

The patriarchal system was a benevolent institution."

"Yes," she broke in with an annihilating glance, "and who abolished slavery? I have always heard it was the Republican party. I suppose you will say now it was the Democrats."

"That illustrates the very point I had in mind"—I hadn't thought of it till that minute, but it pleased me to pretend to have anticipated her stroke. "There was a handful of abolitionists who were for freeing the slaves as an act of justice, and they were the most unpopular people in America. All a man had to do was to say he was an abolitionist to get mobbed on the spot, whether it was in Massachusetts or Illinois, as well as further south. They were for justice, and they were the most lonesome people in America because the popular idea of justice had not developed to that point yet.

"The Republican party was presently swayed by the impulse of benevolence, compassion, pity—and under that impulse, complicated with federal questions, they freed the negroes. The nation was not ready then nor even yet to do it as an act of justice to the negro in recognition of his rights."

"And where was your Democratic party all this time?"

"The Democratic party was hopelessly involved on the wrong side of the slavery question. There was no party in the United States except the despised and hated abolitionists who could comprehend that anything was due to the negro in justice. Even then the Democratic party was following its instincts for justice in its poor human way, laying so much stress on the rights of the states that it never perceived the other rights. The mind of the party had not developed far enough to comprehend the rights of the negroes, and for not being able to see it the party got jolly well licked. And served them right.

"I regret to say that there are many Democrats who do not to this day appreciate the rights of the negroes. There is an inherited prejudice against our black brethren that I can understand though I may not approve of it. It is not easy to acknowledge the equality of a man whom we regard as an inferior. It is much easier to be kind to him than to be just to him. And therefore the Republicans are fairly successful in living up to their ideal while the Democrats are very far from fulfilling theirs. I suppose Mrs. Dillingham, for instance, would do anything in the world for old Dinah—ex-

cepting to recognize her as an equal—say to sit at table with her?"

"Then the Republican party did accomplish something while the Democrats were waiting for that ideal of theirs to arrive," she suggested, "and you say it hasn't come yet. And still you are proud of being a Democrat. Oh, you men."

I was supposed to be completely floored. Happily for me I am so obtuse that I never know when I am vanquished in argument. I ventured to call her attention to the fact that this happened nearly forty years ago. The Republican party was then doubtless a decade in advance of the Democrats. The Democrats were facing to the rear, dwelling on the past phase of the question, which in a political party is a moral sin. Whereas it is now the Republican party that dwells on its glorious past and is serenely oblivious to the good time coming in the reign of justice—

But I fell into that very error right there. For the discussion to Mrs. Dillingham's mind stopped with her last word. For as a woman is entitled to the last word, whatever a foolish man adds to that is but labor and sorrow.

I am not allowed to get beyond the admission that the Democratic party was wrong forty years ago—not even by reminding her that that was before she was born.—John Stone Pardee, in Red Wing Argus.

THE OHIO KEYNOTE.

Speech of Hon. Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, as temporary chairman of the Democratic convention of Ohio, at Sandusky, O., September 3, 1902.

The principles of democracy, always old, but never obsolete, confront us to-day, both in local and in national questions.

One of these national questions relates to trusts. For this evil our adversaries advise publicity as the remedy. Publicity! That might protect investors against fraud; but how could it protect the public against monopoly, which is the basis of trusts? Men whose incomes have increased but little or not at all, but whose living expenses have increased enormously—why should they care for publicity? What is needed is not examinations of the account books of the trusts; it is the sweeping of monopolies from the statute books of the people.

The money question also is national. And let me tell you this is no dead issue, as some would have us believe. Dead though it may be in one form, it is alive in other and more radical forms. So long as Wall street inter-

ests dictate our financial policies, the money question cannot die. You know that I have never accepted the doctrine commonly known as "sixteen to one." I have worked with those who do accept it because I have believed, as I believe yet, that the free silver fight was the first great protest of the American people against monopoly—the first great struggle here of the masses against the privileged classes. It was not free silver that frightened the plutocratic leaders. What they feared was free men.

We have in national politics also the vital question of self-government. Shall we continue to govern distant colonies from Washington, as distant provinces were governed by imperial Rome before her fall, and as crown colonies are governed by the British empire to-day? That question also is at bottom a monopoly question. There would be no subject colonies if colonies could give no monopoly franchises.

But national questions are not for us to deal with in this state convention. Great as is Ohio in territory and population and wealth, important as she is in the sisterhood of states, influential as her Democracy is capable of being in the counsels of the national party, she is not great enough, nor important enough, nor is her Democracy influential enough, to warrant this convention in dictating national policies or remodeling national platforms. We have not been elected for that purpose. The function of revising national platforms belongs with conventions chosen for national purposes. Our function, so far as national questions are concerned, begins and ends with an unmistakable identification of the Democratic party of Ohio with the Democratic party of the republic. That can be done in good faith only by acknowledging the authority of the latest national expression of party doctrine on national questions. In my judgment, therefore, this convention ought to recognize the Kansas City platform. It ought also to pay the tribute of its respect to the great Democrat, who has in two national campaigns brilliantly led us against the Republican party and its allied hosts of nonpartisan monopolists.

Having done that, it is our duty to turn to the affairs of our own state. Let us be fair to our adversaries. They are in the majority in the legislature, and at the last session of that body they passed the Longworth bill which makes it easier in the future to amend the state constitution. Under that law we of Ohio shall no longer be tied down by the narrow ideas of half a

century ago. The dead hand has been lifted. This is probably the best law that has been put on the statute books of our state in the last 30 years.

But on the whole that same Republican legislature has lent itself to the service of the monopoly corporations. Most of its members carried railroad passes in their pockets while they buried the bill to reduce railroad fares to the people; and they suppressed the bill to tax steam railroads on the same basis of valuation as homes and farms. The board of equalization for railroads, all Republicans, had decided that the present laws are so defective that steam railroads cannot be assessed for taxation as high as homes and farms. The Supreme Court had sustained them in that decision. Every Supreme Court judge is a Republican, and some of them were railroad attorneys. Respect for the court precludes our suggesting that it was influenced by these facts, though we all know how difficult it is for any man, even though he be a judge, to escape the influences of association. But notwithstanding the defect in the tax laws, the legislative committee gave but scant consideration to the proposed remedy and the measure was not allowed to come to a vote.

Now note what this Republican legislature did to cover its tracks. It reduced state taxes on real and personal property more than one-half. But how did it make up most of the consequent loss to the state revenues? By taxing monopolies? No. By taxing other interests that were paying less than their share? No. It did it principally by taxing the stock of corporations that have no monopoly privileges but do a competitive business. This stock is owned almost entirely within the state. At the same time the legislature exempted corporations owning rich monopoly franchises in Ohio, the stock of which is held almost entirely outside of the state. The Ohio stockholders in a sawmill company, doing business in Ohio, are to pay taxes, called license fees, on their capital stock; but stockholders in monopoly corporations, who live in New York, are exempted from that form of taxation. Nor is that all. There are gross discriminations between the owners of stock in Ohio business corporations. And these discriminations favor the rich. Whether stock is worth \$10 a share or \$800 a share, it must pay the same tax per share. So the former must pay higher taxes than the latter, in proportion to value, by 80 times—or nearly 8,000 per cent.

If the legislature had taxed steam railroads and other public service corporations fairly, it could have abolished the state tax on real and personal property altogether, without taxing the stock of competitive business corporations at all. But the Republican leaders could not consent to that. They had made a bargain with the steam railroads to permit no hostile legislation if the railroads would submit to a slight increase of taxes. Pursuant to that bargain, the governor proposed and the legislature adopted a law increasing the tax on steam railroads \$400,000 a year. That is less than ten per cent. of what the increase would be if steam railroads were taxed as much in proportion to the value of their Ohio property as Ohio farmers and home owners are. A fair proportion for the steam railroads would be an increase of \$4,000,000 a year instead of \$400,000.

By such unmistakable signs the leaders of the Republican party in this state have exposed their willingness to guard and defend the interests of privilege and monopoly at the expense of the unprivileged people. I say Republican leaders, because I do not believe this partnership with Republican monopoly is approved by the Republican masses. Acting for monopoly interests, the state officials and the members of the dominant party in the legislature have defeated all legislation looking to the correction of inequalities in taxation. Incontestible proof was furnished them that the steam railroads and the other public service corporations together are evading payment of their just share of taxation, as compared with home owners and farmers, to the extent of not less than \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 a year. The facts are conceded. Yet every attempt to correct this manifest inequality has been defeated. State boards, composed of Republicans, stand in the way under the present law, and the Republican majority in the legislature stands in the way of making remedial laws.

If further proof of this corrupt partnership be desired, turn to the experience of the city of Cleveland during the past year and a half. The city board of equalization raised the valuation of the local public service corporations nearly \$20,000,000. This brought it up from 6 per cent. to 60 per cent. of its market value, which is the customary basis of valuation in ordinary cases. But a state board, composed of the governor, the attorney general, and the state auditor, wiped that assessment out, leaving

these corporations to make their own assessments; and the Republicans in the legislature legislated the faithful city board out of existence. In place of that board a new city board has been appointed by the same state officials. It is composed of men who can be trusted to guard monopoly interests. The old city board of equalization was not alone in offending the monopolists. The city council offended also. It provided for a street car system with three-cent fares and ultimate ownership by the city. Government by injunction was thereupon brought into play. The Cleveland council is now enjoined from granting street car franchises with low fares, while every other city in the state is at liberty to grant street car franchises with high fares.

When it was discovered that the city government of Cleveland could be neither bought nor browbeaten, the Republican attorney general was appealed to by the frightened monopolists, and he brought an ouster suit. We have heard of ripper legislation; this was ripper litigation. Cleveland had confessedly the best city charter in Ohio. It had been granted by a Republican legislature of a dozen years ago, to whom the credit belongs, and both the Republican and the Democratic masses of Cleveland approved it. No attempt was made to break that charter until the people elected an administration that dared question the privileges of the public service corporations. Then it was assailed by Republican politicians, spurred on by monopolists, and the attorney general asked the Supreme Court of the state to declare it unconstitutional. That court did so. But it did not stop there. It also declared the whole charter system of Ohio invalid. For that reason the legislature is now convened in special session to frame a general municipal code.

Insofar as the Republican leaders aim to make a proper system of municipal government, they should have the cordial support of every Democratic member of the legislature. But if, as now seems certain, they try to foist upon our municipalities a system of board rule, their work ought to be condemned by good citizens of all parties. For board rule means boss rule in its worst sense, as everybody must know who knows how Cincinnati is governed. Board rule, divided responsibility, control from the state capitol, that is the system that creates and maintains hopeless civic conditions in Cincinnati. The little finger of the boss is stronger than the loins of the people. But un-

der home rule, under the federal plan, which Cleveland had until ripper litigation had done its work, no boss has been able to hold out against public sentiment. In Cincinnati, under their boss and board-ridden government, a 50-year franchise was boldly granted to the street railways, and the same men are still in power; but the mere attempt to make a 25-year grant in Cleveland swept from office every man who favored the proposition from the chief executive down. This illustrates the difference between a political leadership through the manipulation of boards, and a political leadership directly subject to the will of the people.

In framing our municipal code there should be extraordinary vigilance regarding franchises, especially those of street railways. The fact that the street railway grants in Cleveland are about to expire and that the latest judicial decision declares unconstitutional the 50-year franchise in Cincinnati, makes the temptation great for all the powerful public service corporations of our cities to unite in an effort to slip into the municipal code provisions hostile to the public interests. A cunning and well-paid lobby is at work, and the only sure way of bringing its clandestine schemes to naught is to provide in the code that no franchise, and no renewal of franchise, shall be operative in any city until the ordinance granting it has been ratified by a majority vote of the people of that city.

The opportunity opens before the people of Ohio to engage in a noble work. If they choose, they may take their place in the van of the great moral as well as political movement that is making headway wherever the English language is spoken. They have only to say the word, and our state will set an example in human progress such as seldom falls to the fortune of any state to offer. They have only to say the word, and every city within our borders will govern itself in local affairs, and throughout the whole great commonwealth the principle of just taxation will prevail. Home rule and just taxation! Let us adopt those ideals of all good government, and we shall solve "the riddle which the Sphinx of Fate puts to our civilization" and which it must answer or be destroyed. These are the issues of this campaign. These are the shibboleth of the Ohio Democracy to-day, and my prayer is that they will continue so to be until they are realized. Home rule and just taxation! Fellow-Democrats, under that banner let us fight, and by that sign we shall conquer.

WEDDED BLISS.

"O come and be my mate!" said the Eagle to the Hen;

"I love to soar, but then I want my mate to rest Forever in their nest!"

Said the Hen, "I cannot fly, I have no wish to try.

But I joy to see my mate careering through the sky!"

They wed, and cried: "Ah! this is Love, my own!"

And the Hen sat; the Eagle soared, alone.

"O come and be my mate!" said the Lion to the Sheep;

"My love for you is deep! I slay—a Lion should!

But you are mild and good!"

Said the Sheep, "I do no ill, Could not had I the will,

But I joy to see my mate pursue, devour and kill!"

They wed, and cried: "Ah! this is Love, my own!"

And the Sheep browsed, and the Lion prowled alone.

"O come and be my mate!" said the Salmon to the Clam;

"You are not wise, but I am! I know sea and stream as well;

You know nothing but your shell!"

Said the Clam, "I'm slow of motion, But my love is all devotion,

And I joy to have my mate traverse lake and stream and ocean!"

They wed, and cried: "Ah! this is Love, my own!"

And the Clam sucked, the Salmon swam, alone.

—Charlotte Perkins Stetson, in The New Century Journal.

A story is told of a juryman who outwitted a judge, and that without lying. He ran into court in a desperate hurry, quite out of breath, and exclaimed: "Oh, judge, if you can, pray excuse me. I don't know which will die first—my wife or my daughter!" "Dear me, that's sad," said the innocent judge. "Certainly you are excused." The ladies mentioned are still in excellent health and the juryman hopes that the solution of the problem may be long deferred.—Chicago Chronicle.

"I should like," said the man, "to get a position as proofreader."

"Sorry," said the publisher, "but we've laid off all our proofreaders; don't need 'em."

"You don't?"

"No; we're publishing nothing but dialect stories now."—Philadelphia Press.

To be natural, however artificial the circumstances, is the perfection of good manners.—Puck.

"Is Mr. Fusse much afraid of microbes?"

"Well, I should say; he washes the antiseptic gauze gloves he wears in an antiseptic fluid before he even handles

the sterilized glass that contains the boiled and filtered mineral water he intends to drink!"—Baltimore Herald.

BOOK NOTICES.

EDUCATED WORKING WOMEN.

This book, written by an English woman and published in England (King & Son), deals with conditions in England, but most of the author's conclusions and suggestions apply as well to "women workers in the middle classes" over here. It is written in a straightforward, confident style, as if by one who has had experience whereof she speaks.

One of the subjects discussed is, of course, that of salary. "Women never will," she says, "and never can become highly efficient and continue so for any long period on the salaries which they at present receive, or even on the salaries with which, as a rule, they would be contented if they could get them. Vitality and freshness of mind, when youth is gone, cannot be maintained within the four walls of the class room or office, on incomes too small to admit of varied social intercourse or of practical beneficence."

In speaking of the falling-off in the quality and quantity of a woman's work, after she has been some years engaged in it, she advances the idea that women need interesting work more than men.

"All that the average man demands is that his work should be honest and remunerative. It need not be interesting, or elevating, or heroic. Most women, on the other hand, who look forward to a long working career must have an occupation to which they can give heart and mind. The woman is living an isolated life. Men, on the other hand, whatever be their employment, are generally husbands and fathers."

There may be some point in the distinction made, for there are probably more women workers than men workers who are isolated in their lives outside of the environment of work; but surely the average man falls off and wears out, just as the average woman may do, whose work arouses no progressive interest.

J. H. DILLARD.

"Eminent Respectability," by William R. Pedrick (Philadelphia: Alfred M. Slocum Co., 718-724 Arch street), which is described on the title page as "a tale of love, politics and adventure," tells of the career of an eminently respectable man of much wealth and no character—except a very bad one. The interest of the book depends entirely upon the plot, which is woven out of such materials as suppressed wills, marital and parental infidelity, criminality in high life, and frustrated conspiracies. It is an interesting novel for a summer afternoon in a hammock or a short journey on a railroad train. While it preaches no sermon, the characters and incidents are suggestive of the unwholesomeness of the plutocratic atmosphere in which modern American society flourishes.

The Democratic campaign book for 1902 (Dem. Cong. Com., 736 15th St. Washington, and old Inter Ocean building, Chicago. Price 25 cents) has just been issued. The principal subjects it discusses are imperialism, tariffs and trusts, labor questions, and subsidies. As it opens with the national platform, making that the text for what follows, there can be neither complaint nor jubilation at any supposed departure on the part of the Congressional committee from the principles of the party as declared by the latest authoritative convention.

PERIODICALS.

—An article of very exceptional interest is "The Reminiscences of a Chartist Tailor" in the Outlook of August 9. The writer is