

THE RIGHTS OF THE MAN-STANDING-WHERE-HE-DOES-HIS-WORK.

So far as there is a right in any war, it is always on the side of the man that shoots from his own dooryard. . . .

Let us set it down here in despite of the doctors, that a man is a proprietor, in virtue of his existence. The only way to defeat his title is to kill him. So long as he is on his feet he is a landholder and his title rests somehow in the particular land that he walks and works on. Just how the title is to be defined is a question between himself and his neighbors to be adjusted on the spot by the balance of personal forces. It never can be settled for South Africa by a colonial secretary in London. No, nor for the Philippine islands by a lot of diplomats sitting around a green table in Paris. And for ages to come, if occasion shall require, the Man-Standing-Where-he-Does-his-Work will shoot at the invader until his ammunition gives out. So, if wars are ever to cease, it is the other party—the Man-Shooting-Where-He-Doesn't-Work—that must quit first.—The University, of Tucson, Ariz., for July.

MR. DOOLEY ON THE REFORMER.

"Forchnitely, Hinnessy, a rayformer is seldom a business man. He thinks he is, but business men know different. They know what he is. He thinks business an' honesty is th' same thing. He does, indeed. He's got thim mixed because they dhrass alike. His idee is that all he has to do to make a business administration is to have honest men ar-round him. Wrong. I'm not sayin', mind ye, that a man can't do good work an' be honest at th' same time. But whin I'm hirin' a la-ad I find out first whether he is onto his job, an' afther a few years I begin to suspect that he is honest, too. Manny a dishonest man can lay brick straight, an' manny a man that wudn't steal ye'er spoons will break ye'er furniture.

"I don't want Father Kelly to hear me, but I'd rather have a competent man who wud steal if I give him a chanst, but I won't, do me plumbin', thin a person that wud scorn to help himself, but didn't know how to wipe a joint. Ivry man ought to be honest to start with, but to give a man an office jus' because he's honest is like ill-tin' him to congress because he's a pathrite, because he don't bate his wife or because he always wears

a right boot on th' right foot. A man ought to be honest to start with, an' afther that he ought to be crafty. A pollytician who's on'y honest is jus' th' same as bein' out in a winther storm without anny clothes on.—F. P. Dunne, in Chicago American.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN NEW ZEALAND.

For The Public.

A writer in the London Daily News calls attention to a part of a speech of Mr. Seddon, premier of New Zealand, which all the newspapers omitted in their reports. The speech was delivered at a dinner in London, at which Conan Doyle presided. The part of the speech omitted in the reports was that in which Mr. Seddon spoke of the great success of woman's equal suffrage in New Zealand. He said that under joint suffrage the colony had advanced with rapid strides, that important problems had been settled, and that legislation had been carried out which was being imitated in Europe and America. "Nevertheless, all domestic relationships were still the same as before; sons respected their mothers, husbands and wives loved one another, and the young men told him that sweethearts were quite as nice as in pre-equality days. One distinct change had been wrought—a man whose private and domestic life and business honor would not bear inspection would not now obtain high public position."

J. H. D.

A WOMAN AS A "RECEIVER."

About a year ago the partners in the business firm of Hanley & Co., 96 Fifth avenue, New York, got into a snarl, and one of them, James H. Tucker, determined to withdraw his capital. Mrs. Jennie M. Packer was at that time accountant for the firm, a gentle little woman, with large blue eyes and prematurely gray hair. She knew every detail of the business, and when Justice O'Gorman was asked to appoint a receiver for the firm his choice fell to the quiet little accountant. Instead of closing up the business, Mrs. Packer continued it, paid all bills and put it in such a prosperous condition that the partners have become reconciled and she has been discharged with the gratitude of all concerned. One of her first acts after being made a receiver was to see every creditor of the firm. Then she began to straighten out the tangle. The partners brought

suit against her, but she calmly met each issue and the business went on with a smoothness that amazed the warring business men. One of the apartments in the company's offices was fitted up as a reception-room. There Mrs. Packer sat each morning, surrounded by plants and flowers, opened the mail and received business callers, while she directed every move of the business. Her work completed, she handed over greatly enriched coffers to the astonished partners, who are now on amiable terms. Mrs. Packer was a miss Jennie M. Moar, of New Hampshire. The death of her husband three years ago left her dependent on her own talents.—Chicago Chronicle of July 17.

MAYOR JOHNSON ON SENATOR HANNA'S STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO MONOPOLY.

"I was very much interested to see what Senator Hanna had to say about monopolies at Chautauqua," remarked Mayor Johnson yesterday, when asked for his opinion on the senator's address of Saturday.

What the mayor alluded to was Senator Hanna's remark during his speech to the effect that: "When you talk about organized capital in this country forming monopolies, you talk nonsense. There is no monopoly in this country, except such as are protected by patents."

"Now what Senator Hanna had to say about labor and capital and the golden rule was good," continued Mayor Johnson. "I am willing to concede sincerity to the senator in these things and I say if he can solve the labor problem, why here's good luck to his elbow.

"But it seemed to me that the really important thing in his speech was that remark about monopolies. Senator Hanna says the only monopoly is the patent monopoly. Now I am willing to concede the patent monopoly, but when he says it is the only one existing, I take exceptions.

"For instance, if the patent monopoly is the only monopoly, what name does Senator Hanna give to the control of all the railways that enter the anthracite coal regions? This control is not acquired by the ownership of locomotives and cars, but by ownership of practically all the rights of way into those fields. It is almost impossible for a new railroad to get into the fields and if one does, it is soon absorbed. Isn't this something like the patent monopoly?

"Until the expiration of the present

franchises in this city the five-cent street railways control this kind of transportation in Cleveland. This is not because they own cars and rails, but because they have no competition. They are protected by grants and statutes preventing competition and by republican officials, who save them from the necessity of paying their just proportion of taxes. What is that but monopoly and privilege?

"The wages paid to their laborers constitute all the return that labor gets from these companies. All that capital should get is a fair return on the actual investment or cost of reproduction of the system. What they do get in excess of that is derived from monopoly and privilege, which these companies enjoy at the expense of the public and of the laborer. Anything paid to them in excess of a fair return on their actual investment is the price of privilege. If this is defensible Senator Hanna should bring forward his defense of it, instead of devoting himself to the spreading of the impression that a war, a contest exists between capital and labor. The real contest is between labor and monopoly, and capital and privilege.

"To illustrate: When President Schwab made his statement before the industrial commission and assigned nearly \$1,000,000,000 as a fair value for the ownership of the United States Steel corporation, of 80 per cent. of all the iron mines in the lake region and the ownership of all the Connellsville coke land, he not only specified his monopoly, but he put his price on it.

"Measured by the ability of this corporation to make people pay exorbitant prices for its products, I don't think he put the price too high.

"Now, principal among the privileges the United States Steel corporation enjoys, is that of making some one else pay taxes which should properly be paid by the owners of this \$1,000,000,000 worth of property. While farmers and home owners are paying on an average of \$20 in taxes on every \$1,000 worth of property, on this particular \$1,000,000,000 the United States Steel corporation is paying less than \$1 on \$1,000 in taxes.

"A billion dollars' worth of farm and home property is required to pay an average of two per cent., or \$20,000,000 a year in taxes. This coal and iron property pays less than \$1,000,000. In other words, the value of the privilege of making other people pay its taxes amounts to \$19,000,000 a year to the United States Steel corporation.

"And still Senator Hanna says that no monopolies, except the patent monopoly, exist in this country. After being for so many years closely identified with railroads and street railways and the coal and iron business, whose privileges I have just illustrated, it seems strange that these things should have slipped Senator Hanna's mind when he made his Chautauqua speech and said that no monopolies existed in this country except the patent monopolies."—Cleveland Plain Dealer, of August 11.

THE DESPOTISM OF THE DOLLAR.

From an address delivered February 22, 1902, before the Connecticut Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, by Walter S. Logan, of the New York bar, and former president of the Bar Association of the State of New York.

The Latin's battle cry of freedom has always been personal liberty. He considers himself free if he can keep out of jail. The Saxon's fight for freedom, on the other hand, has ever been lined up behind the dollar. The right to hold property has been the Saxon's battle cry. Property represents individual independence. The possession of property is what differentiates the citizen from the mob. The sacredness of property means the encouragement of individual initiative and individual independence. Self-reliance, the right of every man to be the architect and the artisan of his own fortune and to make the bed he is to lie in, is the cornerstone of Saxon freedom. From the Latin you might take away everything and he would consider himself free as long as his limbs were unhampered. The Saxon claims as his birthright to be assured that he may reap what he has sown and keep what is his own. . . .

We fought our fight against the despotism of kings to secure the right to have and retain all that the dollar stands for.

The despotism of the king is a thing of the past. We have won our fight against it and won it well. . . . But a new despotism has arisen. Our struggle for the dignity of the dollar seems to have culminated in the abuse of the dollar. The Dollar has come to be Deified. The despotism of the day is the despotism of the dollar. . . .

The old struggle was by men who demanded the right to retain what was their own and to enjoy the fruits of their own frugality. The new struggle is by men or corporations who by some special extraordinary privilege, license, immunity or advantage have accumulated their boundless millions and are using these accumulations to maintain the monopolies that

oppress and outrage the people. The throne of our modern George III. is no longer at Westminster but in Wall street. The Lord Norths of our day form steel trusts and sugar trusts and all other kinds of trusts, and then claim—not the divine right of kingship, but—the divine right of dollarship to rule the earth. If the interests of the people demand an Isthmian canal, that work is delayed year after year and Congress after Congress because it will interfere with the monopoly of a great railroad company. If the interests of the people demand and the conscience of the people insists upon a fair treatment of an adjacent island which we claim the right to take under our protection and whose product we use to sweeten our morning coffee, that must not be, because great trusts think they will have to lessen their dividends if the people of Connecticut do not pay full duty on Cuban sugar to the impoverishment of Connecticut and Cuba alike. If the interests of the people demand that the iron and steel that is needed in every industry in the land, in the construction of every home in the land, in the making of every tool or implement of trade in the land, in the transportation of passengers and freight throughout the land, shall enter our harbors free and unhampered, that must not be if it will in any wise interfere with the ten per cent. dividends of a billion-dollar corporation. If public improvements are planned in the interest of the people, if better roads or a better utilization of the highways of the people are in contemplation, if trolleys to bring neighborhoods together are asked for, all this must not be unless the consent can be obtained of hundred-million dollar railroad corporations that pay more in dividends every year than was the total cost of running the United States government a hundred years ago. If anything is to be done that the people demand, if any want is to be supplied that the people need, it must not be unless the great monopolies of the nation will graciously give their permission.

The modern dollar has become despotic. The dollars have left the masses and found their way into the pockets of the classes. . . .

The mighty men of earth to-day are not its princes or its potentates, its legislators or its ministers of state, its preachers or its orators, the men of the pen or the men of the sword. The men who wield the world's destinies are its moneyed men. By putting their money into the channels of trade they produce prosperity. By with-