

especially when it is considered that Col. Roosevelt would be entitled to the benefit of all doubts in a case involving his loss of citizenship—ought to satisfy a court that he changed his legal residence from New York city to Oyster Bay on the 1st of October, 1897.

That conclusion, consistent with both affidavits, establishes Col. Roosevelt's constitutional eligibility to the governorship of New York, but it does so by an exceedingly close shave.

But if under all these circumstances Col. Roosevelt be eligible to the governorship, he is nevertheless a veritable star at tax dodging. It may be conceded that he did not intend to relinquish his New York state citizenship for office-running purposes, but then it cannot be denied that he did intend to appear to relinquish it for tax-paying purposes.

From the spring or early summer of 1897, his actual residence was in Washington, but owing to his habit of swinging into New York city to take local office, and then upon retiring from office of swinging back again to Oyster Bay, he had the privilege, when he removed to Washington, of remaining a legal resident of New York city—where he had just relinquished office after one of his swings—or of resuming his intermittent home at Oyster Bay. The privilege was convenient and valuable, and Col. Roosevelt tried to make the most of it. When Oyster Bay levied taxes, his legal residence was New York city; but when New York city levied taxes, his legal residence was Oyster Bay!

One of Col. Roosevelt's strongest recommendations in politics has been that he is personally honest. Never having been accused of pilfering he has for this virtue won much applause. Of course he has had no temptation to pilfer. He is a rich man, drawing his income from what are institutionally honest sources—land values, which the public and not he maintain. Nevertheless, conventional honesty is a recommendation, even though it may never have been tested by temptation. But now Col. Roosevelt's character in this respect is the subject of public dispute; and his cherished reputation, like his gub-

ernatorial eligibility, is in danger, if it survives the campaign at all, of escaping by an exceedingly narrow shave.

STOP STARVING WOMEN AND CHILDREN!

Even if a constitutional amendment be necessary to accomplish it, what one thing could a congress of these United States of America do, in legislating on taxation, that would be more truly equitable, than to make the owners of great fortunes in land pay their fair share of the national expenses, instead of allowing them to shirk that burden as they have done? For they have shirked it, and shirked it from the very foundation of our government, by vigilantly and covertly opposing, like the British lords, all legislation that would set upon their own shoulders the smallest part of what they ought in justice to bear.

How could tax laws be more truly humane than they would be if they said to the poor: "Good people, you shall pay no taxes on what you eat, on what you drink, on the clothes you wear, nor on the roofs that shelter you, henceforth and forever?" How could tax laws be more just than they would be if they said to all the people: "This goodly land, which God made for the use of all, has been left to the possession of the few, but hereafter every one who is permitted to keep as his own any part of this storehouse of God's bounties, whence each derives his living, must pay into the people's treasury a rent commensurate with the value of this his possession, and henceforth and forever neither law nor lord shall tax man or woman for the privilege of working and living on God's land, nor fine man or woman for producing wealth or for saving wealth?"

In our political quarrels over "protection," and "tariff for revenue only," we have been the mere dupes of a few long-headed plutocrats and politicians. There never was nor ever can be such a thing as a "tariff for revenue only." Neither can have any existence except in the imaginations of knaves and victims of knaves. We are only poor fools when we quarrel over such dreams. A tariff is always a tariff. It always was and always will be simply what plutocrats and

politicians can agree upon, with no regard to principle and all regard to wealth, political influence and campaign "soap." The main purpose of a tariff was in the beginning, still is, and ever will be, to enable great fortunes in land to shirk their fair share of the national expenses. To stop that shirking would very plainly make our taxation far more just; and the reward of such justice would be untold prosperity to the nation.

Then why not stop it—this wicked shirking that is merely a method by which the lords of earth intercept God's gift to all, and curse the whole world with poverty, misery and sin? Should not honest citizens unite against it as promptly and as firmly as they do against more open but less ruinous modes of plundering?

The times seem ripe for action—action which wisdom will direct or frenzy impel. When each day "women faint and little children moan" in misery made by the laws, law will not be strong enough to fetter men who are thoughtful as well as brave. Thus, already republicans begin to dislike "protection," democrats begin to hate "tariff for revenue only," populists denounce this "sham battle over the tariff," while prohibitionists and all are nearly ready for the political war-cry of "Down with shams, and stop starving women and children to make great fortunes!"

ASHER GEORGE BEECHER.

NEWS

The nomination of Col. Theodore Roosevelt for governor of New York, of which we gave an account last week, was followed on the 29th by the nomination of Judge Augustus Van Wyck, brother of Mayor Van Wyck, as the democratic candidate for the same office. This nomination was a triumph of Tammany Hall, under the leadership of Mr. Croker, over ex-Gov. Hill. It was evident the night before the nomination, that Hill had been defeated; so no serious contest was made in the body of the convention, but Judge Van Wyck was nominated on the first ballot. Out of 451 votes he received 350. Having thus won the gubernatorial nomination, Mr. Croker offered an olive branch to Mr. Hill, in the shape of the nomination for