

prime mover in completing plans to give them a proper home.

Last week Mr. Cooley visited the "George Junior Republic," which is located in central New York, and with his return comes new zeal and new determination to give Cleveland a similar domicile.

The New York institution is founded on the idea of self-government, and Director Cooley's plan is to model the new Cleveland school upon the lines of this miniature United States.

The plan of the training school will be new for this part of the country. Boys will be sent to the place from the courts; but upon arriving they will be citizens instead of criminals.

The aim is to make the institution far from penal, and in accord with Mr. Cooley's idea, boys are instilled with self-reliance and independence instead of being put under a system of restraint.

"The Republic" is modeled after the federal government, and has a real legislature, a stern executive and sober judges.

Under its workings the boys elect a president and members of congress, as well as a police department. The policing is in the hands of the youths themselves, and they also elect judges and prosecutors and have trials by jury.

The motto of the school is: "Nothing Without Labor." If the children do not work they possess no money of the realm, which is aluminum coinage and is accepted at par.

Girls as well as boys are received at the institution and are given the right of suffrage. Beside this right they are only allowed the true privileges of womankind, which are honored by the opposite sex in a manner that would put to flight the boasted chivalry of history.

In this "Republic" there is every vocation of life. Some follow joining, others take up law and many oft drift to the field of newspapers.

The colony is truly a world of its own. It is a society of souls that does not realize the great future and glories in the present. In it all frictions are dealt with by law and the weakest settle to their places as in the larger world.

A peculiar feature of the new school is that the inmates play the role of both children and grown-up people. The play houses and the real structures are put up at the same time. It is work like a man and play like a child, live like a citizen and at the same time not realize it.

The basis of the institution is charity in its true sense—the charity that gives opportunity for self-help.

Every-day life at this school teaches the lesson of helping others, at the same time, pointing out the way of self-defense and preservation. It changes its "citizens" from the conditions of environment and heredity over which they have no control and toward all is the outstretched hand of stability and power.

Though Mr. Cooley's idea is to follow the plan of the New York institution the children will not be allowed entire self-government in the Cleveland school at first. Later it will probably drift that way, and in time may be the double of the William George idea.

The land has been purchased and all that now remains is to secure the speedy erection of all the necessary buildings. The director has been authorized by the council to advertise for bids for the construction of these buildings.

Mr. Cooley is doing everything to bring this work to a speedy end, and the members of the former committee, which for some time helped to make the home possible may be encouraged.

The citizens of Cleveland may be proud of the place that is being furnished for many weak, a place where education and experience are combined for the benefit of those who most need it.

The plan that is being followed by Director Cooley is in principle the application of the golden rule and the working out of divine commands.—Plain Dealer of August 3.

BRITAIN'S RIVALS AND BRITAIN'S TRADE.

An article by A. C. Campbell, published in the Commonwealth of Ottawa, Can., for August, 1901.

It is a favorite conceit with the lesser minds of every generation that the problems of that generation are new, and that the solution of them must be worked out on original lines. These people are beating their tom-toms now to drive nervous folks into hysterics over the decline of British trade and the necessity for special legislation to arrest that decline. They revamp Mr. Cleveland's dictum about the nation being confronted by a condition and not by a theory, and they seem to think that this is good reason why the people should be directed by hysteria and not by judgment. To justify further their alarmist policy of quick and inconsiderate change, these parties set forth as indisputable and most momentous certain maxims

which sound well but have nothing else to recommend them. The favorite dictum of the present day is that the trade of the world depends upon iron and that only iron-making countries can be great. Another is that the whole world is leagued against Great Britain, and that Britain must be prepared to make reprisals.

A very brief study of history will convince anyone that there was a time when the same class of philosophers declared that wheat was the basis of trade. One of them, in days gone by, drew a most touching and dramatic picture of some great man holding a few grains of wheat in his hand and declaring that the wars, the laws, the intrigues of centuries had had for their object only the control of the areas upon which such berries could be grown. Sounding and solemn were the warnings to Britain to grow their own wheat, lest the stillness of death should settle upon their country through the break-up of its industrial system. Combinations for industrial war were advocated, and restrictions without number were tried—we all know what success. At length the British people began to see that the important thing was not this or that particular trade, but trade as a whole. They began to see that trade is not of the nature of war, but the very opposite. Acting upon these ideas, they removed great restrictions and left each man free to engage in the most profitable business he could find. The result was that Britain's wheat-growing business went to pieces, and Britain grew rich exceedingly. This example could be multiplied many times, for the British people have a saving common sense about them which enables them to profit by experience. The industrial history of the country is a history of slow accumulation of restrictions, followed, before it was too late, by wise modification of the laws on lines of freedom. It is clear to anybody now that the trouble with British trade before Cobden's time, for instance, was not undue competition from without but undue restriction within. And what was true in this case would be found true in every other case in British history, could we but learn the facts.

Is it likely, then, that now, for the first time in her history, Britain needs to increase restrictions, to model her trade upon lines of war rather than upon lines of freedom and mutual benefit?

It may be true that Britain's iron trade is in jeopardy or is doomed. It

may be German woollens will drive British woollens from the market. But, if Britain prospers, the fate of these trades is a matter unworthy of thought, just as the retention of the wheat trade of 50 or 60 years ago was unworthy of thought. If there are elements that threaten Britain's trade as a whole, that is a matter for consideration. Judging from past experience, however, we are to look for those dangers in restrictions upon industry at home rather than in threats of competition from abroad.

When we think of trade restrictions, we naturally think first, and some of us think exclusively, of tariff duties. We think of "trade" as the mere exchange of goods, not realizing that wealth is in course of exchange from the very inception of production, and that production is not complete until exchange is complete and the goods are in the hands of the consumer. There are 10,000 ways in which the statute laws, or those customs which are stronger than statute laws, can restrict trade. The lowland farmer in the Shetlands, as pictured in Scott's story, "The Pirate," found that the superstitions of the only people he could hire made their labor so intermittent and uncertain that no system could be based upon it, and agriculture was impossible. There is no fact better attested by reason and the consensus of all authorities than that a rack-rent system is death to industry. A condition of war will destroy trade, if it lasts long enough. These are but examples of forms of restrictions quite apart from tariff laws,* but each effective in making trade impossible.

While the condition-and-not-a-theory people join in demanding tariff and other restrictions to confine to Britain certain forms of production, there are many sensible people who realize that the hope of Britain's trade lies in extending the freedom of that trade. The demand for less interference from the trades unions is one form of this movement. Of course, it is rank heresy in the eyes of some people to suggest that trades unions ever did or ever could do aught but good. But when we are free to say that even the churches do harm as well as good, surely the high priests of trades unionism will not deny us the right to question the perfection of some of their own acts. Every system is faulty, at least in its application. At a time when continental Europe despised trade and all it involved; when the orient exported only what Britain could not produce; when the United

States had only domestic problems to face and was determined to trade within itself, except in farm produce; when South America was merely a happy hunting ground for the agitator and intriguer—when these conditions prevailed—Britain, the only country where trade was the main object of life, could make what she pleased, choose her market and demand her own price. Under such conditions British trades unionism grew. Freed from foreign competition, the British manufacturer could make concessions to his men and still live. To-day, it is not too much to say, a British factory in almost any staple and long-practiced industry is a copartnership between employer and employed. If the conditions of the market change, the manufacture cannot be changed to meet the new conditions until the "hands" have been consulted and have given their consent. For instance, the southern states are coming forward as competitors for the sale not merely of raw cotton but of manufactured cotton goods. In those states, there are no laws—no effective laws at any rate—such as there are in Britain, restricting the employment of females or minors, or controlling the conditions under which the work shall be done. Nor are there trades unions to protect the workers against the rapacity of slave-driving employers and overseers. In any class of goods which they can make, it is clear, the southern states will be able to undersell Great Britain. In the same way, it is probable, the poorly-paid, badly-organized workmen of Pennsylvania or Alabama may be able to turn out coal or iron which shall displace that of Great Britain in some competitive markets. Further restrictions on the part of British trades unions will not better this position. The hope of Great Britain lies in more freedom. With a due elevation of her labor in skillfulness and general intelligence, Britain can leave to others the manufacture of the mere staples in iron and cotton, just as she leaves to a lower class of labor or a cheaper class of land the production of wheat—while she turns to a higher grade of industry. This will be the natural tendency, and only restriction can check that tendency. The trades unions, by rigid rules, can prevent the adaptation of industry to new conditions, but they must not be allowed to do so.

In fact, they cannot do so unaided. The upper millstone cannot crush until it approaches the lower one. Peo-

ple laugh at dictators whose sole power to punish is the expression of their displeasure.

This lower millstone of restriction, landlordism, against which grind many small upper millstones, is now coming into plain sight again. It has never been hidden from popular view in bad times. Over and over again, landlordism in Britain has absorbed the benefits of successful wars, notable inventions and the more perfect organization of labor; and over again, its "vested rights" have been set aside that the people might not be strangled in its greedy clutch.

As British trade has grown under the glorious sun of freedom, landlordism has demanded greater and greater toll from labor. Town lots, farming lands, mining areas, foreshores—all forms of land ownership—have increased in value immensely in the last 50 years. There may be cases of falling value by reason of exhaustion of minerals, the decay of towns or the removal of special privilege such as the iniquitous corn laws, but there are but trifling exceptions to the rule. Landlordism, like any other form of privilege, never yields a point willingly. Times have been good in England for some years past. They will not be always good. But the landlord will demand to be kept in the same luxury as before, regardless of how the laborer may be housed or fed. And, as in the time of Wat Tyler, and as in the time of Richard Cobden, the landlords' privileges must be restricted that the people may have freedom to work and live. The final report of the royal commission on local taxation, though most conservative in its tone, indicates that the remedy is known to many and advocated by not a few.

In every case up to the present the shackles of landlordism have only been loosened and the people have joyfully turned to their work as soon as they could move. It is to be hoped that when the struggle comes this time, the bonds will be broken and cast aside.

HOME RULE SCIENTIFIC: BOARD RULE DECADENT.

Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Secretary of the National Municipal League, is visiting the chief cities of Ohio, to see the men most prominently interested in the matter of city government. He will have personal interviews with the lawyers and experts who are to assist Gov. Nash in compiling a code bill, and he will have a session with the governor and urge the adoption in that bill of the doctrines of the National Municipal League, as set forth in the municipal programme which was adopted in 1899. The