

Rome, Greece and Babylon in turn drew sword,  
Then each before a stronger power went down.  
O mighty Anglo-Saxons—break your swords,  
Disband your armies, and destroy your arms!  
And in God's name have done with barren lies,  
For you are hypocrites—yea, whited sepulchres,  
O mighty Anglo-Saxons, full of dead men's bones;—  
You preach a gospel when you live it not;  
You trick yourselves with honeyed words of Peace  
While every oath of office echoes war;  
You prate of arbitration to the tune  
Of clanging hammers, ringing on the steel  
That shapes your battleships and armaments.  
On two great continents the churchly towers aspire  
Toward the deep azure and the silent stars,  
And rising peans from the multitude intone  
The Anglo-Saxon's worship of the Christ.  
The Christ! O canting hypocrites, have done!  
Christ's way is peace; His one command is peace;  
His final will and testament is Peace.  
You cannot serve Him and deny Him both.  
Be honest, Anglo-Saxons! And be true!  
Pull down your minsters; hush the swelling hymn;  
Throw to the winds the sacramental bread—  
The holy bread of life and brotherhood—  
Or, with a common human honesty,  
Cease to shed blood; and cease to teach your sons  
The code of battle and the code of death,  
While—dressed in your ensanguined liveries—  
They wait the opportunity to kill;  
Cease to build battleships and death's grim enginery;  
Cease to pay tribute to the god of war;  
And cease—O Pharisees!—to pray "Thy kingdom come,"  
While you are voting means to make a hell  
In some vain-boasted cause of righteousness.

Haste, Anglo-Saxons! Ere it be too late,  
And that sure prophecy the Master spake  
Shall find fulfillment in your overthrow.  
O mighty Anglo-Saxons! Break your swords,  
Disband your armies and destroy your arms.  
Rise to your destiny and learn a godlike strength,  
A power from Peace those nations never knew  
Which flourished for a glorious yesterday  
To lie beneath to-morrow's desolating dust.  
O mighty Anglo-Saxons! Seek a way  
That will be unto immortality;  
And conquer with a conquest unto life,  
O mighty Anglo-Saxons! Ere it be too late,  
Rise, break your swords, and rule by right divine!  
—Katrina Trask, in the Arena for June.

#### A SACRIFICE FOR JUSTICE.

Captain William P. Black wore the uniform of his country during the Civil War and afterward began the practice of the law. He was a member of the le-

gal firm of Dent & Black and enjoyed a lucrative practice at the time the bomb was thrown in the Haymarket.

When the anarchists were about to be placed on trial for their lives Captain Black had an interview with Judge Tuley, during which he said that he had been asked to assist in the defense of the suspected men. He sought Judge Tuley's advice, telling him that he had refused the retainer on the ground that he was not a criminal lawyer and that the cause would best be defended by others. The men who sought to retain the captain informed him that many lawyers had refused the case and that they had come to him in their despair.

"What shall I do?" asked the captain of the judge.

"I do not wish to advise you," replied the judge. "It is a serious matter. You have a large clientage; your firm is one of the leaders at the bar; in the present state of the public mind you will lose prestige and clients."

"I have thought of all that, and I know the sacrifice it will entail," answered the captain.

"Your conscience must be your guide," said the judge.

"What would you do under like conditions?" queried the captain.

"That is hardly a fair question," returned the judge. "You must not make me answer for you."

"What would you do?" reiterated the captain, "if you knew that it would cost you everything in the world, but that the sacrifice was demanded in the interest of justice?"

"I'd accept the retainer," promptly responded the judge.

And Captain Black accepted.—Chicago Record-Herald of Dec. 27, 1904.

#### MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN NEW YORK.

Speech of Frederic W. Hinrichs, at a dinner of the Reform Club of New York city, May 22, 1905, at which the other speakers were Dr. Lyman Abbott, ex-Judge D. Cady Herrick and Louis F. Post. The chairman was John G. Agar, president of the Reform Club.

I became a believer in municipal ownership of public utilities because of what I learned in public life. The city must own, and probably operate, street railroads, lighting plants, and the like, as a matter of self protection. There seems to be no other way of having the cities secure for themselves the enormous property values which reside in franchises in their streets.

Just as I became a convert to municipal ownership in the school of experience, I learned a lesson in taxation as a practical tax officer. As Registrar of Arrears in Mr. Schieren's cabinet, my

office opened upon the main corridor in the Municipal Building in Brooklyn, and at the time of the adjustment of assessments on personal property, I frequently saw some of our most distinguished citizens, prominent in the financial world, prominent in our churches and our charities, pass me on the way to the assessors to swear down or swear off their assessments. They not infrequently spoke to me and asked me the way to the room where this business was transacted. It was unnecessary for them to put their request in words, their timid and abashed manner indicating sufficiently whither they were tending and what they purposed doing. Year after year these men committed perjury in order to escape the payment of taxes on their personal estate.

Both of my reports to the mayor dwelt upon this situation. I strenuously advocated throwing the weight of the administration in favor of a total abolition of personal property taxes. I showed that such abolition, in Brooklyn, at least, would hardly produce a ripple upon the sea of the city's finances, as almost all of the taxes were collected from real estate. The whole of the personal property assessment was a pretense, and is such everywhere, and always will be such.

With a great flourish of trumpets, the announcement is made almost every year that personal property assessments have been advanced. But after the results have been revised, we find that most of these assessments have been wiped out and that the proportion between real estate assessments and personal property assessments is not even preserved; and all of this dishonesty and accumulated perjury are the price of maintaining upon the statute book an unenforceable law to satisfy timid politicians.

I began to study the history of tax legislation. I had been impressed with the writings of Henry George. I had met that great man when he first came to New York. I have always tried to be honest with myself. It did not take me long, after reading "Progress and Poverty," to conclude that Henry George was a prophet in our midst. I cannot see how any honest man can be other than a single taxer to the extent, at least, of abolishing taxation upon personal property. I do not see how any clear-thinking man can be anything else than a single-taxer in the sense in which Henry George was a single-taxer; that is, in favor of imposing all taxes upon land values, including, of course, special franchises, leaving the improvements free from tax.

We must come to that as we are now coming to municipal ownership and operation of all municipal functions. I remember hearing Jay Gould testify before a Congressional committee that a private corporation could run the post office better than the government. Not many people would readily indorse that distinguished financier's views now.

Our city has always owned its own water plant and yet a few Democratic and Republican politicians, with their financial backers, told us only a few years ago, during Mayor Van Wyck's administration (which administration, by the by, caused Mr. McClellan's bosom to swell with pride when he spoke at the city convention of his party in 1901), that the Ramapo company, which they owned, was to be the savior of our city from a water famine, by selling to it water at a price of one hundred percent. in advance of what it costs the city, with all the carelessness and corruption supposed to reside in business conducted by the city to supply itself with water.

My investigations as one of the committee on water supply of the Merchants' Association, taught me that the growing belief of mankind in every civilized community under the sun was that municipal ownership of water plants best served the public; and everywhere, in Germany, England, France, Italy and the United States, the tendency was away from private ownership and distribution to public ownership and distribution, to the manifest benefit of the great body of consumers.

The city has undertaken the education of our children and it does it well. Who would change this great example of successful municipal service?

The city builds and maintains its sewers in addition to maintaining its water-plant and to the distribution of the water to the consumers, but some now tell us that it is dangerous socialism to have the city build a lighting plant and distribute gas and electricity to private consumers. This danger is not apprehended by the millions of such consumers, but only by the Consolidated Gas Company, with its millions of watered stocks and bonds, and its allies in the legislature, conspicuous in Tammany Hall and in the McCarren machine of Brooklyn, to say nothing of Senator McCarren's Republican associate from Kings county, aided by other Republican senators from the rural communities.

Our city maintains engine houses and a fire department, and there is nothing finer of the kind in the world. And

who would deprive the city of this function?

The city opens, paves and maintains its streets, to the great comfort and profit of our citizens. We have, as yet, heard of no organized demand that our streets and their pavements be turned over to private corporations. We macadamize some streets, and all goes well. Carriages and carts pass over them, heedless of socialistic designs. We put down cobblestones and all does not go so well, but there is still no clamor for private ownership or control. We lay granite pavements and maintain them, and nobody complains. The city puts down asphalt pavements and repairs them, and vehicles, equestrians and pedestrians use them even for amusement, utterly unconscious of the danger of socialism, and incipient anarchy lurking in their path. But mark, as soon as the word goes forth that an iron or steel way is to be prepared for vehicles called cars, which can be operated as monopolies over the people's streets, there is trouble!

The cities of New York and Brooklyn built the great Brooklyn Bridge for fifteen or twenty millions, and then ran cars over it, and did it well,—with no strikes and to the great comfort of the people. The elevated railroads of Brooklyn, which are nothing but continuous iron bridges, were built, and it was at once made clear by the great railroad interests that only private corporations could run them and run them well. Indeed, the corporations and those engaged in the surface lines of Brooklyn did not rest content until they had run the city off of our magnificent bridge and had taken possession themselves at a grossly inadequate price. All this was done in their enormous zeal to serve the public.

We have recently opened another fine bridge to Williamsburg, which cost many millions, and a third is building to the foot of Washington street, Brooklyn, to cost many millions more. But our Rapid Transit Commissioners, only a few weeks ago, were about to hand all of these three bridges over to one corporation, the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company (in addition to having the city build for such company an elevated loop in Manhattan through the crowded section of the East side, to connect with all three bridges) for the pitiful return of 3½ per cent. on the city's investment, and a possible one per cent. additional. Our honorable Rapid Transit Commission was thus about to give, in effect, to the Rapid Transit Company the richest franchise in the world, worth one hundred millions, if it is worth a dollar.

And think of what would happen in case of a successful strike of the employees of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company, with all three bridges in the charge of that one company! It would result in a tie-up of all intercourse between Manhattan and the Bronx for weeks, a calamity to our city greater than anything we have hitherto experienced.

And, by the by, what is the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company, with which the honorable Rapid Transit Commission were prepared to treat on such friendly terms, and to whose controlling influence it timidly subjects itself? It is a company owning not one foot of railroad, a mere holding company, owning the stock of the Brooklyn Heights Railroad, which, in turn, is the lessee of almost all of the surface and elevated roads of Brooklyn. And what is this Brooklyn Heights Railroad Company which is the lessee of some five hundred miles of single track Brooklyn car lines? It is a road running from Wall Street ferry to the City Hall,—a little over half a mile in length. It is the tail wagging the dog, a pyramid standing on its head,—and all controlled by a paper corporation with bushels of watered stocks and bonds, and giving, with all its ostensible wealth, a service so wretched that it is difficult to conceive of a public service corporation more deserving of contempt. There is none receiving a larger share from a long-suffering public. But to that company our noble Rapid Transit Commission wishes to hand over \$60,000,000 worth of bridges, all we have.

The government of New York city to-day seems to me to consist of three traction companies (the Brooklyn Rapid Transit, the Interborough and New York City Railroad Companies), the Consolidated Gas Company, one or two trunk railroads, all backed up by two political organizations or machines, known as Republican and Democratic respectively. These exert their influence upon our Legislature in furthering bills advancing their interests or defeating bills intended to protect the city's interests. Or they exert their influence directly upon the city government.

I do not assert that all men in our legislature, or that all men in our city government, are controlled by these influences. I do assert, however, that enough are so controlled to give these traction companies all that they find that the city will bear without revolution. Sometimes their depredations create a public sentiment so strong

against them, that even the political organizations, selfish as they are, hesitate to resist it. I do not charge, in making these assertions, that all of those who cooperate in making effective the demands of the traction or lighting companies, are corrupt men, or even unpatriotic men. Many of them are good men, and public-spirited in many ways, as, for instance, our Rapid Transit Commissioners. But, by inheritance or environment, they trust men and corporations financially strong, rather than the people who should be first considered. They are accustomed to Wall street methods, and custom has made them accept these as inevitable or even praiseworthy. They see nothing wrong in watered stock or bonds. Franchise rights granted by the city are, in their judgment, of no or little value to the city, and hence are given away or sold for a trifle. But these very rights when acquired by the corporations are, in the judgment of the same men, of immense value, and a proper basis for enormous capitalization.

Take, for instance, the franchise connected with the recently proposed elevated loop between the bridges over the East river. Take the subways for a further illustration of what I mean. The present subway was built by the city at an outlay of \$35,000,000, and is theoretically owned by the city. It is said that Mr. McDonald, the contractor, sublet the contract to numerous sub-contractors, and at once cleared \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 for himself.

Mr. Belmont organized an operating company to run the trains, and issued \$35,000,000 of stock. With this the company bought the equipment, and is paying part of the expense of the East River tunnel and Brooklyn subway. This stock is quoted in money-wise Wall street at over 200. This fact would indicate a present profit already of \$35,000,000, at least, with a lease having 75 years to run, giving a right to the exclusive operation of the New York subway, and a long term of the tunnel and the Brooklyn subway. Think of the enormous value of these subway franchises, as thus exhibited! Why should not the city receive a large compensation for them?

I do not begrudge either Mr. McDonald or the Belmont company the large profits made and to be made, as they were pioneers in a new field. But now that the value of the subway has been proved, further extensions should be granted for an adequate compensation only, and leases should be for a short period.

The Rapid Transit Commission, originally appointed by the State, a self-perpetuating body, in absolute accord with Wall street methods, unwilling to trust the people, and unmindful of the City's property-rights, favors the roads and refuses to receive such powers as would enable such commission to safeguard the city's interests.

For three sessions of the legislature, the Citizens' Union, ex-Senator Ford, and various civic organizations, have sought to have the Rapid Transit law amended by giving the commission the power to abbreviate the term of leases to operating roads. The minimum is now 35 years. Furthermore, we sought to limit the right of lease as to extensions of the present subway, to 25 years with one renewal of 20 years. The limit of franchise grants under our charter is 25 years. Why is this standard not adhered to? The union also sought to have the commission invested with power to award the contract for construction separately from that for operation, as has been successfully done in Boston, and to award it in sections. We also sought to have the law so amended that pipe-galleries could be constructed in connection with all future subways. Finally, we sought to invest the commission with the power not only to build at the cost of the city (the power possessed to-day), but the power to have the city operate the road when built, this last to be resorted to only in case proper terms could not be obtained from private bidders. But all of these extended powers were rejected. These propositions to grant new powers to the commission, to protect the city's interests, were all embodied in the Elsborg bill, as to rapid transit, badly defeated a few weeks ago in the senate of the State.

A kindred bill had passed the senate for two successive years, once under an emergency message from Gov. Odell. This year there was every promise of its passage, until there came the laying on of hands, when it was badly defeated. The city is, therefore, again powerless to cope with the big corporations.

One senator from this city, in voting against the bill, said that he did so as he regarded the bill as the first step in the direction of municipal operation. I feel that the defeat of this very reasonable, moderate, and even conservative measure, framed to guard the city's interests, is the first great step in the direction of municipal operation. The people can no longer be restrained. They see their most pre-

cious possessions appropriated by selfish corporations under the forms of law, without any regard for the city's rights.

The president of the Rapid Transit Commission apparently believes that the city can exact no more from the traction companies in case of granting rights as to future subways, than three and one-half per cent. on the moneys invested by the city, and a possible one per cent. per annum besides. But this is not enough for privileges worth many millions, and is not, in my judgment, the true construction of the law.

The Rapid Transit Act, as it exists to-day, enables the commission to give perpetual grants. The people will have none of them. Properly to protect the city, the leases should fall in frequently, in order to enable the city to obtain more favorable terms for renewals, or to run the roads itself.

Poetry is at last classified. The Washington Post tells a story of some children who were discussing the perfections and usefulness of their respective fathers. "My father is the best man in the world," said one little girl. "He is a minister. He makes people go to church." "Mine is best," piped up another. "He's a doctor. He makes sick people well, so they can go to church." Three or four more enlarged upon the benefit the world derived from their fathers, and finally came the turn of a sweet blue-eyed little girl. "My papa's the best of all," she said. "He's a poet." "A poet?" said another, joining the group. "Why, a poet isn't a profession. It's a disease." —San Francisco Star.

Alas, could Teddy only feel  
He had square men for every deal,  
He'd have no need to work and plan  
For a square deal for every man.—Life.

But crooked men, who may not steal  
Outright, will play the crooked deal  
If there's a chance; so, Teddy swears  
All deals are off, except the squares.  
E. H. P.

## BOOKS

### THE WALKING DELEGATE.

To recommend a novel for elementary study of the labor question might seem like strange advice; but all the same, it would be good advice if the novel recommended were Leroy Scott's "The Walking Delegate" (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company), which has been severely criticised for almost every conceivable defect except dullness. That is a defect which cannot possibly be attributed to it. The story