

same way of thinking in this respect as the Times; and it is a very good way of thinking.

* *

Free Alcohol.

For the first time in half a century the United States is to have free alcohol for use in the arts (p. 50). Senator Aldrich, Standard Oil representative in the Senate and Republican chairman of the most important Senate committee, had smothered the bill, for free alcohol would be a serious competitor against the Standard's product. At last, however, he was forced by his committee, which in its turn had been driven by the demands of the agricultural interests, to bring out the bill and submit gracefully to its passage. Meanwhile, the Standard is said to have secured options on all the large alcohol plants, and if the House could have been got to amend the bill so as to limit the production of denatured alcohol to large distilleries the Standard would still have had its monopoly. But as the bill has gone to the President presumably in such condition as to permit manufacturing on small capital, free alcohol is probably assured, and by its economies it will make a phenomenal increase of demand in many directions.

* *

Clarence A. Miller.

One of the leading citizens and lawyers of Los Angeles, Clarence A. Miller, was so useful a representative in California of the single tax idea that his death is a distinct loss to this movement, especially in Los Angeles. He died on the 18th of May. Mr. Miller was a native of Ohio, a brother of Marion M. Miller, who is well known in publishing circles in New York, and also of Prof. Arthur M. Miller of Lexington, Ky. His conversion to Henry George's views was due as much, perhaps, to the leading university reply to George—Gen. Walker's—as to "Progress and Poverty" itself. Having read the latter book, he sought for its refutation in the former; but finding this to rest upon the author's absurd misconception of George's position, Mr. Miller yielded to George's logic and thenceforth was an outspoken advocate of his doctrine.

* *

Memorial Tablets to Garrison and George.

It is an interesting custom which has lately grown up in New York City, that of marking sites especially associated with justly celebrated men; and its adoption for the purpose of perpetuating the memory of the place of death of William Lloyd Garrison and that of Henry George is pe-

culiarly gratifying. For this purpose a memorial tablet committee has been organized, with Joseph H. Choate, lately Ambassador to Great Britain, as chairman, and Bolton Hall, 56 Pine St., as treasurer. The committee has limited single contributions to ten dollars or less. With the fund it proposes to place a tablet commemorating Garrison's death on the house at the southeast corner of 17th street and Fourth avenue, and one commemorating George's, on the Union Square Hotel, about two blocks away. Each tablet is to consist of a bas-relief portrait with an inscription bearing the name and date of death. The association of Garrison's and George's names in this memorial undertaking is in a high degree appropriate.

* *

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND HENRY GEORGE.

Few if asked to name the foremost democrat of history would fail to answer Thomas Jefferson. Among statesmen of all times he is the most philosophic as well as practical champion of human rights. Jefferson, too, while cosmopolitan in view, was thoroughly American in spirit. No man ever lived who understood the American people, their character, needs and aspirations as did he; and they loved, trusted and honored him. To prove, therefore, the democratic orthodoxy and Americanism of any proposition by the argument from authority, it is only necessary to inquire if it harmonizes with the principles of Jefferson.

To this test I intend to bring the proposal of Henry George. The words of Jefferson will be allowed to speak for themselves with few comments. In the citation of his works the Washington edition will be used unless otherwise indicated, and pains will be taken to give the exact volume and page so that there may be no question of correctness. The quotations will be seen to cover every period of Jefferson's life and to be from his writings of every nature.

It is taken for granted that the reader is more or less familiar with the writings of Henry George, and for the sake of brevity no extended citations will be made from them. On the fundamental question of land ownership nowhere do I find his position more succinctly stated than in the preface of "Progress and Poverty," page ix, as follows:

"An investigation of the nature and basis of property shows that there is a fundamental and irreconcilable difference between property in things which are the product of labor and property in land; that the one has a natural basis and sanction, while the

other has none, and that the recognition of exclusive property in land is necessarily a denial of the right of property in the products of labor. Further investigation shows that private property in land always has, and always must, as development proceeds, lead to the enslavement of the laboring class; that land owners can make no just claim to compensation if society choose to resume its right; that so far from private property in land being in accord with the natural perceptions of men, the very reverse is true, and that in the United States we are already beginning to feel the effects of having admitted this erroneous and destructive principle."

I propose to show that each of these propositions is backed by the authority of Thomas Jefferson and that he was also in favor of the policy of relieving labor, commerce and enterprise of taxation as proposed by Henry George.

*

To begin with, it is certain that Mr. George himself believed he was in accord with Jefferson, for throughout his speeches and books he quotes the sage of Monticello in support of his contentions. Not to multiply extracts reference is made to a speech delivered during his canvass when a candidate for mayor of New York city in 1886. It can be found in a book entitled "The George-Hewitt Campaign," at page 79, and is as follows:

"I hold that the people have unalienable rights and that the right to land is one. Mr. Hewitt says this is undemocratic. Mr. Hewitt never got his democracy from Thomas Jefferson."

Taking now the most famous of Jefferson's writings, the Declaration of Independence, as the first from which to quote, we find these words:

"All men are created equal, endowed by their creator with unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

By clear implication the equal right to the earth is here asserted. Life, liberty and happiness can only be enjoyed on the earth and Jefferson says in his Mississippi River Instructions, works vol. vii, p. 579:

"The right to a thing gives a right to the means without which it could not be used."

In his note to Destutt Tracy's Political Economy to be found in vol. i, p. 574, of his works, Jefferson lays it down that:

"The first principle of association is the guarantee of every one of a free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it."

Here by industry Jefferson means labor, and as it is an established tenet of political economy that in the last analysis labor can only be exerted on land, it follows that if labor is to be free, so must land.

Valid as this reasoning is, however, we are not

left to implication or deduction, for Jefferson definitely asserts the equal right to the earth in one short sentence to be found in a letter to Rev. James Madison, works vol. iii, p. 36, Ford's edition, as follows:

"The earth is given as the common stock for men to labor and live on."

And that exclusive possession carries a privilege in derogation of common rights that must be compensated for he asserts in the same letter as follows:

"If we allow the earth to be appropriated we must take care that other employment be provided for those excluded from the appropriation. If we do not the fundamental right to labor the earth returns."

An emphatic denial of the right of private property in land is made by Jefferson in a letter to Isaac McPherson, works vol. vi, p. 180, where he says:

"While it is a moot question whether the origin of any kind of property is derived from nature at all, it is agreed by those who have seriously considered the subject that no individual has of natural right a separate property in an acre of land. Stable ownership is the gift of social law and is given late in the progress of society."

Jefferson, however, saw the "fundamental and irreconcilable difference between property in things which are the product of labor and property in land" that Mr. George notes in the extract I have quoted. In a letter to Dupont de Nemours, works vol. vi, p. 591, he says:

"A right to property is founded in our natural wants, in the means with which we are endowed to satisfy these wants and the right to what we acquire by those means without violating the similar rights of others. No one has a right to obstruct another exercising his faculties innocently."

In almost the same words Mr. George states the right of property. In Condition of Labor, p. 4, he says:

"Being created individuals, with individual wants, men are individually entitled to the use of their own powers and the enjoyment of the results. To attach to things created by God the same right of private ownership that justly attaches to things produced by labor is to impair and deny the true rights of property."

Writing to the same effect, Jefferson, in his paper on the Batture case, works vol. viii, may also be quoted as showing that his investigations go to prove what Mr. George asserts when he says private property in land is against the first perceptions of men:

"A right of property in movable things is admitted before the establishment of government. A separate property in land not till after that establishment. The right to movables is acknowledged by all the

hordes of Indians surrounding us. Yet by no one of them has a separate property in land been yielded to individuals. He who plants a field keeps possession till he has gathered the produce, after which one has as good a right as another to occupy it. Government must be established and laws provided before lands can be separately appropriated. Till then the property is in the body of the nation to be granted to individuals on conditions to be determined."

Again as indicating Jefferson's view that private property in land is not a natural right, but a civil arrangement, the following from a letter to Madison, works vol. viii, p. 103, is to the point:

"That portion of the earth occupied by an individual ceases to be his when himself ceases to be, and reverts to society. If the society has formed no rules for the appropriation of its lands in severalty it will be taken by the first occupant. If a child, legatee or creditor takes it, it is not by natural right, but by a law of society."

That the land of a country belongs to all the people of a country is asserted by Jefferson in the following from a pamphlet by him entitled "Rights of British America," works vol. i, p. 139:

"From the nature and purpose of civil institutions all the lands within the limits which any particular society has circumscribed around itself are assumed by that society and subject to its allotment."

To the same effect the following may be quoted from his paper on the Batture case, works vol. viii, pp. 539 and 541:

"That the lands within the limits assumed by a nation belong to a nation as a body has probably been the law of every people on earth at some period of their history. It seems to be a principle of universal law that the lands of a country belong to its sovereign as trustee for the nation."

+

Mr. George in discussing the claim of landholders to compensation says in *Progress and Poverty*, p. 363:

"Try the case of the landowners by the maxims of the common law. We are told it is the perfection of reason and certainly the landowners cannot complain of its decision, for it has been built up by and for land owners. Now, what does the law allow to the innocent possessor when the land for which he paid his money is adjudged to rightfully belong to another? Nothing at all. That he purchased in good faith gives him no right or claim whatever; it allows him no claim whatever."

Equally positive is Jefferson on this question. He, too, holds that landowners have no rightful claim to compensation, but that if it is given at all it is a pure gratuity. The quotation is from a letter to James Madison from Paris, France, and is to be found in works, vol. viii, p. 103, as follows:

"This principle is of very extensive application and

consequence in every country. It enters into the resolution of the questions whether the nation may change the descent of lands holden in tail, whether it may change the appropriation of lands given in perpetuity, whether it may abolish the charges and privileges attached on lands, and it goes to perpetual monopolies in commerce, the arts or sciences, with a long train of et ceteras, and it renders the question of reimbursement a question of generosity and not of right. In all these cases the legislature of the day could authorize such appropriations and establishments for their own times, but no longer, and the present holders, even where they or their ancestors have purchased, are in the case of bona fide purchasers of what the seller had no right to convey. This principle would furnish matter for a fine preamble to our first law for appropriating public revenue; and it would exclude at the threshold of our new government the contagious and ruinous errors of this quarter of the globe which have armed despots with means not sanctioned by nature for binding in chain their fellow men."

The right of the people to resume possession of their birthright in the land is asserted by Jefferson in numerous instances and the following may be quoted as samples:

"The creator has made the earth for the living, not the dead; nothing is unchangable but the inherent and unalienable rights of men."—Letter to John Cartwright, works vol. III, p. 359.

"Every generation comes equally by the laws of the creator of the world to the free possession of the earth which he made for their subsistence, unencumbered by their predecessors, who like them were but tenants for life."—Letter to John Taylor, works vol. VI, p. 605.

"This corporeal globe belongs to its present corporeal inhabitants during their generation."—Letter to Samuel Kerchival, works vol. VII, p. 15.

"The laws of society indeed give the property of the parent to his family on his death and in most civilized countries permit him even to give it by testament to whom he pleases. But this does not lessen the right of the majority to repeal whenever a change of circumstances or of will calls for it. Habit alone confounds what is civil practice with natural right."—Letter to Thomas Earle, works vol. VII, p. 310.

In expressing the same thought Mr. George uses nearly the identical language. In *Progress and Poverty*, p. 337, he says:

"If all existing men were to unite to grant away their equal rights, they could not grant away the rights of those who follow them. For what are we but tenants of a day? Have we made the earth that we should determine the rights of those who after us shall tenant it in their turn? The Almighty has entailed it upon all the generations of the children of men by a decree written upon the constitution of all things—a decree which no human action can bar and no prescription can determine. Let the parchments be ever so many, or possession ever so long, natural justice can recognize no right in one man to the possession and enjoyment of land that is not equally the right of all his fellows."

Mr. George saw that "private property in land always has, and always must as development proceeds, lead to the enslavement of the laboring classes," and this inevitable consequence was also perceived by Jefferson. Writing from France to Rev. James Madison, works vol. vii, p. 36, Ford's edition, he says:

"I asked myself what could be the reason that so many should beg who are willing to work in a country where there is a very considerable portion of uncultivated lands? It should seem that it must be because of the enormous wealth of the proprietors which places them above attention to the increase of their revenues by permitting their lands to be labored. Whenever there is in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right. I am conscious that an equal division of property is impracticable. But the consequences of this enormous inequality producing so much misery to the bulk of mankind legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property. A means of silently lessening the inequality of property is to exempt all from taxation below a certain point and to tax the higher portions of property in geometrical progression as they rise."

Writing to Washington, works vol. ii, p. 62, Jefferson says:

"To know the mass of evil which flows from this fatal source a person must be in France. He must see the finest soil, the finest climate, the most compact state; the most benevolent character of the people and every earthly advantage combined insufficient to prevent this scourge from rendering existence a curse to twenty-four out of twenty-five parts of the inhabitants."

To John Page, works vol. i, p. 549, he writes:

"The laboring people of France are poorer than in England. They pay about one-half their produce in rent; the English in general about a third."

That Jefferson recognized the unearned increment that comes to land with the increase of population is shown in a letter to James Monroe, works vol. i, p. 347, regarding certain lands and reading as follows:

"If sold in lots at a fixed price the best lots will be sold first. As these become occupied it gives a value to the interjacent ones, and raises them though of inferior quality to the price of the first."

+

While Jefferson never fell into the mistaken idea that it is necessary to do everything at once, yet he knew that if liberty was to be halted at mere political equality the hope of real democracy was in vain; for he declares that if nothing else were done "instead of elevating the masses they would be sunk lower, and instead of a diffusion of wealth it would be gathered into more portentous accumulations." In his own day he felt it

only prudent to go to the extent of devising ways to break up large estates. How he sought to accomplish this he tells in a letter to John Adams, works vol. vi, p. 225, as follows:

"At the first session of the Virginia legislature we passed a law abolishing entails and the privilege of primogeniture and dividing the lands of intestates equally among all the children or other representatives. These laws drawn by myself laid the ax at the root of pseudo-aristocracy."

In his autobiography, works vol. i, p. 49, he says the object of these laws was to "prevent the accumulation and perpetuation of wealth and preserve the soil of the country from being daily more and more absorbed in mortmain."

That this mere breaking up of large estates, however, was not the end of Jefferson's ideas as to the land question, there can be no doubt. The country was yet new and land was not held to any extent for speculative advance. So he says in a letter to Rev. James Madison, works vol. vii, p. 36, Ford's edition:

"It is too soon yet in our country to say that every man, who cannot find employment, but who can find land shall be at liberty to use it, paying a moderate rent. But it is not too soon to provide by every possible means, that as few as possible shall be without a little portion of land."

In fact, he explicitly says that he was not satisfied with this as a final disposition of the matter, for in a letter to James Madison, works vol. iii, p. 4, he says: "If we cannot secure all of our rights let us secure what we can. Half a loaf is better than none."

Jefferson, however, looked forward to the day when, as he says, works vol. ii, p. 332: "We get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe and go to eating one another." He knew that with the development of the country the same social and economic problems that confronted older countries would press here for solution. He knew that what was good in one age and for one set of men and conditions would be bad in and with others. In a letter to Samuel Kerchival, written in 1816, works vol. vii, p. 14, he says:

"Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with progress. As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their ancestors. It is this preposterous idea which has lately deluged Europe in blood. Their rulers instead of wisely yielding to the gradual change of circumstances have clung to old abuses

and obliged the people to seek through blood and violence rash and ruinous innovations. Let us follow no such examples nor weakly believe that one generation is not as capable as another of taking care of itself, and of ordering its own affairs. If this avenue be shut to the call of suffrage it will make itself heard through that of force."

Again he writes to Governor Plumer, works vol. vii, p. 19, as follows:

"The idea that institutions established for the use of the nation cannot be touched or modified even to make them answer their end, because of rights gratuitously supposed in those employed to manage them in trust for the public is absurd against the nation itself. Yet our lawyers and priests generally inculcate this doctrine and suppose in fine that the earth belongs to the dead and not to the living."

At this point, before passing from the ethical side of the question to the practical or fiscal, it may be well to summarize what has been presented. In brief it is this:

I believe it has been shown by the "written word" of Jefferson himself that he is in agreement with Henry George in that there is no natural basis for private property in land, but that it is "a common stock for men to live and labor on"; that it is against the first perceptions of men and rests on civil enactment alone; that when new conditions demand it may be abolished, compensation being a matter of favor and not of right, and, lastly, that private property in land means the "ultimate enslavement of the laborer."

+

Along about the middle of the eighteenth century there arose in France a school of thinkers known as the Economists or Physiocrats, Quesnay, Mirabeau, Dupont, Turgot, Condorcet and others. They were virtually one in theory with Henry George, and in his book "Progress and Poverty," under the head of "indorsements," he says, p. 421:

"The French Economists headed by Quesnay and Turgot, proposed just what I have proposed, that all taxation should be abolished save a tax upon the value of land. . . . As I am acquainted with the doctrines of Quesnay and his disciples only at second hand through the medium of English writers, I am unable to say how far his peculiar ideas as to agriculture being the only productive avocation, etc., are erroneous or mere peculiarities of terminology. But of this I am certain from the proposition in which his theory culminated—that he saw the fundamental relation between land and labor which has since been lost sight of, and that he arrived at practical truth, though, it may be, through a course of defectively expressed reasoning. The causes which leave in the hands of the landlord a 'produce net' were by the Physiocrats no better explained than the suction of a pump was explained by the assumption that nature abhors a vacuum, but the fact in its practical relations to social economy was recognized, and the bene-

fit which would result from the perfect freedom given to industry and trade by a substitution of a tax on rent for all the impositions which hamper and distort the application of labor was doubtless as clearly seen by them as it is by me. Without knowing anything of Quesnay or his doctrines I have reached the same practical conclusion."

Now with many of the Economists Jefferson was personally acquainted and corresponded with them. I having already quoted a letter he wrote to Dupont, in which he discussed the foundation of the right of property. That he was almost in perfect agreement with them is indicated in his introduction to Destutt Tracy's book on Political Economy. He says, works vol. vi, p. 570:

"Political economy in modern times assumed the form of a regular science first in the hands of the political sect in France called the Economists. They made it a branch of a comprehensive system on the natural order of societies. Quesnay first, Gournay, La Frosne, Turgot, and Dupont de Nemours, the enlightened, philanthropic and venerable citizen now of the United States, led the way in these developments, and gave to our inquiries the direction they have since observed. Many sound and valuable principles established by them have received the sanction of general approbation. Some, as in the infancy of a science might be expected, have been brought into question and have furnished occasion for much discussion. Their opinions on production and the proper subjects of taxation, have been particularly controverted; and whatever may have been the merit of their principles of taxation, it is not wonderful they have not prevailed; not on the question score of correctness, but because not acceptable to the people, whose will must be the supreme law."

These Economists coined the phrase—*Laissez faire, laissez aller*—"clear the way and let things alone." That is, sweep away all restrictions on labor, industry and commerce. To this doctrine Jefferson subscribed. They were free traders, so was Jefferson, as was George. In his Report on Foreign Commerce and Navigation, works vol. vii, p. 646, Jefferson says:

"Instead of embarrassing commerce under piles of regulating laws, duties and prohibitions, could it be relieved of all its shackles in all parts of the world, could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants the greatest mass possible would be produced of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness; the numbers of mankind would be increased and their condition bettered."

Going further than mere free trade and pleading for entire freedom of all industry, Jefferson says in his first annual message, works vol. viii, p. 13:

"Agriculture, manufactures, commerce and navigation, the four pillars of our prosperity, are the most

thriving when left most free to individual enterprise."

Commenting on the system combatted by the Economists, he says in his Autobiography, works vol. 1, p. 86.

"We should not wonder at the pressure there for a change when we consider the monstrous abuses of power under which the French people were ground to powder, when we pass into review the weight of their taxes and the inequality of their distribution."

So much regarding Jefferson's opinion as to the effect of complicated, crooked and unjust taxes. His own system is outlined in quotations already given and is further stated in his first inaugural message, works vol. viii, p. 9, as follows:

"Sound principles will not justify our taxing the industry of our fellow citizens. That labor may be lightly burdened I deem an essential principle of our government and consequently one which ought to shape its administration. Still one thing more fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned."

The single tax, advocated by Henry George, is a direct tax; and Jefferson always favored direct taxes as opposed to crooked or indirect taxes. We have seen how he was opposed to tariff taxes. He referred to an excise as "most odious," declared a stamp tax "a very disgusting pill," and exulted over the abolition of internal taxes as follows in his second inaugural address, works vol. viii, p. 40:

"The suppression of unnecessary offices; of useless establishments and expenses enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes. These covering our land with officers had already begun the process of vexation which once entered is scarcely to be restrained from reaching successively every article of produce and property."

Jefferson was fully conscious of the folly and sinfulness of trying to tax everything, as was Henry George. In a letter to Samuel Kerchival, works vol. vii, p. 14, he says:

"If we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, our people will have no time to think, no means of calling their mismanagers to account, but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow sufferers."

It was of the direct tax of the monarchist Federalists, that Jefferson wrote when in a letter to Edmund Pendleton, works vol. iv, p. 275, he complained of the "disgusting particularities of

the direct tax." To James Madison he had written, works vol. iv, p. 234:

"The Federalists talk of a land tax. This will probably not be opposed. The only question will be how to modify it. On this may be great diversity of sentiment. One party will want to make it a new source of patronage and expense."

The intention feared by Jefferson is just what happened, as he says in a letter to John Taylor: "The principle of the present majority is excessive expense, money enough to fill their maws." This principle, together with the following purposes of the Federalists' direct tax, constituted the "disgusting particularities": to wit, it was levied to carry on an unnecessary war with France, to create a standing army to menace public liberty, to enforce the odious alien and sedition laws and the arbitrary and "purely vandalish Logan law."

Of what he really thought of a direct land tax laid on just lines and for good purposes, he tells in a letter to Peregrine Fitzhugh, Ford's edition, vol. vii, p. 136, as follows:

"I am suggesting an idea on the subject of taxation which might perhaps facilitate much that business and reconcile all parties. That is to lay a land tax. This would tend, I think, to mollify the hard tone of government which has been asserted. It will be objected to by those who are for consolidation."

Jefferson's view as regards taxation are well set forth in the following in an essay in *Hunt's Magazine*, vol. iv, p. 507, by George W. Tucker, and quoted in vol. i, p. 115, of *Bolles' Financial History of the United States*:

"Those who carry their recollection back to the period immediately proceeding Mr. Jefferson's administration or who are familiar with the history of parties in our country, know that it was a favorite doctrine with the Republican party that direct taxes were preferable to a tax on imports for two reasons. One was that they were more economical inasmuch as the importer being obliged to advance the tax to the government, charged a profit on such advance, as well as on the price of the goods, by which the price to the consumer was proportionately enhanced; and thus more was taken from the pockets of the people than was paid into the treasury. The other reason was purely a political one; it was, that, when taxes were direct, the people would necessarily know what was the extent of their burdens, and when they were increased, whereby they would more closely look into the expenditures of the government, and thus check its tendencies to waste and extravagance which, when taxes were indirect they may indulge with impunity."

+

To summarize, it will be seen that Thomas Jefferson and Henry George are practically one in believing that there is no natural basis for private property in land; that when society

pleases, equal right may be restored; and, finally, that a single tax on the value of land appears to be a method by which this equal right may be secured.

The argument from authority is not conclusive as to the truth of any proposition, but it is final in defining a dogma and protecting it from the charge of heresy. Admitting that Jefferson is the highest Democratic authority, it follows that his principles are Democratic dogma; and if the principles of another man agree with Jefferson's, the principles of that other man must also be Democratic dogma. That the principles of Henry George agree with the principles of Thomas Jefferson has here, it is believed, been abundantly established.

ALFRED H. HENDERSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Wednesday, May 30.

Pennsylvania Railroad Corruption.

A sensational confession of high grade graft was made at the investigation before the Interstate Commerce Commission (p. 148) at Philadelphia on the 23d. William A. Patton, the assistant to President Cassatt of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, was on the witness stand, and very reluctantly after close cross-examination confessed that he owns \$307,000 worth of stock in coal companies, for which he has never paid anything. He had received it for no other apparent reason than for discriminating in favor of these companies and against their competitors in affording transportation facilities.

Other employes of the Pennsylvania railroad testified to similar instances of graft. One of these was Mr. Patton's clerk, K. M. Perviance, who reluctantly confessed to having about \$38,000 worth of coal stocks which had cost him nothing. Still another was Samuel Rea, the third vice-president, who disclosed 1,500 coal company shares and \$87,000 worth of bonds. D. S. Newhall, purchasing agent of the same road, held \$6,000 worth of coal stock. Theodore N. Ely, chief of motive power, had \$7,650 worth of stock. J. K. Johnson, superintendent of the Tyrone division, testified that he was in no way interested in any coal company, although he had frequently been offered stock in coal companies, but had always declined because he thought it improper. An assistant train master of the Tyrone

division admitted that he had been in the habit of receiving \$1 to \$5 tips from coal operators wanting cars, and had taken it, but done nothing for it. Most of the employes shown to hold coal stock for which they had paid nothing, were connected in some way with the distribution of coal cars, and gross discriminations by the Pennsylvania road in car distribution were disclosed. At the same inquiry on the 25th F. Albert von Boyneburgh, general manager of the Reakert Bros. Coal Company, testified to the relations of that company with the Pennsylvania road, and accused President Cassatt of having given orders which resulted in the ruin of coal companies that refused to make presents of stock to officials of the road.

* *

Further Standard Oil Exposures.

At the hearing on the 24th to the 26th before a branch of the Interstate Commerce Commission sitting at Cleveland, further disclosures of lawless operations on the part of the Standard Oil Company (p. 148) were made. It was shown by direct proof that the Pennsylvania and the Lake Shore railroads are in collusion with the Standard Oil Company to ruin independent oil producers and refiners, and the story of the independent pipe line was told in detail. The Standard Oil Company had obstructed the construction of this line at every possible point but without effect until the line reached the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western road near Belvidere, N. J. At this point the matter was thrown into the New Jersey courts, which held that the line must not pass under the railroad. In this case a son of the Chief Justice of New Jersey was employed by the Standard Oil Company as their lawyer. Among the minor methods for destroying competition, the Standard Oil Company was shown to have been accustomed to underselling and otherwise breaking up the trade of retail dealers. "My instructions," testified one of the agents for this purpose, "were to kill them, and I was told that if I could not do the job somebody else would be sent to take my place. I worked in Youngstown and surrounding small towns, Canton, Girard, Warren, Ravenna, Massillon, Mansfield, Elyria, Oberlin and other places. In all of the towns, with the exception of Youngstown, the independent peddlers were forced to abandon their business." At another point in his testimony he said: "I operated not as a Standard man, but as an independent, but I got my orders from the Standard Oil office just the same. The Freedom Oil Company was the independent oil company there, but we were fighting the tank wagon drivers. We got presshers to give us letters to members of their congregations recommending our oil, and for this we gave them oil, some one gallon, some ten."

* *

Chicago Packing-House Exposures.

Horrifying details of packing house methods in Chicago have filled the papers during the week, in connection with the leaking out of information gathered by a committee of investigation appointed by the President. The appointment of this committee was in consequence of the publication of a novel, "The Jungle," by Upton Sinclair. Upon coming