

joining the Confederacy; and that, too, when he had a big war on his hands. Theodore says: "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Fiddle! I could run all my warships in under the shed, dismantle 'em, put a bantam rooster in for secretary of state, and get more dignity, and consideration for it, than this administration gets; but then I ain't got no bantam rooster—not in my Republican party.

Why, law! I never had any trouble when I had no navy to speak of. I could a built one if I wanted, an' I have a long arm and a good memory, and the boys knew it; and besides, I behaved myself when away from home. There's lots in that. I never had no trouble. The fellows always felt good towards me. I never had to carry a big stick. Then why should I pay taxes for a navy for you and Germany to frolic with? I have a boy—Tom Johnson, his name is—says these big navies and armies are used to enslave people who have just as good a right to freedom as you and I. That's what Tom says. I don't believe he could say it in Germany. Emperor William, they tell me, has seized an edition of Count Tolstol's book, "Thou Shalt Not Kill." I've bin suspectin' for a long time there was treason in the Bible as well as in my Declaration of Independence, and of the same kind.

UNCLE SAM.

THE SALE OF JUSTICE.

A portion of a sermon delivered in Cincinnati, July 12, by Herbert S. Bigelow.

"And judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. Yea, truth falleth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."—Isaiah 59: 14, 15.

We may not know how accurately these words of Isalah described political conditions in Jerusalem. They are a severe indictment of an evil time. Yet I think few will deny that we have in our American cities to-day precisely that condition of affairs which these words describe.

Illustrations are always at hand, and one does not need to go beyond the borders of his own municipality to find examples of tyranny which are submitted to with amazing indifference.

In Ohio there has recently come to light an example of judicial weakness which would cause an uprising if the public conscience were not seared.

Franchises had been granted for an indefinite period. The street railway companies possessing these franchises claimed that they were perpetual. The people claimed that they were revocable at will. A certain judge in Columbus decided in favor of

the companies. It is not necessarily proof of corruption that judges should so often render decisions in favor of the monopolists. Perhaps the law is more often on their side. It ought to be, since they make the laws for the most part.

But this particular judge was a candidate for the Republican nomination to the supreme court of the State. Mayor Johnson charges against him that this decision in favor of perpetual franchises was written three months before it was announced; that it was shown in advance to the companies; that it was through railroad influence that this judge secured his coveted nomination. Having written a decision favorable to monopoly, having secured as a reward the nomination which he sought, having kept the public in the dark until the convention had been held, he now relies on the indifference of the people and the political handicap in his favor to win the race.

I heard recently a story of a dishonest judge. It was no worse than the things that are commonly believed of judges, but it was somewhat shocking to hear the story from a source that could not be doubted. We are growing accustomed to suspect our judges of corruption, but here is a judge that I know was corrupt.

A decision had been written which was certain to depreciate the stock of one of the public service corporations of the city. Three weeks before that decision was made public it was clandestinely revealed to the attorney of this corporation, so that the favored ones could have an opportunity to unload their stock on "widows and orphans."

It is not difficult to understand why judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off, when we reflect upon the character of the men who dictate the nomination of these judges.

One of the ward bosses in Cincinnati recently gave his annual picnic to the people of his ward. It was estimated that from 12,000 to 15,000 people accepted his hospitality. One paper, in fulsome praise of his liberality, gave this list of articles provided by the host: 225 gallons of ice cream, 400 gallons of milk, 3,750 bananas, 30 barrels of lemonade flavored with 26 gallons of claret, 17,000 free tickets to Coney Island, 25,000 tickets to amusements, seven silver and one gold medal and some money in cash prizes.

Commenting on this picnic a newspaper stated editorially that it would be a good thing for the city if more

ward leaders would follow this example of generosity, and then quoted as applying to this boss the saying of Jesus: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

We remember that before Boss Tweed was sent to prison some of the New York papers were speaking of him as "our noble benefactor." Newspaper editors should be a little more discriminating in their praise.

Can a man be generous who spends only other people's money? I wonder if the editor ever heard the story of the house with a leaning wall? Well, there is such a house in a certain ward in this city the history of which throws some light upon the source of the money which is spent so freely.

This was a four-story stone front house. It was for sale. An individual called on the agent and offered a sum so ridiculously small in the opinion of the agent that it was promptly rejected. Soon the agent received notice from the building inspector that one wall of the house had a bulge in it and would have to be torn down, since it was dangerous. The agent remonstrated, but in vain. Counting the cost of removing the wall he determined to accept the offer which he had rejected.

In the course of a few weeks it became apparent who had been the real purchaser of the house. The ward boss took possession. He lives there to-day in this stone front. The wall has not yet been replaced. It stands as one of many monuments of the tyranny that has grown so common among us. It might not be inappropriate to carve on this monument the words of Isaiah: "Truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter."

It is men who are gorged with that kind of plunder who have more to do with the nomination of judges, than all the preachers, and all the lawyers, and all the school-teachers combined. What then can be expected of the courts? From the judge down to jailer the machinery of justice is responsive to the will of these men who boast that they are in politics for the money they can get out of it.

Recently in Cincinnati it was necessary to go out into one of the townships to find a justice of the peace who would issue warrants for the arrest of men charged with false registration. And when these men were brought to jail the warden refused to receive them and they were set free.

Now what is the moral effect on the community of a government of priv-

ilege and plunder? It makes of every ward in the city a school where young men are taught that knavery is the open door to success. Under the influence of such a government the path of rectitude is covered with thorns and virtue is nailed to the cross. In every boss-ridden city, to use the language of our text, "he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey."

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION IN TORONTO.

Cumulative voting will in future be used to a certain extent in the municipal elections of the city of Toronto.

Cumulative voting is proportional representation; not on as good a plan as the Hare-Spence system, but still proportional representation. It will be used at the next Toronto municipal elections in electing the 12 members of the school board and the four members of the board of control, who are to be elected by the city at large—the mayor being the fifth member.

THE BOARD OF CONTROL.

Cumulative voting, as applied to the board of control, means that the elector will have four votes, but that he need not give each of them to a different candidate. He may do so if he wishes; but he has also the power to give all his four votes to one candidate. This makes "plumping" four times as powerful as it was by the old "block" system, when if you "plumped" for one candidate you threw away three out of your four votes. Now you have the benefit of your full voting power, whether you plump or not. And plumping is the correct thing; in fact, proportional representation is simply effective plumping, with the addition in the best systems of a provision for transfer of votes, so as to prevent wasting too many on one candidate. However, we are dealing now with the cumulative vote. Besides permitting an elector to give all four votes to one candidate, the cumulative plan enables him to give two of his votes to one candidate, and two to another, or he may give three votes to one candidate, and his fourth to another candidate. In fact, he may distribute or cumulate his four votes as he pleases. The controllers being elected by the people at large, instead of by the council, there will be only three aldermen elected in each ward. These will be elected by the old block vote.

Let us see now what can be done in regard to the board of control. First, if one-fourth of the voters give all their votes to one candidate, they

can elect him, no matter what the other three-fourths choose to do. Suppose 24,000 voters go to the polls, then 6,000 of them can elect one controller, if they are sufficiently well organized to plump their four votes on the one candidate; or, if half the voters were so well organized that they could be depended upon to split their votes on the same two men—two votes for one, and two for the other—then they could put in two controllers.

A great deal will depend on the wise choice of candidates and good organization.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The newly amalgamated board of education for the city of Toronto consists of 14 members, two of whom are appointed by the separate school board, and the remaining 12 elected by the city at large. The system to be used in electing these 12 is not cumulative voting to the full extent, but is a mixture of the cumulative vote and the limited vote, because each elector must not cumulate more than three of his votes on any one candidate, although he will have 12 votes at the election of 1904, and six votes at each subsequent election. The reason of this is that the 12 elective members of the board of education have all to be elected in 1904, but after that only six members will be elected every year, to take the places of the six who retire.

The practical effect of this voting method is that one-third of the electors can put in one-third of the board in 1904. That means, if 24,000 voters go to the polls, and 8,000 of them agree on a ticket of four candidates, they can elect their ticket by cumulating their 12 votes on the same four candidates, giving three votes to each. Three times four is 12. We shall probably see candidates coming out in quartettes or tickets of four each; and some careful organization will be necessary. At subsequent elections, when only six are to be elected, the tickets will be in twos, instead of fours.

ONE MAN'S WORK.

There is one man in the legislature who deserves special mention in this connection, and that is Samuel Russell, of Deseronto, M. P. P. for East Hastings. He is a warm friend of proportional representation, and has on three occasions introduced a bill into the house to give municipalities power to use proportional representation in their elections.

This has had the effect of familiar-

izing members with the proportional principle. Besides this, Mr. Russell's quiet and persistent work during the present session in committee and otherwise, has had much to do with the success of the daring innovation—as many consider it—of cumulative voting. The innovation is in imperfect shape at present, but its great value consists in a recognition of the proportional principle and in making a beginning in the right direction.

THE POPULAR VOTE.

Another piece of progressive legislation may be mentioned in this connection. The municipal council of a county, a township, a city, a town or a village of this province may now legally pass a by-law for the submission to a vote of the electors, at any annual election, of any question not specifically authorized by statute. It has been so common a thing to submit questions to a popular vote, that many readers will be surprised to learn that this was illegal, and could have been stopped by a judicial injunction, except in the case of money by-laws and others specifically named by statute. The legislature at its session just closed has removed this anomaly, and given a greater measure of popular self-government.

One effect of the change is that it is now quite practicable to obtain the referendum and initiative—sometimes called direct legislation—in municipal matters. This can be done through an organized system of pledging candidates, which has been tried in Toronto with great success. This is not the place to give details; but anyone interested in the working of the people's veto and direct initiative can obtain details by writing to Mr. James Simpson, 42 Albany avenue, Toronto. Mr. Simpson is secretary of the Toronto Federation for Majority Rule.

ROBERT TYSON.

SONGS OF THE SHIPYARD.

"Mother, may I go out to combine?"
"Yes, my darling daughter;
Sell your bonds at eighty-nine,
And fill your stocks with water."

Lewis and Charles went up the Street,
With forty millions of water;
The floods swept Lewis off his feet,
And Charles came grumbling after.

Sing a song of sixpence,
Here's the stock to buy!
Four and twenty shipyards
Baked in a pie.

When the pie was opened
There was no end of troubles;
Nothing in that pretty dish
But iridescent bubbles.
—N. Y. Evening Post.