

\$10,000 from the cemetery, net income.
 \$1,175 from city park and hall for festivities, net income. (All the above is the property of the city.)
 \$8,750 from 1 newspaper for publishing city adv'ts.
 \$750 from advertising boards and pillars.
 \$375 from electric clock service.
 \$3,750 from taxes on dogs (\$4 each).
 \$1,875 from hunting and fishing rights.
 \$30,000 from keeping record of real estate sales.
 \$72,000 from tax on provisions, brought into the city.

The city owns \$245,250—a capital "to grow" for 34 different purposes, coming from bequests, collections, gifts, etc.

This was the amount on December 31, 1904.

It grew in the year of 1904 by \$26,750. It grew from January 1, 1890, from \$47,500 by new gifts, bequests and interest, to \$245,250 on December 31, 1904.

The purposes are six monuments and monumental fountains, a big organ for the hall for festivities, one hall of arts, a garden for wild animals, for the people's kitchen, for the people's free library, for increasing the number of open street gutters with clear flowing water, etc.

May 2, 1906.

L. DREIER.

* * *

THE RUSSIAN LAND QUESTION

Editorial in the New York Globe of June 2, 1906

That the land question so quickly pushed to the front in the Duma is further evidence that the Russian peasant, however inhospitable to new ideas, is tenacious of old ones. The delegates representing the peasants secured the inclusion of expropriation as a principal item of the reform programme. This indicates that the peasants still cling to the notion entertained when serfhood was abolished—that the land belongs to them and not to their masters, and that to keep them out of it is robbery.

With respect to agrarian rights the peasants at emancipation had traditional conceptions antedating and at variance with the written law. According to the decrees of the czar, copying the land system of the west, estates belonged to the proprietors; according to the peasants they belonged to them, and the proprietorial right consisted merely in the personal authority over the serfs which for some inscrutable but not to be questioned reason the czar had conferred on their masters. As Sir Donald Wallace says in his authoritative work, these peasant conceptions were not put into strict legal form, but the peasants often expressed them in their own homely, laconic way by saying to their masters: "We are yours, but the land is ours." When the emancipation came, and the moujik title was not recognized, the notion long prevailed that a part of the decree had been suppressed, or that a second and more important one was to come. Of what use, the peasants asked, is freedom, if we are actually poorer than we were?

With infinite difficulty were many villages—and it is to be remembered that land communism prevails in Russia—induced to accept the so-called liberty on the terms offered. They believed themselves outraged by an arrangement which gave them only half the land and required them to compensate their masters for that half. As late as 1885 the czar was compelled peremptorily to order that settlements should be made which, under the theory of the original decree, were to be by agree-

ment under the direction of arbiters or umpires appointed for the various districts. The peasantry has never ceased to consider as wrong the forty-nine year payments and the reservation of half the land as the private estate of the landlords. So on the first opportunity, as the Duma proceedings show, the demand is renewed for more land and the cessation of land payments.

Progress of time might have dimmed the old conceptions had they not been kept alive by the population increase. In 1861, when the present division was made, the average amount of land set off was 8.62 acres per private male serf, 12.03 acres per crown male serf, and 17.56 acres per state male serf. Now in many districts, especially where the private serfs were the most numerous, the communal division of the land has so gone on that the allotment has dwindled to a mere sliver. "Zemli malo!" ("There is not enough land!") is an exclamation often heard at the village assemblies. Those that look ahead ask anxiously: "What is to become of our children? Already the communal allotment is too small for our wants, and the land outside is doubling and trebling in price! What will it be in the future?" With millions of peasants on the border line of starvation, eager is the gaze at the estates of the proprietors and at what the state and crown still owns. With the pressure of material want a mordant, the tradition that the land is kept from its rightful owners does not fade. The Duma, the new power of which the peasant has heard, is to do what the czar, if his will had not been perverted, long ago would have done.

If some adjustment is not made Russia's rural regions are likely to become afflicted with chronic agrarian disorder. In the cities, where men are massed, the soldiers are able to enforce some sort of order, but in the sparsely settled country the task is beyond achievement.

* * *

THE TOWN MEETING IN NEW ENGLAND

For The Public.

In these days when the "expressed will of the people" by ballot is being over-ridden with impunity by unscrupulous political machine law makers, and laws are placed upon our statute books in defiance of the spirit and interest of the people's wishes, it is well to study democratic methods wherever we can find them. The town meeting in New England is one of the most democratic institutions which has ever been devised. It rests absolutely upon the aggregation of individual voters in mass meetings assembled. The people en masse first vote viva voce, vote next by show of hands, again by a division of the house, and last a voting list is procured and the votes are checked up, and from this last there is no appeal. This is certainly direct legislation in its broadest and most deliberate form and in effect it is the initiative and referendum. All matters affecting public policy or the credit of the town must be decided by referendum vote. No extension of public debt or credit, or granting franchises for public utilities without a vote. Three to five people can initiate legislation by serving notice

stating the subject to be acted upon. This is handed to the town constable who draws up the legal warrant, and it is posted at the postoffice, at the town hall, at other central points, and at remote street corners, giving notice when and where the meeting will be held and for what specific purposes. When the time arrives the meeting is called to order. The warrant is read by the constable. The moderator is nominated and elected from the floor. The meeting is then open for business. Women are allowed a voice but not a vote in these meetings. The same qualifications are required to vote in town meetings that are necessary for State and national elections.

A New Englander coming west to reside cannot fail to be impressed with the thoughtlessness of the citizens of little communities who are ambitious and active to incorporate their town or village as a city. They appear to rush blindly and joyfully to delegate away their own powers of progress or self-defense by means of direct legislation, by incorporating themselves into a city. It appears to the average voter and real estate dealer that to live in a city, to have their business in a city, is most desirable. Thus we find little communities of 200 or 300 inhabitants on the map as cities. Mayors are elected, city councils chosen, and trouble begins. The reins of government are slipped out of the hands of the individuals, and the city team is then driven by so-called representatives who, as a rule, represent only themselves. Then the little community begins to suffer from a government by a few and for a few, and the chances of corruption are increased and temptation is created.

In all New England where the town meeting system of government is operative, no record of embezzlement or corruption has ever come to my knowledge. An auditing committee is elected annually in town meeting, and the board of select men simply carry out the measures which were decided upon in town meeting, and do not presume to do more or dare to do less.

The largest town in this country is Brookline, Mass., which has a population of nearly 40,000 people who have voted for generations against incorporating as a city to be swallowed up by Boston. This town is one of the most beautiful in all New England, and has more wealth per capita than any other community in the world. The town meetings are conducted with decorum, spirit and justice, and with less confusion than is exhibited in any large city council, State legislature or the national Congress.

The advent of a town meeting is indelibly written upon the memory of every boy and girl in New England, because of the distribution of "election cake," which is always a part of the programme. Sheets of glossy buns with raisins are sold and passed about and find their way into every family where there is a voter, and the children early learn of the town meeting and its significance. The custom came about from the necessity of feeding those who came to town from remote parts of the township to vote while the women did their "trading." It will, perhaps, account for the patriotism of the New England people when it is known that the idea of a free government, which recognizes all men to be equal, that no man is greater or more powerful than his

brother, that the rich man's hand counts for no more than does the poor in town meeting, is fed to the youth of that land with buns and homemade root beer, until he looks upon the President of the United States as one of his select men, his servant, to do his bidding as defined in town meeting or political convention and expressed in a party platform.

MINONA S. FITTS-JONES.

+ + +

THE BUSY CHILD.

I have so many things to do
I don't know when I shall be through.

To-day I had to watch the rain
Come sliding down the window-pane.

And I was humming all the time,
Around my head, a kind of rhyme;

And blowing softly on the glass
To see the dimness come and pass.

I made a picture, with my breath
Rubbed out to show the underneath.

I built a city on the floor;
And then I went and was a War.

And I escaped; from square to square
That's greenest in the carpet there.

Until at last I came to Us—
But it was very dangerous.

Because, if I had stepped outside,
I made believe I should have died!

And now I have the boat to mend,
And all our supper to pretend.

I am so busy, every day,
I haven't any time to play.

—Josephine Preston Peabody, in Harper's Magazine.

+ + +

"So the millionaires gave a mask ball? Was it a success?"

"No, but it would have been a success save for Percy Lavender."

"What did he do?"

"Why, he went disguised as a process server, and all the millionaires jumped out of the windows."—
—Chicago News.

+ + +

"What are they doing?" asked a visitor to the United States supreme court.

"They are handing down a decision declaring those Chattanooga lynchings are in contempt of court unless they show cause by October," said an ancient doorkeeper.

"Is it such a serious thing to be in contempt of the supreme court?" persisted the visitor.

"Serious thing!" exclaimed the doorkeeper. "Why, sir, just stop and think it over. There ain't nobody left to appeal to but just Providence."

—Chicago Chronicle.

+ + +

If it isn't larceny or just plain stealing, what is it when a man takes money that doesn't belong to him, secretly hands it over to those who have no