

known to experts to make it safe to place entire guidance in the conclusions of a statistician, and both he and the mere theorist are too warped in mind, and not sufficiently susceptible to argument, to make them safe advisers in matters which vitally concern the business of a whole nation.

It is not enough to say that a commission shall be "non-partisan." What "non-partisan" means in relation to the tariff is something that I do not know. Everyone who has either studied the tariff question, or who has had experience in business, is "partisan" toward some one kind of tariff. The man who has no ideas of any kind as regards the tariff might be a non-partisan, and from that angle be fitted for a place on a commission, but he would be of no value to such a work. Therefore it must be assumed that the members of the Tariff Commission will be partisan, but sanely so. This means that their recommendations must be confined to the presentation of facts, and not extended to the giving of advice upon tariff matters in general.

There was proof of this in the work of the Tariff Board. In connection with the woollen schedule investigation, we conducted a very thorough inquiry into the cost of producing raw wool, not only in the United States, but in all of the wool-producing countries. The results of that investigation were something that the Board, made up of members of both political parties, and of different tariff beliefs, could unite in presenting. We proved to the satisfaction of each member of the Board that the average wool grown in this country costs over nine cents a pound more to raise than does the wool of Australia, and that it costs twice as much to raise as the wool of South America. Upon such a statement of fact all the members of the Board could and did agree. If it had been necessary, however, to report to Congress what recommendation the Board should make as to tariff duties on wool, there would have been a complete division in the Board, and two conflicting reports.

There would have been a report from some members stating that wool was so important an article to the country's growth and existence that it was necessary so to protect the wool-grower that he could at all times turn with profit his attention to the raising of sheep, and that he should have sufficient protection from wool raised in other countries, no matter how great that protection must be. On the other hand, other members of the Board would have reported that the difference in the cost of the production of wool here and abroad was so great that, in order to give complete tariff protection, so high a duty was necessary as to involve a bad economic policy; that there was a limit beyond which duties should not go, no matter what the apparent necessity of an American industry; that any industry that required for its protection a duty beyond a certain point was an industry not fitted to the country, and too artificial a one to be part of the country's necessities; therefore, as wool could not be protected without an enormous duty, it would be well to put it on the free list. Agreeing, as we all did, on the facts in the case, those would have been the divergent opinions we would have expressed if called upon to report to Congress our recommendations in regard to the proper duty on wool.

Such would be the case in any Tariff Commission when faced with a similar problem. Any fair-minded commission can be a non-partisan commission, so far as facts are concerned; but when asked for recom-



ASSORTED CARGO FOR THE RETURN TRIP OF THE DEUTSCHLAND.

—New York Herald.

mendations as to what tariff policy should be pursued, the members will naturally and inevitably divide, and the line of cleavage will follow the tariff ideas of which the members are respectively the partisans.

## LAND OF RUG-MAKERS

*How Persians are Starved, Robbed and Cheated—by Persians*

THE recent cataclysm in the western world has served to call attention to Persia and the Persian people, writes Youel B. Mirza, in the Review of Reviews (American).

It would at first appear that all the Persian troubles and misfortunes are directly traceable to the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907, and the desire on the part of the two powers to absorb Persia and her people. Happily such is not the case. They simply discovered that it was a chance to step in and prevent another Oriental state from becoming Prussianized.

To Persia falls the lot of being one of the worst-governed countries in the family of nations. "A king," says Sadi, "must be just, that they (the people) may resort to him, and merciful, that they may sit secure under the shadow of his greatness." But the Kajars (the present dynasty) are neither just nor merciful, nor do they possess kingly qualities.

The Persians have been under a typically Oriental form of government for centuries. The average man takes no interest in his government. If you meet a Persian on the street and ask him, "What is the name of your king?" he will answer, "The king's name is sacred and the common people are not supposed to know it, but ask the priest of the village, and he will tell you." I venture to say that less than half of the subjects know the name of their sovereign. They only know enough to obey "Shah-in-Shah," "the king of kings."

The government has never done anything that would make the inhabitants of Persia happy. Not a single mine or factory in Persia is operated, not a single hospital or public school is established by the government. In a country twice as large as the German Empire, there are only twenty-five miles of railway, and these are owned and operated by a Belgian corporation.

Throughout the whole of Persia no modern agricultural implements are to be found. From the sowing of the seed to the threshing of the wheat, and from the weaving of a rug to the finishing of a packsaddle, all the labour is performed by the hands of the weary peasant.

The practice of buying and selling government offices is still rife among the Iranian officials. The practice of bakshish can perhaps be best explained by a hypothetical case.

Let us suppose, for instance, that the reader is worth a million dollars, and is seeking the position of a vizier. The first step would be to present a good-sized purse to an official, who would then take great pleasure in introducing you to his superior. You keep giving gifts and presents to all the officials until finally you are introduced to the royal family; then bakshish has to be given to all the princes and to the Shah. If the purse and your personality

please his royal highness, your position is assured.

As soon as you have secured the position, you recoup yourself by reversing the process, from a giver you become a receiver. If the office means gubernatorial appointment, then your hope comes from the appointment of various officials for collecting the taxes. The collectors, in order to maintain their own state and to meet the usual bakshish of the governor, are compelled to extort a much higher sum than is expected by their chief. Here, then, comes the sad part of the Persian administrative system. All the burden and expense falls upon the poor and the peasant.

Sometimes the tax-collectors come at a very trying season, when people have no money with which to pay. They desert their homes and disappear for weeks at a time. I have seen peasants driven almost to despair, I have seen them punished with the bastinado, because they had no money to pay the tax-collectors.

Every door that a Persian has in his home is taxed fifty cents a year. Consequently all the peasants have houses with only one door. In fact, some of the poorer class, who have been unjustly treated, live together in houses built in clusters, buried in the ground, with a communicating path known only to themselves; the result is that the tax-collectors, though they see nothing but a grass-built hut, may be actually in the midst of several hundred tax-dodgers.

Added to all these hardships, the daily wage of a man is only fifteen cents, of a woman scarcely ten. Even the skilled artisan fares but little better. The bricklayer and the shoemaker earn from twenty to thirty-five cents. The dye-master, with an inborn ability for telling the pattern of an antique rug by the touch as accurately as a blind man reads his raised-letter Bible, receives only fifteen cents dyeing red, ten cents for blue, and seven or eight cents for other colours, for one pound of wool.

It may be of interest to the reader to know the cost of the materials, the amount of labour, and the value of the best Persian rug when finished. Some dealers and importers of rugs tell us that a square foot of the best Persian rug is worth ten dollars. It takes a single weaver twenty-three days to complete this portion, which allows the weaver about forty-four cents a day for wool, labour, and dye-stuffs.

The city of Tiflitz, Russia, is crowded with Persians; some of its best merchants and contractors are of this nationality. I met an acquaintance some years ago in Tiflitz and asked him, "Which government do you prefer?" Without any hesitation and with great emphasis, he replied, "The Russian."

"Why?" I asked.

"You see this gold watch," he said. "If I were in Persia, I would be afraid to show it, because if you wanted it, and happened to be stronger than I, you would take it forcibly. Here is another thing," he continued. "My home, as you know, is in the best section of Tiflitz. I can live there with peace and comfort, without fear of robbers. Here my business is prospering. What chance would I have if I were living in my own country? I can be of greater service to my country by living in Tiflitz than I could ever be in my native city, Urumiah, because here the Russian Government does not interfere with what I am doing."

Such is the feeling of the Persian business men, as well as the labouring class, who are found in



DEUTSCHLAND UNTER ALLES!

—Cassel, N.Y. Evening World.



COMPETITION!

N. Y. World.