

hailing for the most part from obscure Highland settlements—who protested against the amalgamation on the ground that it was an acceptance of the voluntary principle and a violation of the constitution of the church as adopted at the Disruption. The dissentients were treated with scant courtesy. An attempt was made to thrust them out of the synagogue, and their offers of compromise were rejected. But they were sturdy Scots, and not to be put down. They claimed that they were the faithful among the faithless, and that the property of the Free Church belonged to them. The Scottish courts decided against them, and they resolved to appeal to the House of Lords. When, in view of the enormous cost of that appeal, they suggested that whichever side won the expense of the trial should be paid out of the church funds, the suggestion was scouted with a bad grace. The United Free Kirkers thought the Wee Kirkers, as they dubbed the dissentients, would never be able to raise the money to carry on the appeal, but they were mistaken.

The document read from the United Free Church pulpits on Sunday was drawn up in the spirit of humility, and contrasted remarkably with the hoity-toity tone assumed by the defendants in their negotiations with the appellants before the trial. "Once again," says the manifesto, "the church is apparently to endure the loss of possessions for obedience to what we regard as the will of Christ, and for practically asserting in that line the inalienable liberties of the church. The ground of the judgment is that the Free Church has no right to take the steps which her convictions demanded; no liberty to distinguish what is essential and non-essential in the Westminster confession; and no power, therefore, to enter into a union with a sister church, though that church was one with her in all essential points of doctrine, discipline and government." The judgment is certainly an astonishing one, and confirms us in the belief that Mr. Bumble was right in his opinion about the law. We suppose if there had been only one appellant, instead of over a score, the lords would have decided that he was the rightful custodian of the Free Church property, which is valued at over £10,000,000. The costs of the trial, we are told, will be not less than £40,000. The defendants have been ordered to pay these costs, and we should say they are now sorry that they did not listen to the proposal of the appellants that the costs should be paid out of the Church property. John Stuart Mill said that the English law put a premium on injustice. That it

should cost £40,000 to settle a religious dispute proves, we think, that Mill was right. The judgment was not a unanimous one. Two of the seven law lords did not agree with their colleagues. We hope, however, it will rouse Scotsmen to agitate for home rule and for the disestablishment of the House of Lords. It must appear to them ridiculous that an English court should be allowed to upset a judgment of the Scottish courts, and still more ridiculous that a great organization like the Free Church of Scotland should not have the power to revise its constitution, and to modify its creed in accordance with the fresh light which is being constantly thrown by the higher criticism on the Scriptures which the churches still acknowledge as the rule of faith and practice. The Free Church was founded by Dr. Chalmers, a man of liberal ideas, who, had he lived, we feel sure would have approved of the union of the Free Church with the United Presbyterian. There is one thing in favor of the defendants; they are in possession of the churches and the manse, the training colleges and the bulk of the Free Church property. The 24 successive appellants will have their work cut out if they decide to carry out the lords' judgment to its logical conclusion. Some compromise is surely possible. The lords may be technically right, but they have struck a heavy blow at spiritual freedom, and in favor of an antiquated orthodoxy. Yet there have been times when our law lords have done better than this. It was said of Lord Chancellor Westbury that by his judgment in the Wilson case he abolished Hell with costs, and thereby deprived members of the Church of England of their last hope of eternal damnation. Our present Lord Chancellor, however, and the majority of his colleagues seem to be desirous that Scotsmen should retain that hope. The appellants against the United Free Church are faithful preachers of the Gospel according to Calvin, who discovered that usurers had a chance of Heaven, and that there were babies in Hell a foot long. They have been rewarded for their orthodoxy, but we do not believe that they will be able to fill the 1,100 pulpits which the House of Lords has handed over to them with men of their own way of thinking.

The question of the connection between church and state is raised afresh by this judgment. The Free Church, that is to say, the Church of the Disruption, did not object to state endowment; what they protested against was the interference of the State in spiritual matters. By amalgamating with a Nonconformist body like the

United Presbyterians they undoubtedly abandoned their State Church position. It would be a good thing if all State churches were disestablished. Clericalism under State patronage is an enemy to progress, and we rejoice that in France the quarrel between the Vatican and the Government seems likely to lead to a permanent rupture. By insisting upon adherence to the Concordat the French Government are well within their rights. The Concordat was the work of Napoleon I., who drew it up in such a way that there could be no doubt that he meant France and not the Pope to be supreme. France therefore will not accept bishops of whom she does not approve, or allow bishops of whom she does approve to be removed without her consent. It is curious that Scotland and France, old allies, should both now be agitated by something of the nature of a religious revolution. The loss of the Free Church property may be a spiritual gain for the United Free Church of Scotland, and the severance of the Church and State in France will help the cause of civil and religious freedom all the world over.

EUROPE'S MUNICIPAL STREET CARS, AND THE ECONOMIC LESSONS THEY PRESENT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

By Judson Grenell. (Copyright, 1904, by Judson Grenell.)

Glasgow is an excellent place from which to study the street car problem. It is probable that the statistics furnished by Glasgow officials have been more quoted than from any other municipality, but, after all, figures are not everything, and, as has been before remarked, while figures do not lie, liars sometimes figure. So I shall not weary the reader with statistics. Suffice it to say that the reports are all in favor of municipal ownership from the financial standpoint. But there are other things to consider as well as money, and it is necessary to view the problem from all sides if one desires to come to a correct conclusion.

After talking with city officials and intelligent citizens in Glasgow; in Liverpool, Manchester, Oldham, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, Bradford, Salford and London, England; in Berne and Lausanne, Switzerland; in Freiburg, Germany, and in various other localities; after viewing the magnificent plants some of these cities have installed and noting how the public is being accommodated; and, keeping in mind also the financial side, I can truthfully say that the street car problem has been solved in Europe over-

whelmingly in favor of municipal ownership.

UNIVERSAL APPROVAL.

I have failed to find in a single city where municipal has followed private ownership, even a respectable minority of citizens favoring the private monopoly of city tramways. Municipal ownership is as yet comparatively young, while the private company with its long monopoly had every advantage that experience could give; but only occasionally was the private monopoly content with normal profits. Possessing a "good thing," they worked it for every penny it was worth, until finally city after city tired of the exactions imposed and either bought or fired them out, and these municipalities have since reaped the reward of their righteous indignation.

During the past five years hundreds of thousands of dollars have been turned into the treasuries of municipal corporations by the cities' tramway officials; cars run oftener and more rapidly; seats are provided at all hours for 95 per cent. of the passengers; and employes are much more solicitous to give satisfaction than they ever were when in the employ of a private street car company. While occasionally a particular line of a system fails to meet expenses, the public is recompensed in other ways and the apparent loss is usually an actual gain.

SHORT HAULS THE RULE.

Glasgow has been held up as a model for cities contemplating owning their own street car systems. It is, in fact, well worth studying, and a superintendent would be wise indeed could he not add to his general knowledge of street car matters by an investigation here. Still, in my opinion, both Liverpool and Manchester are not one whit behind Glasgow in their conduct of their municipal tramways. There is in every instance a wise supervision that looks after the accommodation of the public while not neglecting economy. The men are not overpaid, the supplies are purchased in a competitive market, and the cars are neither extravagantly nor parsimoniously furnished.

It must be kept in mind, however, that probably in no city in Europe are the conditions just the same as those of American commercial and industrial centers. Go back far enough, and it will be seen that most continental municipalities were walled towns, for protection against foreign foes. In consequence they are compactly built, and even in such a great city as Paris, with its 2,500,000 inhabit-

ants—the area of which is about the same as Detroit, Mich., with 300,000 population—the suburbs are quickly reached, making long hauls the exception.

Most English cities were never walled enclosures, but the land laws have had the effect of insuring compactness, so that Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, etc., all with populations running into hundreds of thousands, comprise areas of from 10,000 to 15,000 acres only. Paris covers less than 25,000 acres. Of necessity, then, the hauls are short, the great bulk of the street car riding public paying the minimum fare demanded for the shortest ride.

THE "ZONE" SYSTEM.

In no English city owning its own street cars and tracks did I find one fare charged different length hauls. The "zone" system prevails, passengers paying according to distance traveled. It has been said that the American public will never consent to be "bothered" with this way of collecting fares; that the average American citizen prefers the one-price way; and that the system would financially ruin any American road adopting it. These are not valid objections against the "zone" system that are not more than offset by the simple fact that under it each passenger pays for just what he gets, and that he of the short haul is not mulcted for the benefit of suburban passengers. In short, the "zone" system is the most equitable possible way of charging for street car rides, and the system is as easily laid out and managed as is the system of a merchant who, selling cotton cloth by the yard, charges in proportion to the number of yards ordered. Land speculators dealing in suburban real estate are the chief opponents of the "zone" system. It most certainly would not favor their interests.

Let me explain the "zone" system. After the unit of a haul is decided on—and this unit varies in different cities—a center is established, and the distance between the center and the beginning of another division is a zone, and is the basis of all subsequent charges. In Glasgow this basis is, in the rough, about a mile, for which ride the charge is a cent. In Manchester the basis is two cents for two miles. When two zones are entered the cost is doubled.

When paying a fare the passenger either informs the conductor where his ride is to terminate, or hands over the exact fare he desires to pay. In either case he is given a check containing the names of the streets or stations terminating the various zones, and this check

is punched opposite the terminus of the zone or zones paid for.

As a rule the backs of these checks are used for advertising purposes, quite an income occurring from this source. These checks are at once receipts for fares paid as well as bars to dishonesty on the part of conductors and passengers. "Inspectors" board cars at regular intervals and call for these checks, in the meanwhile noting the number of passengers the memorandum kept by the conductor calls for. I do not remember seeing passenger indicators in any street cars abroad, the number of checks taking their place.

CLOSE VIEW OF MANCHESTER STREET CARS.

Last year was the second the street tramways of Manchester had been under municipal control. The system is not yet perfected, as the experimental stage is incomplete. Yet the management turned \$250,000 into the city treasury, besides cutting the fares, reducing the hours of labor of employes from 70 to 54 hours a week, increasing their pay, putting on more cars with more rapid speed, and in other ways improving the service.

Letters of introduction from Mayor Maybury, of Detroit, Mich., and Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, O., provided me interviews with city officials everywhere, and the information thus obtained as well as the confidence with which those in charge of municipal tramways talked, backed up as were their words with official figures, makes it impossible for me to see how anyone with any general knowledge of the situation can argue for a moment in favor of private and against public ownership of street car service.

"No one in this city at least," the superintendent of the Manchester city tramways told me, "even dreams of returning to the private ownership of our tramways, except he has a nightmare."

In no big town in England has this addition to the duties of a municipality been a failure. It was often necessary to buy out private companies, paying a good round sum for unexpired franchises, and then throw the outfit on the scrap heap and build anew from the bottom. Yet this was cheaper for the public than permitting private ownership to continue.

Here the penny fare is the unit. That small sum carries a passenger about two miles. Over 50 per cent. of our fares, in round numbers, pay this sum; 25 per cent. pay a penny and a half; 15 per cent., possibly, pay tuppence. The remainder pay thrippence, any increase over the largest amount carrying them out of our and into other municipalities' territories. In the cross-town routes there are half penny zones, but these cut but a small figure in the system, such routes being only feeders to the main lines.

Some routes are run at a financial loss,

but there is compensation in other directions, one being the prevention of congested traffic elsewhere.

You can say for me to the American public that our experience here proves that city tramways must be under municipal control if the best and cheapest service is desired. Only through gross mismanagement can there be financial loss.

Manchester, as also, do other up-to-date towns, uses two sizes of street cars. These seat from 38 to 75 passengers. Four passengers only are allowed to stand at one time in the small cars, and six in the large ones, during rush hours. This privilege is seldom needed, and never abused, as the cars are sufficiently numerous to take care of all ordinary crowds.

CONDUCTORS HAVE APPRENTICES.

On the big cars, besides motormen and conductors, there are employed "trolley boys." The duty of the trolley boy is to watch the trolley rope and to stop the car when a passenger wishes to alight while the conductor is collecting fares. The boy starts in at \$1.75 a week, and is raised 50 cents each year for five years, when he emerges a full-fledged conductor, commanding journeyman's wages—say eight dollars to ten dollars a week. This latter sum is tip-top pay in England for a skilled mechanic.

I noticed in Bradford, on the municipal tramway there, what looked like the persistence of customs more applicable to private ownership. For one thing, the motorman, in giving warning at street crossings, was compelled to pull a string attached to the clapper of a big bell hanging overhead. Each conductor carried a "safe" into which the passenger dropped his fare, so that the conductor handled only such money—and that his own—as was necessary to change larger for smaller denominations.

PARIS TRAMWAYS.

Paris presents a sharp contrast to England's municipal street car service. Here the companies are monarchs of all they survey, notwithstanding the spread of socialistic ideas in the French republic. Where old franchises are running, the fare is six cents for first-class, and three cents for second-class passengers. New franchises call for four and two-cent fares, respectively. On the double-deck cars the inside passengers pay the first-class price, the outsiders the lower charge. These prices take one anywhere inside the city limits, be the distance long or short.

An advantage offered in the higher fare is the privilege of demanding a transfer to any other line crossing the one on which the first-class rate has

been paid. Another advantage is the shelter provided in stormy weather. Where a car is not a double-decker, it is divided into two compartments, the first-class passengers having the privilege of sitting on upholstered seats and with curtains at the windows.

The intervals between cars are long, so that in the rush hours and on holidays one must practically engage a seat ahead by going to a "station" and getting a card on which is printed a number. When a car finally appears, the conductor calls out the numbers in rotation, and not until your number is reached are you allowed to get on the car, and not even then, if all the seats are occupied. I have waited for several cars—on one occasion over an hour. You see, this is "private enterprise," where the stockholders are making several hundred per cent. on the actual outlay.

IN SWITZERLAND AND GERMANY.

I found Swiss and German cities owning their own tramways. They are generally run on the profit system, rather than exclusively for the public good, and in consequence the service is not what it should be. In none were the accommodations provided equal to those of Glasgow, Liverpool and Manchester. Freiburg, Baden, has an excellent municipal tramway service, run on the one-price principle for either long or short hauls, a fee equal to two cents, if I remember aright, being the charge for either long or short distances inside the city limits.

In Lausanne, Switzerland, where the street car service is privately owned, the employes work long hours, and conductors and motormen wear for a uniform blue cotton blouses, receiving about six dollars a week. Here I paid four cents for comparatively short rides, and one cent for rides covering a very few blocks.

One defect in continental street railway systems was that they often ended abruptly and seemed to run to nowhere in particular. There is no particular effort made to reach the outskirts of the municipalities. This is in marked contrast to many of the street car systems in America.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL ENTERPRISE.

London tramway service is being gradually municipalized and changed from horse to electric power. Few of the lines are completed, and the service lacks as yet much that is desirable—speed among other things. The power is applied from conduits between the tracks, and in this respect they resemble cable cars. But the motion is smooth and continuous. Anyone who has rid-

den in the jerky cable cars such as disgrace Chicago, for example, cannot fail to note the difference. By the way, I found Edinborough, Scotland, still clinging to cable cars and private companies. The contrast between Glasgow and Edinborough is marked. The one thing in favor of conduits is the doing away with unsightly overhead wires. This is one of the reasons given why the London county council adopted them. Still, if the London county council is so aesthetically inclined, one wonders why the members allow the cars to be used as traveling advertising bill boards. The way these cars are disfigured with signs is a public disgrace. The staring letters telling of the virtues of patent medicines, infants' foods, pickles, whisky, etc., dwarf everything else in sight, and the stranger has difficulty in discovering the inconspicuous lettering indicating the routes.

Neither in Glasgow nor Manchester are these disfiguring advertisements allowed on the cars, though this involves a loss, I was told, of over \$100,000 a year. Yet there is compensation in keeping nightmares off the public streets.

CONCLUSIONS.

Summing it all up, my conclusions regarding the regulation of street railways are:

1. The municipal service of the tramways of Europe is much improved over that given by private ownership.
2. The charges for fares are based more nearly on the services rendered, and these charges are lower under municipal than under private control.
3. Employes work shorter hours and receive better pay.
4. There are few or no conflicts with other municipal functions also occupying the streets in common.
5. Notwithstanding the low fares, large sums are being turned into the public treasuries.
6. Municipal tramways, with low fares, have had a marked effect in increasing land values.
7. There is no good reason why, either under the one price or the "zone" system, municipal street car services cannot be made to return handsome profits.

Detectives have discovered that when Chicago people are baptized their sins are washed away into the drainage canal.

That the saturnalia of iniquity which is making St. Louis infamous is directly due to this source of infection, is the unhesitating opinion of the best authorities in psychobacteriology.

The federal courts will be asked for an injunction.—Puck.