

And yet this kind of business, besides its profits great,
Has one advantage really surprising to relate,
Since valiant, honest warriors against monopoly
Apparently regard it as a useful industry!
And those who for the praise of men would gladly take much pains,
Nor would be known to soil their hands with aught but honest gains,
Find in the grabbing of the earth—that unwhipped social sin—
A tempting chance to not play false and yet to wrongly win.

While through the wilderness of wrong the blind conduct the blind,
What region good intentions pave is often brought to mind,
When leaders look to tyrants' laws our tyrants to defeat
And see without a pang the earth snatched from beneath our feet.

JAY HAWKINS.

THE FILIPINO LABORER.

Between 1852 and 1888 I spent more than 20 years in the Philippines. During those years all the agricultural labor was done by Filipinos. . . .

I got once a good lesson in manners from an old Filipino. I was overseeing some work which went slowly and not to my liking. I slung out at the men the word "Brutos!" (brutes). The old fellow approached me politely, and said: "I beg your worship's pardon; we are not 'brutos,' but we do not understand the language your worship uses." I apologized, and I hope never so failed in sense and politeness again.—Ogden E. Edwards, in New York Nation of Jan. 8.

CHARACTER.

Character is a by-product.—Woodrow Wilson.

Mankind have always been more or less busy, it is likely.

What have they wrought?

Nothing permanent, except character.

So fleet the works of men, back to their earth again,
Ancient and holy things fade like a dream.—

The Tower of Babel has vanished. The Pyramids are vanishing. But whatsoever of character the Babylonians and the Egyptians built remains and will remain.

The saying that character is a by-product is smart. A successful pork-packer saying it would be voted clever. But a president of Princeton—

This is truly an era of remarkable things.—Life.

TAXATION BY "AGREEMENT."

Editorial in New York World of February 1.

The farce of personal-property taxation in this city is not shown more clearly in the discovery of a success-

ful scheme to swear off assessments by dummies, or perjury by proxy, than it is by the custom of accepting the unsupported statements of rich men as to how much personal assessments they are willing to "stand for."

On Friday Messrs. J. Pierpont Morgan, Jacob H. Schiff, George W. Vanderbilt and other men of large wealth appeared before the tax commissioners to secure a reduction of their personal assessments. Mr. Morgan was assessed for \$600,000, but claimed that the value of his taxable securities is "largely exceeded by the indebtedness against them." He explained: "I borrow a great deal of money, in fact millions." As reported in the Sun Mr. Morgan further said:

In point of actual fact I cannot legally be required to pay any personal tax, because, as I have stated, my investments and holdings are non-assessable for personal taxation. But I don't want to be looked upon as a tax-dodger. I think that every man doing a large volume of business in this city ought to pay something in personal taxation. If I am required to take an oath to this effect, I will pay nothing, but if you are willing to accept my personal statement, I will pay on \$400,000 assessment.

Mr. Morgan's statement was accepted, and he was not sworn. In like manner and upon similar grounds the assessment of Mr. Schiff was reduced to \$200,000, and that of George W. Vanderbilt to \$50,000.

The first reflection of the average citizen upon this transaction is likely to take form in the pertinent question: Why is the unsupported statement of very rich men as to their taxable property accepted by the tax commissioners, while the ordinary citizen is required to swear off or to pay?

Without questioning the veracity of any of these multi-millionaires, is it not a fact that the pictures and furnishings alone in any of their mansions—not to mention the jewels—are worth many times the sum of the personal assessment which they are permitted to fix for themselves?

If personal property cannot be more fully and equitably taxed it is time to repeal the law altogether.

ENGLISH COMMENTS ON OUR COAL FAMINE.

Editorial notes in the London Spectator of January 17.

The pictures of the prosperity, happiness, and comfort of the working population of the United States which are so frequently drawn by the American millionaire are not confirmed by the accounts which reach us of their sufferings during the present winter. A Reuter's telegram from Chicago

(January 12) stated that "extremely cold weather prevails in the Western States, and a number of persons have been frozen to death." This is attributed to the extreme price of coal, which is still in some places as high as three pounds sterling per ton. Now, the coal owners of the United States are protected by a tariff against foreign competition, and this duty is evidently held to be responsible for the acute misery of the situation, for both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate action has been taken with a view to the removal or suspension of the duty. But if the American has so large a margin of comfort, how is it that a rise in the price of fuel involving an additional expenditure of, say, three or four shillings a week for a month or two, results in "a number of persons being frozen to death?" And if, as Mr. Carnegie has argued in print, protection lowers prices, why do protectionist assemblies seek to lower prices by removing a protective duty? Providence seems determined to prove that even the richest and largest free trade area in the world cannot afford to defy the laws of political economy.

The seriousness of the crisis in America is shown by the extraordinary proceedings at Washington on Wednesday, when a bill for a rebate equal to the duty on all kinds of coal coming from all countries for a year passed the House by 258 votes to 5. Therefore the bill went up to the Senate, which passed it immediately on receiving it from the House. An amendment was adopted by the Senate adding a section to prevent the imposition of a duty on anthracite coal after the expiration of time provided in the act. We cannot help being reminded that the death knell of protection was sounded in England by the Irish famine, which was the proximate cause of the conversion of Sir Robert Peel and half the conservative party to free trade.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY. CIVIL SERVICE UPHELD.

Theodore Wensink, a prominent member of the Buckeye club, and one of the select coterie of Salenite leaders, was discharged from his position of waterworks assessor by Superintendent Bemis yesterday morning. Wensink did not take his dismissal with good grace. Instead of kissing the hand that smote him, he proceeded to call down imprecations upon the devoted head of the learned superintendent. Incidentally he said mean things about Mayor Johnson for allowing the professor to remain at the head of the waterworks department,

and pervert it from its function as a part and parcel of the municipal political machine. Then he vowed vengeance both against the professor and against the mayor.

"Where Johnson camps with his tent this spring, there will I be," exclaimed Wensink. "Where Johnson camps with his tent I will camp in the dooryards of every man of the ward. I will tell them my tale of ingratitude and unrequited benefits conferred. I will tell them of Johnson, who knows not his friends, and of Johnson's evil genius, the professor, who has turned the waterworks department from its proper function, so that it is now little more than a place where political services are counted as naught. No rest will I take until this professor is driven from the city, and until the proud head of Johnson is brought to the dust."

Prof. Bemis told of Wensink's bitter mood to Mayor Johnson.

"It may defeat us," said the mayor. "But," he added, "I would rather be defeated and stand for principle, than win by truckling to schemers."

"It was in this fashion," said Prof. Bemis, in explaining the removal of Wensink. "Since the establishment of so many water meters there has not been need for as many assessors as formerly. There was the necessity that one be discharged; so I ordered two employes to make an examination of the reports of all the assessors to find out which was the most incompetent. The balance of incompetency was largely in favor of Wensink. It was found that out of 11 assessments reported in three days, three were absolutely wrong. When I confronted Wensink with these facts he admitted that he had not examined the houses in question.

"They were the houses of poor women," he said, "and I shall not assess them up as high as others in better circumstances."

"Of course I admired Wensink's benevolent motives, but the waterworks department is not authorized by the city council to make any distinction in assessment on account of the material prosperity of the person to be assessed. If this were the case we could save assessors entirely by merely charging each consumer in accordance with his wealth. And if it were to be a matter of charity, we ought to turn it over to Director Cooley."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

LET THE TUNNELS ALONE.

For The Public.

With something of the pertinacious insistence with which the elder Cato

declared that Carthage must be destroyed, and the almost forgotten Nasby used to "Pulverize the Rum Power," the newspapers of Chicago have long been demanding that we "lower the tunnels."

For years they have had an acute attack of this malady just before the opening of navigation. During the past year or two, however, the senseless clamor has become chronic or constant; and, what is worse, high-priced "experts" and grave scientific men have devoted columns to the serious discussion of the "tunnel problem." This shows how great a matter a little fire kindleth. While confined to the funny paragraphers of the daily press these frequent and latterly almost constant gibes might be lightly passed over, though it did jar one's sense of propriety that they should appear in staid and serious protection papers. However, the recent serious discussion and grave editorial advocacy of the lowering of the tunnels in these same protection papers, shows that all sense of the incongruity is lost, and is one of the enigmas of progress.

It would almost seem that the tunnels are without a single defender. Yet the very arguments that are used against the tunnels show that to them, in part at least, must be due Chicago's marvelous growth.

The progress of lake shipping and ship building has made these much abused tunnels better than a custom house to prevent Chicago from becoming a "dumping ground" for goods produced elsewhere. Even under the Dingley tariff law, though most of its schedules are intentionally prohibitory, there is some importation; and in proportion as goods are "dumped" here, domestic enterprise is discouraged and the development of home industry retarded.

That such must be the result is at once apparent to any mind capable of logical processes. But we are not driven to abstract reasoning to support this view. Many concrete examples establish it. Two of Chicago's Michigan suburbs furnish a perfect illustration. Fifteen years ago Grand Haven, with its magnificent harbor at the mouth of the Grand river (as its very name indicates), had about twice the population of its neighboring city of Holland (also a significant name). Moreover, Holland was at a disadvantage in that a much larger proportion of its people were foreigners, and, though of most worthy and sturdy character, were withal weighted down by European

conservatism. But Holland had one tremendous advantage over its sister city of Grand Haven, 20 miles to the north; it did enjoy the protection of a shallow harbor—Black lake—more recently called Macatawa bay. Even the comparatively shallow-draught boats of that day dared not attempt to "dump" goods into Holland. The result has been that local industry has developed until Holland has become a thriving manufacturing city, with twice the population of Grand Haven, which has barely held its own in population, and has actually gone backward so far as business enterprise is concerned.

Do we Chicagoans need any plainer lesson—any further warning—not to disturb the tunnels under our noble river, which has in the past furnished such efficient and beneficent "protection," and made us one of the greatest commercial and manufacturing centers in the world? What is it to us if a few rat harboring elevators have been built along the Calumet? And even if we cared a rap, let us be candid enough to admit that the real reason is because the land to build them on is cheaper, and that it is not at all due to the presence of the beneficent tunnels in our noble river.

In conclusion, candor requires me to say that I am not a protectionist. To me, even revenue tariffs are an abomination, and custom houses a curse. But if I were a protectionist, I should have to run in debt for the hardihood to seriously propose the lowering of the tunnels which have so long and effectually served to keep Chicago from becoming a "dumping ground for the pauper-made goods of Europe."

WILEY WRIGHT MILLS.

Chicago, Feb. 8, 1903.

THE OPPORTUNITY OF DEMOCRACY.

For The Public.

I believe it is true of parties as of individuals, that if they decline the burden that seems naturally offered to them, they lose the opportunity of the service, and have to give place to others who are willing to take up the burden.

This is the history of the birth of new parties. To go no farther back than the fifties, we find an example in the anti-slavery problem. Neither of the old parties would assume the task. Fortune pointed especially to the Whig party as the one to which the burden should fall—not so much because of its inherent principles as because the Democrats were hopelessly hampered. The opportunity was