

ties justifying the application to him; these were furnished, and the rules of his office having been complied with, a hearing was appointed for November 6 in Philadelphia before Hon. Morris Wolf, Deputy Attorney General; defendants were duly served with copies of the charge with ten days' notice. The accused officials did not contest the application; it would naturally appear that permission should issue as a matter of course. But instead the Attorney General suggested that the complainant, instead of serving the Board of Revision of Taxes, should serve the individual assessors (their appointees and subordinates). This was done; new papers were prepared and served, and another day appointed for a hearing. Again the defendants failed to contest the application. Again the permission should have issued as a matter of course; it did not.

Later another day was set for a hearing; again the defendants failed to contest; permission was then expected as a matter of course; it was not granted; and on December 10 the Attorney General refused permission, suggesting that permission be obtained from the District Attorney. This was a matter that had been passed on before; his attention was called to the fact that the proceeding was not of a criminal nature; that the violation complained of was not of city ordinances, but of a statute of the General Assembly; that no local body or power in Philadelphia had any control over the Board of Revision of Taxes; furthermore, that the Attorney General had already made this objection two months previously, and had yielded the point; and that having already held two hearings and much time having elapsed, it seemed late in the day to raise an objection already disposed of. Finally, however, on December 30 the Attorney General declined to grant permission (a mere formality), again suggesting that application should be made to the District Attorney.

From the statements made the public may draw their own conclusions. The question before the Attorney General was not complicated; his office was not responsible in case of error; his requirements were met; a prima facie case was made out, not disputed. His delay seems inexcusable, and may amount to a denial of justice.

SAMUEL MILLIKEN.

FOOD PRICES IN GERMANY.

Starnberg, bei Munich, Bavaria (Villa Lipps),
Dec. 23, 1914.

I would like to ask the authority for the statements on p. 1164 in regard to prices of food in Germany. We live in a small town, about twenty miles from Munich, and we have hardly found any difference so far in prices, and all sorts of food are as abundant as usual. The good house bread, the staple food of middle class people, is exactly at the old price, fifty pfennigs for the two and one-half pound loaf. Remember 50 pfennigs are only 12 cents, and that the German pound is 500 grams, that is nearly one-tenth heavier than the American avoirdupois pound of 453 6/10 grams. Work out the problem and you will find that we are paying almost exactly 4 1/2 cents per pound for house bread.

Vegetables are as plentiful as ever. Why should they not be? They are too bulky to send in large

quantities to the front and the supply was large this year.

We get all the eggs we want at about the usual winter price for prime fresh eggs, 3 cents apiece.

We had a big English cock pheasant the other day. It furnished dinner for four. It cost two marks, that is 48 cents. Step into a poulterer's in Chicago and ask him what he will charge you for an English pheasant or even a Canadian grouse, which is not half as large.

ROBERT W. HALL.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, January 26, 1915.

Commission on Industrial Relations.

In the hearing before the Industrial Commission at New York on January 18, Roger W. Babson declared absentee landlordship the greatest handicap to both labor and capital. The Associated Press reports made him say absentee ownership of industries. On January 19, Ida Tarbell testified. She advocated scientific management, saying that it resulted in shorter hours and higher wages for efficient labor. "We know," she said, "that people have a right to short hours, to recreation—in a word to more life." On being asked her opinion of the cause of inequality of women's wages as compared with men's, she said: "There are many reasons why women's wages are low. For one thing they are an unstable quantity. And then they go into industry untrained. They are not worth much to industry naturally." She spoke very highly of the treatment of its employees by the Steel Trust. The employees, she said, were opposed to the abolition of Sunday work since it would reduce their earnings. The company stores of the Frick Coal and Coke Company she considered a philanthropy. Upon this Chairman Frank Walsh read from a report showing that these stores yield a profit of 517 per cent. Miss Tarbell declared that the Steel Trust maintains a model village in Vandegrift, Pa. She was asked whether workers are not forbidden in this town to attend organization meetings. She knew of no such prohibition. Whereupon Chairman Walsh read a proclamation of the Burgess referring to "demonstrations by persons, mostly non-residents," which "engender ill-feeling among our neighbors and citizens," and forbidding any assemblages, marches, parades, public meetings or public demonstrations upon the streets or private properties "until such time as may seem more expedient." Miss Tarbell was followed on the stand by Congressman David Lewis of Maryland. He remarked that he had come to the conclusion reluctantly "that the whole theory of private