



THE COMMITTEE THAT SNUBBED MR. ROOSEVELT.

The Republican State Committee of New York in session. Among prominent members may be seen (1) Chairman Timothy L. Woodruff, (2) William Barnes, Jr., (3) William L. Ward, (4) George W. Aldridge, (5) Francis Hendricks, (6) James W. Wadsworth.

## A DEMOCRATIC VIEW OF HIGH PRICES

NOW THAT we are entering upon a heated political campaign, the "cost-of-living" issue once more obtrudes itself in the shape of the somewhat delayed report of the minority members of the Senate Committee which investigated this subject. The majority report of this committee, which was headed by Senator Lodge, was reviewed in these columns early last month. It exonerated the tariff and enumerated some fifteen causes as contributing to the remarkable advance in commodity prices in the last decade. The report signed by the Democratic members of the "Select Committee on Wages and the Prices of Commodities," Messrs. Johnston, of Alabama, Clarke, of Arkansas, and Smith, of South Carolina, attacks each of the causes cited by the majority as sharing in the responsibility, and names only the tariff, the trusts, and the increased gold supply. Being "without sufficient data" they decline to apportion the degree of responsibility between these three causes, but "that the two first are the chief malefactors we have no doubt, and they are of our own creation or permission." Moreover, they tell us, the second of the three is itself dependent on the first, for "there are few trusts that could survive a revenue tariff":

"They flourish only under the shadow of high protective walls. Standing behind these walls that shut off foreign competition and destroy domestic competition by consolidations and absorptions, they are limited only to selling at a fraction less than the foreign price plus the protective duty. That they reduce cost of production seems certain, but it is in rare cases that the public or the laborers employed by them participate in the enlarged profit. So enormous have been their profits that we find organizations springing up all over the country, like the Elgin Board of Trade, the wholesale grocers, lumber-dealers—associations that have contributed largely to the advance in prices and the frauds perpetrated by manufacturers of certain goods in reducing the weight of contents of packages from 20 to 50 per cent. and maintaining the same prices."

As proof that wages would not fall with the removal or substantial reduction of the tariff, these Democratic Senators cite the experience of Great Britain:

"It is about sixty years since Great Britain adopted free trade, and during that time, according to a table published in Whitaker's "Almanac," wages have increased 81.7 per cent. and prices only 3 per cent. It is, therefore, well seen that the abolition of the tariff in England did not bring down the rate of wages. Neither would it in this country. If we remove the

obstruction, allowing prices to sink to their natural level, the question of wages may be trusted to take care of itself."

In the Payne Tariff these investigators find several instances where it seems to them that household expenses have been increased, instead of having been decreased:

"The Payne-Aldrich Bill took broom corn from the free list and made it dutiable at \$3 per ton. Thereupon the price to the consumer advances \$1.20 per dozen on brooms, the tariff being represented by about one-fifth of a cent and the graft by \$1.19 $\frac{1}{2}$ , the consumer being the victim.

"In all the United States there were 5 per cent. of the people directly financially interested in maintaining the exorbitant tariff on woolen goods, and perhaps less than one per cent. of this 5 per cent. got 95 per cent. of the spoils beyond a living; and yet every citizen must have woolen garments and blankets.

"We doubt not that every increase in cost of these goods has added its thousands of victims to the silent tenants of the cemeteries and graveyards; yet every effort to reduce even the most prohibitory duties, so as to permit every American citizen to be warmly clad at a reasonable cost, was persistently voted down. . . . .

"Champagne was put on the schedules at from 54 to 66 per cent., while wearing-apparel was taxed from 80 to 92 per cent.

"Drinking champagne was to be encouraged and wearing woolen clothes discouraged. So with hats, those bringing not over \$4.50 per dozen were taxed 77 per cent. and those valued at more than \$18 per dozen 47 per cent.

"The President was misled into stating in his Winona speech that because the duties in more items had been reduced than increased there had been a revision downward.

"The President argued that inasmuch as 654 items were reduced and 220 increased there was a revision downward. It is an argument based on numbers, not results, and is fallacious."

Other statements of this document, which may figure as campaign ammunition for the Democrats this fall, are thus summed up by the New York *Sun*:

"A special attack is made on the wool and cotton schedule, and the duties on steel and sugar come in for a share of attention. The report sets forth that the increase in the production of wheat, corn, and potatoes has kept pace with the increase in population and that therefore the increased prices of farm products can not be explained on the ground that there has been an increased demand for these products due to the growth of population.

"The committee points out as a significant fact that the United States produced more farm products in 1909 than in 1900, but that the exportation was smaller in 1909 than in 1900. The minority invites attention to the fact that according to testimony taken by the committee the wages of farm laborers increased 50 per cent. between 1900 and 1909, and they say that



no such increase is shown in any of the wage-scales in the protected industries.

"The minority says that another blunder was made in the report submitted by Senator Lodge, in which the conclusion was reached that 'reduced fertility of land, resulting in lower average production or increased expenditures for fertilization,' was a factor in determining the price of farm products. Senator Johnston and his colleagues quote from the statistics of the Department of Agriculture to show that the average production an acre was greater in 1909 than in 1900 as to every product entering into ordinary consumption, including corn, wheat, oats, rye, barley, and potatoes. . . . .

"The Democratic members agree with their Republican brethren that the increased production of gold has enhanced prices, but they deny that it is an important factor in the increase. If the rise in prices in the United Kingdom has been 27 per cent. and in the United States 62 per cent., here is a difference of 35 per cent. Increased gold supply, operating alike everywhere, can not account, therefore, for this additional 35 per cent. that we have experienced in the United States."

The report signed by Senators Johnston, Clarke, and Smith is characterized by the *Philadelphia Record* (Dem.) as a "very strong document," and the *New York Journal of Commerce* (Com.) refers to its "cogent arguments." The *Brooklyn Citizen* (Dem.), while granting that both of the reports on the subject of the high cost of living are open to attack on the ground of partizanship, concludes that "the Democratic report has this advantage over the Republican report, that it is fortified by indisputable facts."

On the other hand, the *New York Sun* (Ind.), finding both reports faulty, juggling with statistics, and striving to make political capital for the respective parties, asserts that "the majority report did deal in a somewhat intelligent manner with farm produce as an important factor in proving by analogy that the tariff did not cause high prices," and adds:

"If a jury of impartial men were sitting in the case of the Republican Senators *versus* the Democratic Senators we think that they would pronounce in favor of the majority report, and yet it is as full of holes as a sieve. Neither report is likely to have much effect in the political campaign."

Here the *Providence Journal* (Ind.) evidently disagrees, for it believes that the division of the Senate Committee on party lines betokens that the Payne Tariff is to be a paramount issue in the Congressional campaign. We read:

"The majority report subordinates the tariff in tracing accountability for high prices. The minority report charges the tariff with being the most apparent and effective influence; not alone the Payne Law, but preceding legislation, as framed on the principle of protection. Probably in not a few Democratic strongholds this latter point will not be prest. But in the sense that the Payne Law is an iniquitous example of tariff-making on any tolerable theory, the Democrats are sure of a solid party following and the support of independent opinion, the amount of which can not be calculated until the votes are cast on the next occasion of a public utterance."

Another set of "cost-of-living" figures which are occasioning comment by the press, have been furnished by a committee appointed by the Massachusetts legislature. It is shown that a family of normal size, earning from \$600 to \$700 a year, spent \$611.58 for necessities in 1901 as against \$737.28 in 1910. Figures representing inquiries in several thousand families show an increase of 30 per cent. in the cost of food, 20 per cent. in clothing, 15 per cent. in fuel, 12 per cent. in rents, and 10 per

cent. each in light and sundries, while the report on wages shows an increase averaging about 20 per cent. in the nine years. Upon these facts the *St. Paul Pioneer Press* (Ind. Rep.) is led to remark as follows:

"The margin is uncomfortably close, and leaves the wage-earner apparently in the position of using almost every penny he earns to meet the cost of necessities, without leaving any 'rainy-day' margin or any provision against old age and accidents. . . . .

"The net result of the report appears to be that the cost of living has increased, aside from the advance in the price of food-stuffs, largely by reason of the change in the standards of living.

"Against such conditions there is little hope of successful legislation. It is impossible to deny the people the right to live in better houses, wear better clothes, attend amusements, and demand vacations, even tho the supplying of these demands be at the cost of all margins and make an end of old-fashioned thrift. The question, apparently, is one which the consumers must solve for themselves, with such help as the Congress and legislatures may afford by checking combinations and trust plans that raise prices without reason."

### "THE LADY-IN-CHIEF"

**R**ICH IN HONORS, says the *New York World*, Florence Nightingale died "leaving the world, which had paid tribute to her as it has to few women, her debtor." The newspapers variously call her "the Lady-in-Chief," "the Lady with the Lamp," "the Lady of the Crimea," in reference to the service she rendered Great Britain and the world on the battle-fields of the Crimean War. Longfellow wrote of her:

On England's annals through the long  
Hereafter of her speech and song  
That light its rays shall cast  
From portals of the past.  
A lady with a lamp shall stand  
In the great history of the land  
A noble type of good  
Heroic womanhood.



FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

The lamp referred to is the nurse's lamp

with which she used to make her nocturnal rounds of the hospitals when all was silent.

She was born in Florence, Italy, May 12, 1820, of wealthy parents who owned an estate in Derbyshire. The *New York Sun* goes on to say:

"When she was eighteen she was taken to London to be presented at court. She met Elizabeth Fry, the reformer, who had done much for the betterment of conditions in English prisons. It was by talking to this woman that Miss Nightingale was first attracted to the idea of hospital work. When she was taken the following year to the Continent for the regular trip that the Nightingale family always made, instead of devoting herself to the doings of society she inquired into hospital systems. She spent nine years visiting the Continental cities and studying their nursing sisterhoods. In 1851 she enrolled herself as voluntary nurse in the training-home at Kaiserswerth in Germany. Later she studied in the Paris hospital conducted by the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, but her health broke down and she returned home to Lea Hurst.

"The Crimean War started and it soon became known in England that the enemy was nowise near so dangerous to the British troops as was the condition of the camps and the hospitals in which the sick were put. The percentage of fatalities was unbelievably high and the whole situation called for prompt handling.

"The activities of Miss Nightingale had not passed unnoticed at home in England, and Sir Sidney Herbert, at the head of the War Department, said it was a woman's task that had to be undertaken at the Crimea. It happened that in 1854, just at the same time that Miss Nightingale wrote a letter to him ask-