

whose kingdom is so much harder to establish, make great the nation that gives her half-hearted and cynical devotion? Had the spirit of Ananias animated the early preachers of the gospel of love, the movement would have died before it was born. If those who pretend to love justice are to declare that justice shall be done only when and where it does not interfere with the interests of those who have bought and paid for the privilege of doing injustice, Ananias and his kind are given command of the one movement that is to save the world. "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"

A. C. CAMPBELL.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

LOUISIANA.

Natchitoches, La., Dec. 15.—I have seen at this place during the past few days a good illustration both of the manner in which effectual work may be done in the interest of juster taxation, and of the readiness with which open-minded men accept clear suggestions.

Natchitoches (pronounced Nack-i-tosh) is one of the most interesting old towns of the South. It combines the beauty of an ancient background with the freshness of modern progress. It is a cathedral town with a Catholic bishop. It is the seat of the State normal school, one of the best in the whole country. Here one may see the flower of Southern hospitality, in homes as simple as they are refined, as open as they are modest, as dignified as they are gracious. Here one may find the best type of the high-toned Southern gentleman—not, perhaps always free from prejudice, who is?—but, in the main, open-minded and well-informed. Here one may sit at table with the old regime and listen to a discussion of woman suffrage. Here one may attend a reception at the home of an enlightened Congressman and find about him a group talking of Henry George and the single tax. Really there are few towns in all these United States superior, in a combination of refined manners and intellectual freshness, to this old and new little city of Natchitoches—with its dignified double-towered cathedral and its own municipal lighting plant.

It is no wonder that Louisiana's recently-elected progressive superintendent of education should have wished to assemble here his first meeting of local superintendents. The normal school, where they met, is, as I have said, one of the best in the land. It is so recognized by the foremost school men, North as well as South. The State superintendent of Maine was present

at the meeting, and he will bear witness to the truth of this statement. It was fine to see his undisguised admiration and his genuine friendliness.

The meeting was notable for its earnestness and for its businesslike conduct. Nearly every corner of the State was represented by some leading man enlisted in the cause of public education. There was an entire absence of politics and political axes—just a determination to further public education. Of course a main underlying thought was the increase of funds for this purpose, and this brings me back to the theme with which I started and which is the purpose of this communication, namely, that earnest men are open-minded and see more things than newspapers are ready to report.

I spoke quietly, not publicly, to men from every part of the State, and found not one who did not agree with me when I said that the large land holdings were shamefully assessed at far below their values, and that the revenues of the parishes ought to be increased by a juster assessment. A parish superintendent said to me that one might ride ten miles in any direction from his town without getting off the land of half a dozen men, that this land was worth on an average at least \$15 per acre, that in fact you could not buy it, and that it was assessed at not more than a dollar per acre. Let me say also that most of these sound-headed men also saw the point that a juster assessment would not only increase revenue, but might force the great land holders to sell land in smaller holdings, a result which they clearly saw would be advantageous to the development of the community.

I talked quietly and individually, because the time is not quite ripe for public agitation of the question. But it cannot be long delayed. The discrimination in favor of large landlords is too marked to escape public attention much longer. Assessors are still timid and conventional. Some who have innocently tried to assess equitably have lost a good job, and the masses of the people have not yet opened their eyes. But the time is approaching when the idea of a better assessment of land values for public revenue will be more generally grasped and a reform demanded. What I found at this meeting was that many who want more money for the public schools already see the point. Meantime nearly all are ready to join in a campaign in favor of local taxation for local schools, and by and by they will agree where to lay the honest burden.

J. H. D.

WASHINGTON.

Washington, D. C., Dec. 17.—We hear it on high authority that "words are good when backed by deeds, and only so." Being curious to learn whether "words, words, only words," was the

attitude of the administration towards the "beef trust," and having in mind that the House on March 7, last, at the instance of a Republican (Martin, of South Dakota) unanimously passed a resolution, calling upon the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to report as to the cause of the low price of fresh beef and the large margin between the price of cattle on the hoof and dressed meat; and that nine months have elapsed, and the "early report of his findings according to law," which he was then directed to make, has not been made, I introduced a resolution yesterday, directing the Attorney General to report whether he has ascertained that the "beef trust" is a combination in restraint of trade, and if so, what steps he has taken to cause a "forfeiture of their property" in course of transportation from one State to another?"

The curiosity that dictated the resolution was not lessened by the discovery that in a letter to the American Anti-Trust league, dated August 20, 1901, Mr. Moody's predecessor, Attorney General Knox, declared it to be the duty of his department; "and its object, to enforce the Federal statutes as interpreted by the courts, wherever there is probable cause for believing that they have been violated." As the "probability" of their violation by the "beef trust" must be admitted even by the Attorney General's office—else why the farce of applying for an injunction—it would seem that there is no good reason for not taking the most summary action against this combination that the statutes provide for.

In view of the very explicit wording of section 6 of the "anti-trust" law, of 1890, which provides:

"Sec. 6. Any property owned under any contract or by any combination, or pursuant to any conspiracy (and being the subject thereof) mentioned in section 1 of this act, and being in the course of transportation from one State to another, or to a foreign country, shall be forfeited to the United States, and may be seized and condemned by like proceedings as those provided by law for the forfeiture, seizure and condemnation of property imported into the United States contrary to law;"—

what can be more clear, than that it is the obvious duty of the Attorney General to at once take steps for the "forfeiture, seizure and condemnation" of any property of the beef trust which may be (and it always has some) in transit between the States? Does anyone doubt that the combination would dissolve if such summary steps were taken?

Anyone making whisky without complying with the internal revenue law has his property confiscated and destroyed, and is lucky to escape with his life if he attempts to defend his property. He who manufactures cigars except in accordance with internal revenue regulations finds his property confiscated. Whoever brings property into this country without paying duty is liable to lose it. But those who compose