

plete control of our markets. The old prejudices in favor of the "Old Flag" were worked for all they were worth. We were threatened with cheapness and abundance. In argument the adversaries of reciprocity were bankrupt, and mentally they were derelicts. Nevertheless, they carried the day.

Outside of Ontario, in the rest of the Dominion, the friends of freedom have the majority. The influence of the manufacturers and millionaires seems to have gained the upper hand in this Province.

We are a country of churches, many churches, and we are a good churchly people; but we don't fail to devour the widow's house. Wisdom will have to cry and utter her voice in the streets a good many Sundays before she finds ears that will hear.

W. A. DOUGLASS.

✦ ✦ ✦

THE NEWER IDEALS OF SUFFRAGE.

New York, Sept. 24.

Gov. Hay of Washington made a strong plea for Direct Legislation at the meeting in Cooper Union,* arranged by the Women's Political Union, and at which the speakers were the Governors of the five suffrage States—Wyoming, Utah, Washington, Idaho and Colorado. All of them told of improved conditions in their States, due, in their opinion, to the part taken by women in politics, but Gov. Hay showed how woman suffrage was only one of the innovations which have proved so beneficial in the youngest among the States. Hand in hand with it went the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. Others of the Governors told of the good done by direct primaries, and all emphasized the fact that the women voters were as a rule solid for any innovations that would mean more direct and honest rule by the people.

This brought the suffrage talk at the meeting more in touch with other necessary political reforms, of which woman suffrage is merely one, than it usually is. Altogether the meeting was an occasion of high political importance and spoke well for the immense strides taken by organizations of women in the last few years. An interesting advance in public enlightenment was shown in the temper of speakers and audience, but most particularly in the temper of the audience and its manner of reacting to the sentiments expressed by the speakers.

It was the first opportunity several of the speakers have had of addressing a New York audience, and they made the most of it. But in spite of the large attendance of suffrage sympathizers, the audience was characteristically a Cooper Union gathering, which, it may be said has laws of its own. It took no interest whatever in platitudes concerning our country's "glorious past." But it was keenly alive to anything concerning the questions of the day and sensitively aware of how backward New York is in matters of State and city housekeeping.

It was also interesting to note that even the suffrage women had lost their enthusiasm over some arguments which they themselves used strongly but a few years back. When one of the Governors appealed to the audience to say why Mrs. Hearst, Mrs. Harriman and other women controlling large estates philanthropically should not be accorded the privi-

lege given men in their employ at ten dollars a week, or even, dreadful thought, accorded the loafer on the street in front of their palaces, not a hand was struck in the audience or on the platform. The women heading the suffrage movement of today have realized that this sort of argument is of no value and is for them of doubtful taste and more than doubtful logic. Woman has been the "under dog" politically so long that she is beginning to understand she must cast in her lot with the other under dogs, and that it will do her no good to claim political rights and duties by appealing to any property qualification she may possess. She must ask for them on the ground of simple justice alone.

Another reflection called out by this meeting was the backward-mindedness of the New York dailies in persisting in having a "women's club meeting," no matter of what character, reported by young men just trying to make good as novices, or by women who do "society notes" and the like. The true significance of this particular meeting would have been best understood and brought out by a writer of considerable political insight. Possibly that was why it was treated by most papers as it was. It was a "women's meeting," and also it concerned political innovations in the Western States. It appears to lie in the interest of most journals in this city to keep their readers in pleasing ignorance concerning Western political innovations.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

PROTECTION FOR WOOL GROWERS.

Kansas City, Mo.

Many voters and their wives and children shiver in cold weather for want of woolen clothing and blankets. They know that the tariff on wool and woolen goods makes consumers pay \$1.75 for each dollar's worth of woollens; and while they cannot afford to buy, they take some consolation from the fact that though they and their little ones shiver, wool-growers get a benefit.

And wool-growers—they vote year after year for tariff taxes on everything, with the idea that they receive part of the robbery in the 11 cents per pound of tariff on wool. They fool themselves. Since the wool trust organized in 1876, wool growers have never received a penny a pound of benefit out of the 11-cent tax.

Yet consumers pay as much for manufactured woollens as though wool growers received that 11 cents. We export some fine wool, but we could not do so if it was worth 11 cents per pound more at home than in London.

We import some 200,000,000 pounds of coarse carpet wool, hair of the alpaca goat and camels' hair, commodities we do not produce in this country. On the imported wool and hair, the wool trust pays a duty. But that does not mean that it pays the American wool growers 11 cents a pound extra for tariff tax. Wool is worth no more in this country than in Australia or New Zealand where there is no tariff tax.

The following quotations on wool ought to con-

*See last week's Public, page 979.