

cede the validity of his claim, we must pay the rent or get off.

But, does the steel company really own that sixty years' supply of ore?

Is there not a corporation superior to the United States Steel Corporation that has a prior and nonforfeitable claim on the "ore"? And does not that superior corporation, as a matter of fact, charge the United States Steel Corporation a royalty on that ore? That is to say, does not the State levy a tax upon the ore lands? And what if the State—that is, the public—should decide that Mr. Morgan, by declining to drop the price of steel when cost declines, thereby exacts unjust tribute from that same public, and that, therefore, it would be no more than fair to raise the royalties—that is, to levy an equitable tax upon the demonstrated value of the ore lands?

Some people will think that such increased tax would only have the effect of causing Mr. Morgan to advance correspondingly the price of steel. Not so, however. Mr. Morgan is already "charging all that the traffic will bear." If he advanced the price it would enable the owners of inferior mines to work them at a profit, and thus the increased supply would augment the stress of competition, with the result that prices would speedily decline to the former level.

It is the competition of outsiders that prevents Mr. Morgan from getting more than he now receives for steel. Stop outside production and, though cost should fall still lower than it is now, yet Mr. Morgan would be able to raise the price of his product—for the traffic would bear a higher price if it was all in the hands of a single concern.

But there is the further objection that to raise the taxation on that sixty years' supply of the "most valuable ore" would be unfair.

Well, there are idle ore lands which, if worked, would not yield a profit sufficient to pay the current taxes; while, if no tax was charged, a small profit would arise to the operator. Is it fair to tax away all the value of these

lands, and, at the same time, unfair to tax the greater values enough to prevent the owners from throttling competition and extorting monopoly prices from the public. Is the Great Public—the armed giant—to lie down and quietly permit the Liliputian Monopolist to bore out its eyes with a fire brand?

Mr. Morgan says that the "earnings" will be \$125,000,000 this year. Half of this is profit on the water in the stock. Is it fair that the public should pay \$62,500,000 a year to the steel company as profit on its water?—that is, as the "earnings" of something that does not exist. On the contrary, would it not be perfectly fair for the public to defend itself against such exploitation by means of exercising its power to tax land values equitably?

If it is right that Messrs. Carnegie and Morgan should add the diminished cost of pig iron to their profits now, it will, of course, be right for them and their heirs to acquire the rest of the world's iron ore mines, as fast as they shall become accessible, and so, keep on adding diminished cost to profit throughout all time. Possibly, however, before Mr. Carnegie's 60 years are passed, the public will conclude that it has some rights in the premises.

The potential equalizer of opportunity is the power to levy taxes; which power resides in the state, and the state is the public. Therefore, the people have the power to compel Messrs. Carnegie and Morgan and the rest of the monopolists, to really earn what they get, in spite of the fact that they have "secured such an abundant supply of the best ore obtainable."

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

New York, Oct. 5.—Much valuable political information can be derived from a study of this year's campaign in New York city, chiefly on the moot question of how far non-partisanship is really possible in municipal politics.

As even distant readers will generally know, the contest, as for several years past, has been between the Democratic organization, dominated by Tammany Hall as the Democratic power in Man-

hattan Borough (the city proper), and a fusion of Republicans with the Citizens' Union, a body professedly non-partisan, but made up chiefly of Republicans who are not members of the machine with a sprinkling of Democrats from the class which does not affiliate with Tammany, together with sundry other bodies, mostly of skeleton membership.

The event of the present situation has been the startling "coup" by Tammany's leader, in adopting and indorsing the two Democrats who had been nominated by the fusion to run with Mayor Low, the Republican who is candidate for reelection.

Roundly denounced from two sides, on the one as a confession of weakness on Tammany's part—a charge which nobody really believes—and also as an act of treachery on the part of the candidates who accepted the indorsement, and on the other as a relinquishing of spoils to independents which should have gone to regulars, the action has yet been universally recognized as a move of surpassing shrewdness, dictated by a breadth of view, which to tell the truth one would have scarcely looked for from a man brought up in the school of machine politics.

At one stroke, it punctures the non-partisan contention, and brings out the salient fact that the nomination on one ticket of candidates professing different political faiths, is nothing more than a deal to secure the administration for the Republicans, nominally in the minority, through the purchase of a certain number of Democratic votes by naming Democrats for secondary positions. For as soon as the inducement for Democrats to vote the composite ticket is removed by giving them the same Democratic names on the Democratic ticket, there is a cry of treason from the Republicans thus left without their ammunition.

Behind it lies the fundamental fact that the same tendencies which influence men to align themselves on one side or another of political issues in national or State affairs, influence them equally to take similar alignments in municipal affairs. At the bottom, perhaps, it is a class distinction; and in New York it should not be forgotten that while Tammany, as the result of its overpowering control, has attracted a greater or more effective share of corrupt influences than some of its opponents, yet in the long run it maintains its control because it is most representative of the plain people.

One other factor, the virulent opposition of the Brooklyn Democracy, cannot well be appraised by anyone who has not been acquainted with New York politics and familiar with the fact which has become a tradition here, that in the organization of any party whatsoever, the Brooklyn end always demands its full share and usually a good deal more, of whatever plums there are to distribute; and that in any convention of which they form a constituent part, no ticket can go through without opposition from the

Brooklyn delegates unless their leaders have practically dictated it. But to Democrats throughout the country who are interested in the contest here as a party matter, it may be of interest to also learn that this spirit of greed rarely extends to actual disloyalty at the polls.

E. J. SHRIVER.

Cleveland, Oct. 6.—Any unbiased observer must conclude that Tom L. Johnson has his political adversaries badly frightened. Evidence of this is furnished by the hysterical character of the news sent out by the Republican Press Bureau from the headquarters in Columbus. The Democratic managers claim that they are making converts wherever they hold meetings. They base this conclusion upon the interest manifested by the vast audiences they draw, and hold to the close of the meetings. The closing talk at the night tent meetings is made by Peter Witt, the Cleveland tax expert. He gives stereopticon illustrations of inequalities in taxation not only in Cleveland but also in the towns where the meetings are held; and in every case the audiences have remained until he has finished. That great gains will be made generally throughout the State, so far as indications point, is clear.

There is one uncertain point—Hamilton county. Boss Cox is so strongly entrenched there and the people are so apathetic that it is questionable whether much can be done. It has been the policy of Mayor Johnson to discourage outside speakers from coming into the State to participate in the campaign, but an exception is now to be made of Hamilton county. Mr. J. B. Vining, secretary and treasurer of the Ohio Single-Tax League, is inviting single-tax organizations to send as many speakers into Hamilton county as they wish to, and conduct the campaign there as they deem best. The only condition is that they work entirely independently of the Democratic State committee. This will open the field to single-taxers everywhere to volunteer their services or contribute money.

"Billy" Radcliffe is on his way to Hamilton county and will remain there until the campaign closes. He has been continuously on the road in Ohio since June 29th, and has done effective work wherever he has been.

So far there is no indication that the overwhelming Republican plurality will be overcome. It will take a political upheaval to do that. But there is a fair chance to carry the legislature, which will bring home rule throughout the State and incidentally relegate Mark Hanna to private life. Tom L. Johnson is everywhere conceded to be the most effective campaigner in the political arena to-day. Much is said about his "red devil" and "circus attraction," but it is the unique personality of the man that draws. Five thou-

sand people were packed into a tent in this city last night to listen to him. There was no brass band accompaniment, no music whatever. For an hour and a half he held the audience after two other speakers had spoken. The last half hour was devoted to questions. Anyone listening to Johnson for fifteen minutes will understand why Mr. Herrick declines to meet him on the platform.

D. S. LUTHER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 8.

The campaign for the revival of protectionism in Great Britain (p. 391) was opened wide on the 1st by the Premier, Mr. Balfour, in a speech at Sheffield. He plainly advocated the reversal of the traditional free trade policy of the past two generations and the adoption in its place of a retaliatory tariff policy.

One of the effects of this speech was to precipitate the resignation from the Balfour ministry of the Duke of Devonshire, its spokesman in the House of Lords. The Duke had remained in the ministry when other free traders resigned (p. 392), with a view to holding the ministry up to the free trade traditions, or, at least, preventing its becoming protectionist. But upon the publication of Mr. Balfour's Sheffield speech, the Duke resigned peremptorily. In stating his reasons he said:

I had hoped to have found in your speech a definite statement of adherence to the principles of free trade and the ordinary basis of our fiscal and commercial system and an equally definite repudiation of the principle of protection in the interest of our national industries. But in their absence I can not help thinking that such declarations as those which I have quoted cannot fail to have the effect of materially encouraging the advocates of direct protection in the controversy which has been raised throughout the country and of discouraging those who, like me, and I hoped yourself, believe that our present system of free imports and especially of food imports is on the whole most advantageous to the country, although we do not contend that the principles on which it rests possess any such authority or sanction as to forbid any departure from it—for sufficient reasons.

At the 38th annual conference

of the Conservative party association, in connection with which Mr. Balfour made his Sheffield speech, an official resolution on the tariff question had been presented during the same day. It was as follows:

This Conference, believing that the changes which have taken place during the last fifty years in the conditions under which British trade has been carried on necessitate a reconsideration of the fiscal system which we, as a nation, have adopted during that period, thanks to the Prime Minister for having instituted an inquiry into the whole subject and welcomes the policy he has foreshadowed for securing to this country fiscal freedom in our negotiations and commercial relations with foreign countries.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Conference on the 2d.

Three days later Mr. Balfour announced the selection of the following ministers in place of those who had resigned:

W. St. J. F. Brodrick, formerly secretary for war, to succeed Lord George Hamilton as secretary for India.

Joseph Austen Chamberlain, postmaster general, to succeed Mr. Ritchie as chancellor of the exchequer.

Alfred Lyttelton, recorder of Oxford, to succeed Mr. Chamberlain as secretary for the colonies.

H. O. Arnold-Foster, secretary to the admiralty, to succeed Mr. Brodrick as secretary of war.

Graham Murray, lord advocate of Scotland, to succeed Lord Balfour, of Burleigh, as secretary for Scotland.

Lord Stanley, financial secretary of the war office, to succeed Mr. J. Austen Chamberlain as postmaster general.

No selection to replace the Duke of Devonshire has yet been announced.

By way of supplement to the Premier's Sheffield speech, Mr. Chamberlain opened his campaign for tariff protection with a speech at Glasgow on the 6th. He announced a specific scheme of protection, proposing—

1. A tax of 2 shillings (48 cents) a quarter (8 bushels) on foreign wheat, but none on wheat from British possessions. No tax on corn, but a tax on flour.
2. A tax of 5 per cent. on foreign meat and dairy produce, but no tax on bacon.
3. A substantial preference to the colonies on wines and fruits.
4. A tax of 10 per cent. on imports of manufactured goods.
5. A reduction of three-quarters of