

which he might well have taken hot from Professor Laughlin's opening speech, that *voluntary trading benefits both parties*.

+ +

Democracy and Free Wool.

Democratic leaders may well pause to consider the probable effect upon national politics of President Taft's freetrade advances in contrast with their own action on the wool tariff. If the people were to get a notion that the protected Interests are moving away from the Republican party and sidling up to the Democratic party, and that Democrats are making them welcome while Republicans are giving them a goodbye kick, the Democratic leaders might be surprised at the result of the elections next year. Let those Democratic leaders mark well the warning. They may be helping President Taft to drive into the people's heads that very notion about him and the Interests and themselves.

+

No one should lightly criticize the Democratic tariff of 20 per cent on raw wool. A reduction by one-half, it is indisputably a revision downward. This is at any rate keeping the Republican pledge, however it may be with the Democratic. Moreover, the excuse of Democratic leaders for retaining any tariff at all on raw wool, is that it is necessary for revenue purposes. Of the validity of this excuse we confess our incompetency to judge—considering the excuse by itself. We know that national revenues are necessary. We know that the obligations of previous Congresses must be provided for, in so far as they cannot be Constitutionally repudiated. We know that national revenues must be raised largely by tariffs on imports, until the Constitution is amended in that respect. We know that the Constitution cannot be thus amended in time for the present Congress to abolish duties on imports. We do *not* know, however, whether duties on raw wool are really necessary for revenue purposes. Neither does any one else *know*. All of us therefore should be considerate toward those Democratic leaders in Congress upon whom the responsibility, both official and political, for guessing right on that question happens to rest. If, then, the necessity for relying upon a tariff on wool for revenue purposes were one of good guessmanship alone, we should be for standing by the Congressmen who have the political and official responsibility. But there is reason to fear that revenue necessity is not the controlling purpose.

+

So far from being a revenue purpose, the con-

trolling purpose appears to be protection for wool growers. If there is indeed a revenue necessity, it seems to come into play less as a deplorable but imperative fiscal need, than as a happy protection accident. This is a conclusion which, in so far as it may affect Chairman Underwood, we would rather escape than adopt. He has seemed to be among the ideal leaders for our struggle between democracy and plutocracy. But he himself, unless falsely reported, has made declarations that give to his purpose regarding the proposed wool tariff, a protection color which no appeal to revenue necessity can wholly wash out. We allude to that part of Mr. Underwood's argument for a duty on raw wool in which he opposes putting wool on the free list *because* this would cheapen its cost to manufacturers without reducing the prices of their products to consumers.

+

The argument is the same that Senator Bailey made in his Texas debates with Bryan eighteen months ago.* As an economic argument, it is utterly fallacious. As an excuse for duties on raw wool, it is in its origin an ingenious invention in behalf of the protected Interests. With wool on the free list, protection is damned. With a protective tariff on wool, be it 44 per cent or 20 per cent, all protected interests are buttressed by the raw wool interests. And that a 20 per cent tariff is protective, Chairman Underwood himself bears witness. Else what does he mean when he argues, as Senator Bailey did against Bryan, that as long as there is a tariff on woolen manufactures there must be a tariff on raw wool? Is that a *revenue* policy? Isn't it distinctly a protection policy?

+ +

Bryan's Dictatorship.

Chairman Underwood's verbal assault upon Bryan as a dictator has an unfortunate tendency to confirm a conjecture that he may have fallen under the Bailey influence—an influence which in the last analysis is that of the protected Interests. It may have been only the careless expression of a momentary irritability. Let us hope so. But charges of political dictatorship against Bryan have a suspicious significance, no matter who utters them; for this kind of warfare upon Bryan originated with the plutocratic elements in the Democratic party.

+

It is an accusation that cannot be made by any one in good faith. How can a man be a political

*See The Public, volume xiii, page 122.

dictator who holds no public office, who holds no party chairmanship, who belongs to no inside clique, who has no Big Business affiliations, who cannot pull a single secret wire in politics, whose only political power is the confidence which a vast majority of the masses of his party repose in his fidelity? Bryan's political power has no other source nor support than that well-earned confidence. He hasn't any longer even the dubious power of a possible candidate for the Presidency, for he has distinctly declared his intentions on that score. That the power such a man as Bryan has is to be dreaded by some kinds of political managers is true enough; but not by any of the kind with whom we still wish to identify Chairman Underwood. The test, however, of all such political managers is that they, as Mr. Underwood seems to have done, mistake the wholesome power of a trusted leader for the dangerous dictatorship of a boss.

+ +

Republican Insurgency.

If the Democratic party needs warning against the possible effects of a popular tendency to **contrast** the wool-protection policy of their majority in Congress with President Taft's apparent awakening to the advantages of free trade, Republican progressives also need a warning, and one not altogether dissimilar. Their opposition to Canadian reciprocity is almost certain to ruin them in national politics. They are not to be criticized lightly on this question, any more than the Democrats on the wool-tariff, for their position is one of responsibility and difficulty. It may be, too, that the Taft reciprocity agreement was set for them as a trap. But to the outsider it would appear that they are less likely to be trapped if they pick up the trap and walk away with it than if they try to kick it aside.

+ +

Is it not time for these men to impress upon their constituents the fact that protected Interests have been deceiving their party all these years, and making it a tool of plutocracy through its attachment to the economically unsound and morally revolting theory of protection? Do these Republican statesmen, progressive though they are, still hold to the notion that a protective tariff is necessary to equalize labor cost? That this notion is as ill-founded as all the other protection rubbish, their constituents are rapidly learning. A country of high wages is a country of low labor cost. Unless they themselves also learn this lesson, they may soon

turn up at the wrong end of a long procession and in uncongenial company.

+ +

Wages.

In so far as Republicans are sincere in contending for tariffs high enough to cover differences in cost of American over foreign goods caused by the higher wages that prevail in this country they are better freetraders than Democrats of the Bailey brand. The logic of their position necessitates their destroying protection, root and branch, if once they realize that American wages are higher than foreign wages for other than tariff reasons. And that this is so is the truth. The only reason for its seeming to be not so, is that protectionists contrast American with British wages, and then—with no proof, no argument, "no nothing" except their confidence in the stupidity and gullibility of their victims—attribute the higher wages of the United States to our protection policy, and the lower wages of Great Britain to her free trade policy. The true comparison is not between this country under protection and a European country under free trade; it is between two European countries, one with free trade and the other with protection.

+ +

This comparison has been recently made by the British Board of Trade. As reported in a recent issue of the (Philadelphia) Saturday Evening Post, the comparison is between free trade in Great Britain and protection in Germany. Germany copied our protection system more than 20 years ago, and here is the result so far as hired labor is affected, 100 being taken as the unit for calculation:

	Wages.	Hours of Work.	Hourly Wage.
Great Britain	100	100	100
Germany	83	111	75
German wages lower.....	17%
German hours longer.....	...	11%	...
German hourly wage lower.	25%

+ +

Is Work Plentiful?

Anybody that wants work can get it and with decent pay. So we are told. By persons who don't need jobs, to be sure, yet who mean well. But how does that assurance tally with the threat of the Chicago elevated railroads regarding the extension of the ten hour law for women to their fare collectors? They employ women as fare collectors at poor pay for 12 hours' work a day. The 10-hour law extended to their work would compel