

that the *time* consumed in production, and never the resulting *product*, is the basis of comparison. Because labor abroad gets, say, a dollar a day, whereas American labor in the same industry gets, say, two dollars, the conclusion is implied and often asserted, that American industries cannot pay American wages unless competing foreign products are burdened with a tariff high enough to make up for the lower wages abroad. This is like saying that a freight car can't compete with a wheelbarrow because it costs so much more. The comparative *productiveness* of American and foreign labor, the determining factor, is ignored. If American labor at two dollars a day produces, say, twice as much in a day as labor abroad at one dollar a day, why is Protection necessary to maintain American wages?

+

That is the question Protectionists will have to answer to a long befooled people, when the Insurgents shall have made common knowledge of the difference between cost of production abroad and at home,—which is one of our reasons for liking the Insurgents in spite of their fatuous confidence in the soundness and wisdom of Protection. We suspect that it is one of the reasons why they are not liked by Aldrich and other shrewd beneficiaries of Protection.

+ *

The Oregon Fight for People's Power in Government.

We advise all persons, wherever they may live, who are interested in clearing the Jungle and killing the Beast that Judge Ben B. Lindsey tells about, to send to W. S. U'Ren, Oregon City, Oregon, for a pamphlet just published as a campaign document in the People's Power fight in Oregon. Although the pamphlet would doubtless be mailed free of charge to any applicant, applicants ought to enclose at least a small campaign contribution to cover the cost of complying with their request. In addition to its local value as a campaign document, this pamphlet is a capital supplement to Senator Bourne's speech (pp. 697, 698); for, as the speech graphically describes the progress Oregon has already made in government *by* the people, the pamphlet—which ought to be got into the hands of every voter in Oregon, of every voter in every State for that matter—describes as graphically the efforts, on the one hand to strengthen the political power of the people and on the other to pull it up by the roots, which are to be voted on at the election in November. No one who reads this pamphlet and Bourne's speech, can be

deceived by the newspaper misrepresentation that has already set in regarding the struggle in Oregon which is now under way.

+

Some of the formal features of the Oregon pamphlet are interesting for peculiarities required by the Oregon election laws. For instance, in order to comply with the "corrupt practices law," the pamphlet carries the statement that it "is printed by Multnomah Printing Co., 82½ Front St., Portland, Oregon, and the authors are W. G. Eggleston, of Portland, Oregon, A. D. Cridge, of Portland, Oregon, and W. S. U'Ren, of Oregon City, Oregon." To appreciate this, one must imagine the embarrassments attending the publication in Oregon of a campaign document written for the Interests by some Dugald Dalgetty of the pen.

+

Questions of taxation and exemptions are dealt with in the pamphlet, notably and concretely. It shows in detail in this connection the actual taxes for every Oregon county in 1909, under "the general property" tax which prevails throughout the United States, and what they would have been under the "land value tax" which is forging ahead in Canada, Australia, etc., and is likely to be voted on in Oregon upon Initiative petition in 1912. In Baker county, for example, the pamphlet shows that under "the general property tax" farmers' lands were taxed \$79,045, and would have been taxed under "the land value tax" only \$40,319; that farmers' buildings, stock and implements were taxed \$36,171, and would have been taxed nothing; that improved city lots were taxed only \$14,074 and would have been taxed \$30,549; that improvements on city lots were taxed \$29,686 and would have been taxed nothing; that speculators' land in the country was taxed only \$35,184 and would have been taxed \$76,372; that vacant city lots were taxed only \$14,074 and would have been taxed \$30,549; and that franchise corporations were taxed only \$57,025 and would have been taxed \$123,781; and yet that the total taxes were only \$17 more under "the general property tax" than they would have been under "the land value tax." The other counties offer approximately the same contrasts in favor of taxpayers who are users of land, and against those who are only forestallers. This data is accompanied in the pamphlet with an explanation in general terms and by examples, enabling any taxpayer to calculate the difference to himself, in dollars and cents, between the two fiscal policies—"the general property tax" and "the land value tax." This feature of the pamphlet is alone of

inestimable general value, both for its data and for its suggestiveness as an example in fiscal investigation.

* *

Equality, Not Discrimination.

News dispatches tell of the refusal by Kate F. O'Connor, a successful business woman of Rockford and equal suffrage leader well known throughout Illinois, to accept a nomination for county superintendent of schools. There is nothing remarkable in that fact, but there is a whole volume of good sense in her brief statement of reasons. She said:

Superintendent Kern, even though a man, is the best superintendent in the country outside of Ella Flagg Young of Chicago, and I have no desire to place any obstacle in the way of his succeeding himself as long as he lives.

This is in the true spirit of the movement for votes for women. Women are not to be preferred to men in civic life, any more than men should be preferred to women; there should be no preference at all on the basis of sex.

* *

Excellent Street Car Rules.

The Chicago system of street car stopping-rules is so extraordinary and of such excellence in promoting its apparent purposes, that we take pleasure in commending it to the consideration of more backward cities. It is very simple in general outline. All it requires is that cars shall stop to let off or take on passengers, only at the near side of an intersecting street—at the north side, for example, if the car is going south, and at the south side if the car is going north. What could be more simple than that? A mere child of a motorman might understand it. Its usefulness is enhanced by a simple exception. When cars round a curve from one intersecting street into the other, they must stop, not at the near side in that case, but only at the far side—e. g., at the north side if the car comes from east or west and turns north, and at the south side if it comes from east or west and turns south. The purpose of this trifling exception is too obvious for explanation—at any rate to the passenger who observes it when the car does not. Another exception makes the rule and its first exception applicable only to the "loop" region. When you try to board a car outside the "loop," or on any of the streets that border upon it, you get without extra charge, the excitement of guessing which side of the intersecting street the car will stop at. If you are a regular customer of particular lines at particular crossings, you may become so familiar with the habits of your car

as to lose the benefit of those exhilarating sensations; but the stranger at any crossing will seldom fail to get his money's worth if he likes to guess at uncertainties. Those, however, are not the only advantages this most excellent system offers. Since cars in the "loop" (except as they round curves), may stop only on the near side of an intersecting street, and as most of them can be entered only at the rear, you have coming an exquisitely lithesome guess as to how far down the street the entrance end will probably be when the car comes to a standstill. And if your guess fails you, you may have to run one way or the other, even if you are a woman, a cripple, or a man well along in years, or else lose this car and get another guess on the next one; for the cars must "make time" regardless of the bad guessing and inagility of would-be passengers. If you are not a regular customer the chance of missing the guess is increased. But it is surprising how often this guess is fairly made; seldom does it miss by much more than half a car length. Nor are these guessing bees the only fun about it all. The doors in the front of the car and nearest to the cross walk being closed, you must trot a right smart distance out in the street to the other end of the car. The pleasures of this pedestrianism are all the greater if the street is muddy or icy or covered with snow; and when it is crowded with waiting cabs or automobiles, or when cabs and automobiles go flitting past between the car and the sidewalk as you get on or off the car—the explosion of a dynamite bomb doesn't compare with it for thrills. All this exciting fun would be lost if the car stopped on the far side of the intersecting street, where its entrance end would be near the cross walk instead of being a considerable and uncertain distance up or down the street. Whom to credit with this system of rules nobody knows; fortunately perhaps, for if he were known, he might be "statued" like that bronze policeman which no longer disfigures the Haymarket; or get into a book as one of the many eighth wonders of the world. But he must be some man who never rides in street cars. Whoever he is, though, his system excels in the inconveniences with which it favors street car riders and the dangers it affords them. "It is to facilitate traffic and prevent congestion in the loop," explains a serious voice from the City Hall. Wherefore we add that advantage to all the others.

* *

Franking Privileges and the Postal Deficit.

In a friendly editorial notice of the service of The Public in sending to its subscribers official