and he probably is) the instances of which that instance may serve as an example are abundant.

* *

Tariff Disclosures.

Jesse F. Orton's Washington correspondence relative to the hearings before the Ways and Means committee of the House in its tariff investigation, furnishes illuminating news matter. One of his nuggets—and a nugget it is—he found in the testimony of a manufacturer of varnish who stood stiff for a protective tariff. This witness talked too much. In the course of what his protection brethren doubtless regarded as superflu-

ous information for the purpose, he told of selling American varnish abroad at a profit. But he wants protection for American varnish. Otherwise he couldn't sell his varnish in this country at exorbitant prices. He didn't say that exactly, but that is exactly what he meant if he meant anything. The same witness had had experience with sewing machines, having sold in South Africa for \$19.50 the identical kind of machines that were selling in the United States at the same time for \$65. He had also sold plows there for \$8.50 for which farmers in the United States paid at the same time from \$12.50 to \$20. When the witness was asked—he was N. B. Arnold, of the Keystone Varnish Company of Brooklyn, by the way—whether he didn't sell abroad at a loss, he laughed the idea to scorn. He was an exporter for profit, not for his health. On maintaining the tariff for protection of the American market, however, he was a "standpatter" with the rest; it makes for more profit on home sales, to the benefit of the seller and the impoverishment of the consumer.

* *

The Army Uniform.

A singular complaint finds voice through the press of the country, a typical instance being in an issue of the Washington Post. "In the very capital itself," the Post complains, "is witnessed the strange spectacle of a soldier or a sailor turned away from places where all other people have the right to go, solely because he wears the uniform of his country's service." This is evidently an error. Soldiers and sailors in the uniform of commissioned officers would not be turned away from any place where other people have the right to go. It is not because the common soldier "wears the uniform of his country's service" that he is turned away. It is because he wears the uniform of a menial—of a person unfit for social equality with his officers. If army and navy officers did not draw the line of social equality against army privates and navy sailors, no one else would draw it.

* *

Election Frauds in Chicago.

A bi-partisan combine of political jobbers in Chicago has virtually ruled the city for years. Political corruption did not go out with the routing of the "grey wolves." A worse combination succeeded—a combination which has had the vitalizing force of the Big Business interests within it, and on the outside a polish of sepulchral whiteness. Although this congenial "crowd" of hoodlums and pharisees have affected elections, al-