

advertising,  
insurance,  
legal expenses,  
all costs for damages to persons and property,  
the clearing of all wrecks,  
the generous salaries paid to officers,  
millions for oil and  
waste for locomotives,  
other millions said to have been paid for water  
for locomotives,  
many millions reported to have been disbursed  
but for what specific purposes does not appear  
except that they are said to have been paid for  
"other expenses,"—

*and to this aggregate add—*

all disbursements for purposes other than oper-  
ating expenses,  
the aggregate taxes of 40 years,  
rentals for leased lines,  
considerable sums reported as real estate expenses,  
and

*several millions reported to have been set aside  
to redeem financial obligations without explaining  
how or when they were redeemed or offering evi-  
dence that they ever were redeemed;—*

adding all those disbursements together, all which  
are indicated above, *all of them*, and deducting the  
grand total from the aggregate income or revenue  
reported for the same period, and the remainder  
shows the *profit of twenty-four cents net on each  
dollar of income.*

It is a *clear profit* of several thousand dollars  
in excess of 457 millions—about \$1,315 for *every  
hour, day and night*, from October 31, 1869, to  
July 1, 1909.

LEVI STEVENS LEWIS.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### CANADIAN ELECTIONS.

Toronto, Sept. 22, 1911.

When the news came to us that President Taft had offered reciprocity to Canada, it seemed too good to be true; and when the items were given, I must confess my astonishment at the generosity of the offer. It was truly a parting of the ways. After a period of half a century of unneighborly, unbrotherly, obstruction of trade between these two contiguous nations, a proposal to remove that obstruction, though only partial, seemed so good that I never dreamt that the Dominion would do anything but accept it most joyfully.

Here was a step, though not very large, towards that peace and good will for which we have been praying during the long ages. Besides that we are rapidly approaching the hundredth anniversary of the peace at the conclusion of the war of 1812. The

proposal had gone forth that there should be a grand love feast to celebrate this centennial of peace, that at that celebration the flags of the two nations should be entwined, the hands of the representatives should be grasped, that a pledge of eternal peace should be entered into, while the nations would join with heartiest joy in the song, "Blest be the tie that binds."

Some of us had visions that the two countries by that time would have come to recognize the grand truth, that this world is the gift of God to all the members of his family, and that the terrible injustice of allowing one part of the race to charge the rest for occupation of the surface of the planet would have ceased, that taxation would so far absorb community values that the despoiling speculator would have been converted to the enriching producer, so that all the relics of barbarism in the shape of custom barriers, would have disappeared, leaving each location to do its best for the rest of the world. But what is our disappointment when we see over here the friends of freedom rejected, the Presidential offer of good will treated with scorn, and a policy of severance and hostility adopted amid the acclaim of the multitude. This is not the first time that the people have turned their backs on truth and progress. We all have read of a famous election when the overwhelming majority called out for the robber Barrabas and rejected the Prince of Peace.



The province of Ontario is a peninsula wedged into the United States. To the south, the east and the west she is within easy access of a number of cities close to her borders, cities which are her natural markets. The farmers with their eggs, butter, fruit and vegetables can gaze on the cities of Buffalo and Detroit, and yet in many cases, for commercial purposes, with a double tariff barrier, they might as well be a thousand miles away. At any time within a few hours her vegetables, grains or fruits could reach millions of people in the States; under these circumstances who would ever imagine that a population of a little over two million people would of their own free choice vote in favor of excluding themselves from their best markets? With an everlasting wilderness to the north and the finest market in the world just at their doors to the south, they have voted to cut themselves off from their very best customers, and in degree make the south practically a wilderness, too.

Paralyzed on one side, Ontario has voted for paralysis on the other side also. A natural blockade of snow and ice isolates her on the north, then she puts up another blockade to cut herself off from the south. Had a similar vote been presented to any group of two million people in the United States, can we imagine that half a dozen people could be found to vote "yea"? Yet this Province of Ontario elects seventy-one representatives in favor of blockade and isolation, and only fourteen in favor of greater freedom.

The appeals of the papers and politicians of the obstruction cast were of the most disgraceful character. President Taft was represented as having some ulterior and sinister motive. Free trade with the States was spoken of as a kind of slavery or robbery,—that the people of your Republic would get com-

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.