

The criminal statute would allow the arrest of the coal barons and, upon conviction of being parties to any restraint of trade, or of having formed a combination to control prices, they could be imprisoned for one year. A coal baron in jail would soon bring him and his brother robbers to terms, and the price of coal would soon tumble. R. M.

NEWS FROM ENGLAND.

For The Public.

It has been immensely gratifying to me to find in Great Britain such widespread popular sentiment in favor of the abolition of private ownership of land. No doubt the reason why this sentiment is more generally developed and has taken more serious hold upon the people of this country than in the United States is because of the concentration of the land problem. Indeed this close neighborliness of the people of the tight little isle has operated in many instances to the advantage of sociological progress; as, for instance, in the commercial cooperation which has been so splendidly built up in this country. Very many cooperative enterprises which have been begun in our own country have fallen through, because of distance, with all its inconveniences, which intervened between the promoters. So in like fashion I think municipal ownership in Great Britain has been advanced because of the proximity of the operating cities and the inspiration which grew out of the intimate acquaintance thus afforded concerning the initial experimentation.

I am furthermore afraid that I must confess, although I suffer patriotic chills in doing so, that there is a larger percentage of men and women here than with us who give serious, sustained and thorough study to social problems. This is, of course, a generalization which does not at all animadvert upon the many devoted and unsurpassed sociological students in America—it is simply a statement as to relative numbers. Certain it is that one can scarcely find here an intelligent person who does not recognize the land question as at the base of all reform problems. Everywhere it crops out, in conversation and in public discussion; whether the topic is housing the poor, municipalization of public service, or any sort of effort towards the betterment of social conditions.

How grandly worth while it was, to the whole human family, that Henry George lived and taught. How

I do hope that in the good Somewhere that received that great soul it is given to him to know of the superb acceptance of the truths he told. I think not any joy that other state has brought to him could satisfy him more than to know how at length his service to his fellowmen is growing toward fruition.

I wonder if The Public has told its readers of the progress of a movement begun in London called "The Garden City" plan. Briefly, it is an attempt to relieve the congestion of great cities, and also to systematize and humanize industry, by inducing manufactories to retire from large, unwholesome cities and to build for the industrial people model dwelling places wherein humanity may expand instead of decay; the inexorable and the vital provision being the everlasting holding of the ground whereon the Garden Cities are built away from private ownership and speculation. The plan further includes the mandate of perpetual preservation of an agricultural belt surrounding each Garden City. It is marvelous the interest which this movement enlists in London. The Pioneer Garden City will soon be in process of building—located not far from London. I believe there are measureless possibilities incarnate in this project. It interests me more than any other feature of progressive sociology which I have found on this side of the Atlantic.

ANNIE L. DIGGS.

London, England, Dec. 12, 1902.

THE SUNDAY QUESTION.

The Sunday question, while never swelling to the dimensions of an issue of widespread importance—like the silver or tariff questions—occupies a rather permanent position in the background of the public mind, and ever and anon surges forth to engage the attention of the masses.

The following lines are an attempt to arrive at some fundamental principles governing the consideration of the question.

Foremost in importance and underlying the whole discussion, is the principle that the government shall not interfere with the religious life of the individual, that it shall neither enforce nor prohibit the observance of religious rules. This principle is one of the cornerstones of American institutions; it animated the early emigrants when they turned westward for relief from oppression, and it inspired the heroes of the revolution when they drew up the consti-

tution of our country. Any Sunday legislation, accordingly, which has in view the enforcement of religious tenets—more specifically of the fourth commandment—is contrary to the spirit of freedom and tolerance.

Often, however—perhaps generally—this purpose is not thus undisguisedly avowed. It is the "quiet" and "rest" of the Sabbath which is the object of solicitude; the offensive Sunday amusements are stigmatized as nuisances and disturbances of the peace, and it is on this ground that their prohibition is demanded.

Now, I believe that this view of the matter, even when it is honestly entertained, is nevertheless very largely to be traced to religious sources. The nuisances and disturbances of peace are regarded as such, not because they are intrinsically offensive, but because they run counter to religious convictions and habits. Abstract from the desecration of the Lord's day, and they will appear perfectly harmless.

A candid and unbiased introspection, I dare say, would corroborate this statement; both in its historic origin and in its present incitation. The objection to Sunday amusements clearly draws its nourishment from religious soil. However, there is a perfectly definite, objective method of testing the matter. Besides our 52 Sundays, the year contains some half-dozen extra holidays, which are not freighted with the religious injunction against work and pleasure. In all other respects these days exactly resemble the seventh day of the week; the wheels of industry are slackened, the individual is released from his regular duties and is free to follow his own inclinations. Decoration day and the Fourth of July are Sundays without the fourth commandment, and Sunday is a holiday with the commandment attached. Now, what do our holidays teach us in regard to the amusements that are tabooed on Sunday? Not only are they considered perfectly allowable, but extra provision is even made for them. The theaters give special performances, the baseball games begin in the morning, music resounds on every hand, and an air of festivity and gladness pervades the entire community. This, accordingly, is the verdict of the purely human, natural man; and since the main difference between Sundays and the other holidays lies in the religious injunction, as already mentioned, the legislation against Sunday