

The Public

PS Badger Apt 1-99
255 Ontario St

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1898.

Number 32.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Gov. Pingree's reelection in Michigan is an unwelcome feature of election news to the plutocratic combine that has acquired a mortgage upon his party. It is an ominous intimation that that mortgage may yet be repudiated. Great and glorious indeed would be the day for the republican party when the Elkins-McKinley-Hanna triumvirate gave way to the leadership of Pingree. Then would come back to the old party the spirit that Abraham Lincoln breathed into it and that Mark Hanna has squeezed out.

The Elkins-McKinley-Hanna combination can find little consolation in the elections when they turn from Pingree's triumph in Michigan to Roosevelt's election in New York. They have less to fear from Roosevelt in one respect, for there is no Abraham Lincoln democracy in his blood; but they have as much to fear in another, for he now looms up as a competitor in the next republican national convention for McKinley's place. In Platt's hands he would be a strong card. That danger was not overlooked by McKinley when he refused to extend his campaign stumping tour into New York. It remains to be seen whether Roosevelt can be induced to take up with second place.

But of all the disappointments to Elkins-McKinley-Hanna that of the congressional elections must be uppermost in the tripartite mind. Pingree's triumph, Roosevelt's election, these might have been accepted as misfortunes to be overcome in good time; but how can the popular rebuke

implied in the congressional elections be explained away? All the McKinley organs protested throughout the campaign that every vote against republican congressmen would be a vote in condemnation of the administration. McKinley himself hinted as much in his stumping tour. And now the people have elected a congress which, if not hostile to the administration, escapes it by the narrowest margin. A clear majority of 47 has sunk to a majority of not more than 18, and probably not more than 13. The rebuke has come.

Dr. Connor, who, at the time of his appointment upon the president's committee for examining into the mismanagement of the war department, was suspected of having been appointed for a whitewashing job, has on more than one occasion, by his method of examining witnesses, not only justified that suspicion, but indicated that the job was congenial. The last occasion was during the present week in Chicago. We reproduce the facts from the report of the Chicago Tribune, the leading republican paper of Illinois. The witness under examination was Dr. Cuthbertson, surgeon major of the First Illinois cavalry. Dr. Cuthbertson's testimony was so badly suited for whitewashing purposes, that Dr. Connor, the committeeman, undertook in his customary manner to modify it by argument. "Doctor, do you know," he argued, "that the percentage of mortality in our army was considerably less for the first four months of campaign than of any other army of history?" The animus and object of that argumentative question was obvious. But Dr. Cuthbertson was not in the whitewashing business. He promptly replied: "I do not think there is any comparison. Our army

was within the boundary of the home government. A rich and generous government was behind it, and I am firmly of the belief that if it had been properly handled the campaign would have been less deadly."

The programme which the president's whitewashing committee appears to have adopted of trying to show that our casualties were less than other armies have suffered, reached the climax of absurdity when Gen. Wheeler was led on into testifying that our troops at Santiago were no worse off than the Spaniards! It is a programme that cannot succeed. Sooner or later the American people will demand information upon the real question at issue. That question is not whether our army suffered more or less than other armies, but whether it was subjected to useless suffering which the war department could have prevented.

Prof. Laughlin, of the Chicago university, Rockefeller's economic hothouse, has replied to Gov. Altgeld on the McCleary bill dispute, but without bringing out anything to his own advantage or to that of the McCleary bill. The fundamentally vicious feature of the bill is its manifest purpose to vest the issuing of the common paper currency of the country entirely in private banking corporations. That purpose Prof. Laughlin neither denies nor defends. We doubt if the people are yet prepared to believe with Prof. Laughlin that a bill with such a purpose "is not doing the banks a favor." In fact Prof. Laughlin himself must feel that he is throwing in a little extra for his salary when he assures the public that this bill, for which the banks are working with all their might, is not in their interest. When did the banks adopt the manners and customs of Altruria?

Perhaps it is ungentle to refer to Prof. Laughlin's salary in connection with the McCleary bill. At any rate he should have the benefit of his own protest when he says: "I am absolutely uninfluenced in what I think or teach by any person or by any authorities; in my university post I am responsible only to my conscience, so long as I do my duty. No one ever has, even in the slightest way, hinted to me what I should believe or teach."

That no one has ever hinted directly to Prof. Laughlin what he should teach is probable enough. It may have been unnecessary, owing to the confidence of the trustees of Chicago university in his fidelity to plutocratic interests. They probably know him and he knows them. But that he would receive hints hardly less forceable than kicks, were he to become plutocratically unsound, was startlingly illustrated in the case of Prof. Bemis, who was invited to resign from the faculty of Chicago university because he did not agree with the eternal monopolies of Chicago on the subject of the ownership and control of Chicago streets.

Nor are we dependent alone upon the Bemis case for our opinion as to the tenure by which Prof. Laughlin holds his economic chair in the Chicago university. At least two of the trustees have spoken. One of these trustees is Ferd W. Peck, of Chicago, who in an interview upon the subject of professorial responsibility, after the difficulty at Brown university over President Andrews's financial heterodoxy, said that the trustees should see to it that "no unsound financial doctrines nor anything of a dangerous character be taught." The other trustee of Chicago university, Daniel L. Shorey, also referring to the Andrews case, said: "If the trustees had quietly asked him to resign, and had not given him a fallacious reason for it, their action would have been approved by nine-tenths of the intelligent men of the country. It was an awful blunder that they made." Now Prof. Laugh-

lin may never have received any direct personal hint as to what he should teach at Chicago university, but to a man of ordinary acuteness these published hints from two of his trustees would be enough. He credits himself with having changed his opinion on the quantitative theory of money. That change of opinion brought him in harmony with the great monied interests, to which his trustees are related. Suppose upon reconsideration he should change back again, would he expect to make the change public and still retain his chair? Prof. Laughlin is not so simple.

Reports reach this country from Berlin which indicate that the emperor's party is preparing a bill for the repression of socialism. The extraordinary growth of the socialist party in Germany makes the emperor shiver. And well it may. For the socialist party of Germany polls the largest vote of any of the parties of the empire. It would hold the balance of power in the reichstag if the districts were not shamelessly gerrymandered. But, dangerous as this party now is to the party of divine right, it will be a thousand times more dangerous if repressed by force. Two million voters cannot be wantonly suppressed, even by a nondescript survival of "God's anointed."

The Chicago Tribune is so hard driven for proof of its contention that wages are rising, as to resort to what it editorially calls "the report of the Senate Committee on Wages and Prices, of which Senator Allison was chairman," covering "the period from 1840 to 1891." Now it happens that there is no Senate Committee on Wages and Prices, and never was. The committee to which the Tribune probably refers is the Senate Committee on Finance. This committee made a report in 1893 on wages, prices and transportation, in which it professed to cover the period, as to wages, from 1840 to 1891. But Senator Allison was not chairman of that committee. The chairman was Senator

Aldrich. Apparently the Chicago Tribune meant to refer to the well known Aldrich report, and got into a muddle. But its muddle as to the identity of the report is a trifle in comparison with its folly in referring to that report at all as an authority. The statistics of the Aldrich report have been completely and irrefutably discredited. To cite them in proof of increasing wages is prima facie evidence either of dishonesty or ignorance.

It was quite unnecessary for the Chicago Chronicle to oppose woman suffrage in order to prove that, in spite of its political professions, it is not a democratic paper. But it does seem to have been necessary for it to offer some rather stupid arguments in order to make a pretense of reasoning about the matter. Among these, of course, is the worn out plea that as women don't vote in large numbers under limited suffrage rights, they would not do so if the suffrage right were unlimited. That argument has been demolished time and again. If women take no interest in tame school board elections, it is because these elections are tame. Neither do men turn out in large numbers at unexciting elections. But what bearing has that on the question of their right to vote? This weary argument against woman suffrage is supplemented by the Chronicle with an assertion that woman suffrage in Colorado, where it is unlimited, is also a failure. That will be news to the women of Colorado. The reasons suggested for the failure are humorous enough for Puck—just about. One reason is that women stay away from the polls when the weather is bad. If that were a valid objection we should have to disfranchise the whole republican party; for it is proverbial that in bad weather the republicans poll a light vote. Another reason advanced by the Chronicle is that in the cities of Colorado "meretricious women, whose votes are purchased by unconscionable candidates, crowd around the polling places," thus keeping respect-

able women away. What would become of manhood suffrage if it were subjected to that test? In our cities meretricious men have often crowded around the polls and sold their votes to unconscionable candidates. Shall we therefore disfranchise all men?

Woman suffrage in Colorado has been misrepresented. Instead of lowering it has elevated the political sentiment throughout the state. True, it has turned neither men nor women into angels. That was not to be expected. But it has checked some of the political devilry of the men. And it has advanced the intelligence and stimulated the conscience of the women themselves, regarding public affairs. All this is appreciated by the women, and a proposition to abolish woman suffrage in Colorado would command very few of their votes.

Some suggestive correspondence, which has not received the attention it deserves, was carried on in September between the president of the New England Free Trade league and the American members of the Joint high commission which is considering the preparation of a treaty for trade reciprocity between the United States and Canada. At the time of the correspondence the joint commission was in session at Quebec, and various monopoly interests on this side of the line were importuning the American members to perpetuate them. This led the New England Free Trade league, which represents no "interests," except common interests, to solicit a hearing in behalf of American consumers, a term that includes the whole American people. But the American commissioners, protectionists for revenue, had no mind to listen to any free trade arguments. So they wrote that "there would be no opportunity for further hearings, with a few exceptions made for special reasons." As one of these exceptions proved to be in favor of the notorious Home Market club, of Boston, the Free Trade league suggested that it

would be only fair to make one in favor of the league. To this the commissioners replied that "the hearing given the Home Market club of Boston was to be an exception made in fairness to the interests represented by that organization, because the free trade interests centering in Boston had already been given an extensive hearing." The significance of that reply is in its application. It was "the free trade interests centering in Boston" and represented by the Boston chamber of commerce, that had been heard and to which the Home Market club was accorded the exceptional privilege of a reply. But the "free trade interests centering in Boston" are only another species of protective interests. There had been no hearing in behalf of the general free trade principle — the principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Such a hearing, and not a defense of local interests, whether labeled "free trade" or "protection," was what the Free Trade league solicited and was denied.

But though the New England Free Trade league was not accorded an open hearing before the American commissioners to Canada, it was allowed to file a printed argument, and of this privilege it made good use. The argument is signed by Henry W. Lamb, president of the league. At the outset he reminds the commissioners of the naturalness of free trade. "The people of the United States," he says, "desire to trade with the people of Canada, and they need Canadian products. The desire and the need are so strongly returned, that, in spite of tariff barriers, there has been a large commerce between the countries." He then calls attention to the general belief in this country that the annexation of Canada would be good for our trade, and follows up that idea with the proposition, which should be kept always before the people, that "if all tariff barriers to the full exchange of American and Canadian products should be completely removed by treaty instead of annexa-

tion, substantially the same trade benefits to both people would result."

Some of the republican papers are sadly confused over the possible effects of annexation upon American industries. The Los Angeles Times is one of these. It is especially concerned about beet sugar. Learning that Cuban sugar can be laid down in New York free of duty at $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound, and be refined there for three-fourths of a cent, making the total cost $2\frac{1}{4}$ cents, whereas beet sugar cannot be made in this country for less than three cents a pound, the Times wants to know what would become of the beet sugar industry if Cuba were annexed. From the protection point of view that is a pertinent question. But what about American sugar eaters? Must they be compelled to pay unnecessarily high prices for their sugar so as to foster the beet sugar industry? Something like \$200,000,000 annually, the Times estimates, would be lost to the American beet sugar industries if they were destroyed by cheap cane sugar from our new colonies. It neglects to observe that all that was so lost, and more too, would be saved to American sugar eaters. Still, the Times does not oppose the policy of ultimate annexation. That would be contrary to the Hanna-McKinley-Elkins policy, and therefore unpatriotic. So it urges the imposition of a protective tariff upon goods from our colonies. Think of that! A tariff upon goods from territory over which our own flag floats! Could protective tariff madness go further?

When P. M. Arthur, the head of the organization of locomotive engineers, began to manage his organization "upon business principles," as the newspapers of the time naively described it, another stealthy step was taken in the direction of government by railroads. Exactly what it was that Mr. Arthur did, is not generally known. All that the public understands is that he has ever since been spoken of as a model labor leader, because he manages his organization

“upon business principles” and has no strikes; and incidentally it has leaked out that Mr. Arthur and Chauncey M. Depew, he of the Vanderbilt system, are very good friends. Another fact is known about Arthur in his home city of Cleveland. He lives upon the most aristocratic thoroughfare there—Euclid avenue—and is reputed to be a millionaire. The locomotive engineers are hardly as prosperous as Mr. Arthur, but they are kept out of strikes and their wages are not cut. From these and other facts, especially the fact that when Arthur’s influence is needed for the railroads in politics he gives it, an inference amounting almost to certainty is drawn. It is inferred that Arthur’s understanding with railroad magnates goes much further than the question of wages, and that he is in a combination with the great railroad magnates to give them the engineers’ vote whenever it is needed to protect railroad monopoly.

That is doubtless the essence of Arthur’s arrangement, whether it be manifested by a specific agreement or not. Such an arrangement would be simple. To make it effective nothing more is necessary than for the companies to leave wages undisturbed and to make no political demands so long as their privileges are not threatened by legislation; but to suggest the necessity of reducing wages, if legislation objectionable to them be carried through. Thus Mr. Arthur, getting the credit with his organization of maintaining wages, could secure perpetual reelection and be always in position to give warning, with apparent sincerity, that if political candidates or parties that were objectionable to the roads succeeded at elections it would indeed be necessary for the engineers to submit to a reduction of wages. Nothing could be simpler. Nothing has been more effective. It has been so effective that the whole organized body of locomotive engineers may, with few exceptions, be regarded as a solid voting

force which the railroads can call upon in any emergency.

And as with the engineers, so with the firemen. Sargent has about succeeded in turning them over to the roads as an additional voting force, to be called into action in the same way.

Nor does this railroad conspiracy for political ends stop with the engineers and firemen. It has worked so satisfactorily with these two branches, apparently, that it is being extended to the whole railroad system. Every employe is to be made to vote with his road. The entire body of railroad men in the United States is to be turned into a voting force to perpetuate the power of the monopoly pirates. The specific organization for that purpose is the “Railway and Telegraph Employes’ Political League.” Its grand president is John W. Callahan, of the C. & W. I., and its grand treasurer is David W. Ross, secretary to the second vice president of the Illinois Central. The headquarters of the league is in the Unity building at Chicago. The dues are as low as ten cents a year, evidently for the purpose of making it impossible for employes who object to joining, but fear to refuse, to urge inability to spare the money for dues.

That this league is under the patronage of the railroad magnates, and that any railroad man who neglects to join, does so at the peril of losing his job, is not only understood among railway employes, but is evident from the circumstances. Its purpose is disclosed in a recent circular letter addressed to railroad employes, a copy of which has come into our possession. In that letter are these words: “We urge you to organize and fight legislation that will be detrimental to your interest and that of the company which employs you.” As anti-monopoly legislation is not and cannot be detrimental to the interest of railroad employes, the plain object of the organization, as here disclosed, is to whip railroad em-

ployes into line to vote against legislation that may be detrimental to the monopoly interests of their companies. It is, in other words, to turn railroad employes into voting serfs.

The circular letter of this railroad league, now before us, shows that it was written either by knaves or dupes. It asserts that legislation reducing railway and telegraph rates would cause a reduction in the number of railway and telegraph employes and thus a reduction of wages. That is absurd upon the face of it. It is an empty threat, not a rational prediction. Is there a railroad man so stupid as not to know that reduced rates inevitably make more traffic in any business, and consequently require the employment of more men? How then could the companies reduce the number of employes if rates were reduced? And if they couldn’t reduce the number of employes, how could they reduce wages?

There are two interests in railroad-ing. One is the legitimate earning interests of the roads; the other is the watered stock interests. In the latter, railroad employes have no share. High dividends don’t make high wages. What makes high wages is plenty of opportunities for work. When railroad employes understand this, they will not be duped by a bosses’ organization like the “Railway and Telegraph Employes’ Political league.” Many of them might go into the league because they feared black-listing; some of them might join in order to get near the throne; but none would be fooled by the transparently false pretense that legislation against railroad monopolies can injure the interests of railroad employes.

An example of the wondrous change that has within a few years come over the churches in their attitude toward the theater, was presented early this month in New York, when a crowd of clergymen—Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, Unitarians, Hebrews, Congregationalists and

Presbyterians—packed one of the theaters to witness a new play. The play was Hall Caine's "Christian," and the clergymen were there upon invitation of the management. That would have been shocking twenty years ago; and thirty years ago it would have driven most of the clergymen not only from their pulpits but from all church fellowship. Barnum used to provide theatricals for his churchly patrons; and clergymen sometimes attended the performances, as their parishioners often did. But their consciences were pacified and their Christian standing saved by Barnum's pious fraud of dubbing the little theater that belonged to his musum, a "lecture room." The man was brave indeed, who, being a church member, went to a "play house" which openly called itself a theater. But most of that narrow prejudice has gone now. Outside of remote country places few clergymen of the present day, except those of the Talmage stripe, who make it an article of vital faith that a whale literally swallowed Jonah and that the sun stood still on Ajalon, would object to attending a decent play. The change is a good thing, both for church and theater.

Of all the odd reasons for insisting that in spite of their manifest poverty the American people are unconsciously enjoying a period of prosperity, the oddest is this, that the trade in diamonds and pearls is brisk. One prosperity touter actually has the impudence to publish that fact as an indication of general prosperity. He says that thus far in 1898 we have imported \$6,955,789 worth of diamonds and \$3,440,076 worth of pearls, while in 1897 we imported only \$1,985,810 of diamonds and \$1,573,788 of pearls. Here is an increase in the importation of pearls and diamonds in one year of nearly \$7,000,000. Does that mean prosperity? For some people it clearly does, but does it imply that there is general prosperity? It would, if the prosperity of diamond and pearl buyers depended upon the prosperity of the masses. But the "if" is in the

way. By no means does it follow that the masses are prospering, because the few buy diamonds and pearls. On the contrary, an expansion in the demand for diamonds and pearls may very well mean that the diamond and pearl buyers have a tighter cinch upon the earnings of the rest of the people; in other words, that the rest of the people are worse off than before.

The increase in the demand for diamonds and pearls may mean that our much-vaunted prosperity is of the kind which a well known iron trade journal admits it to be; namely, that there is more work, but lower pay. In that kind of prosperity the demand for diamonds and pearls would naturally expand. The few who profit by greater work for lower pay, could afford to buy more of them with the extra sweat they extract from those who do the greater work and get the lower pay. But is this the kind of prosperity that Mr. Hanna's pious side partner meant when he went upon the road as an "advance agent"?

President McKinley's latest journalistic valet, William E. Curtis, now of the Chicago Record, but aforesaid of the Bureau of American republics, fills the position with characteristic industry and extraordinary loyalty. No bootblack could be more devoted.

Quoting President McKinley's plea for grabbing the Philippines, that he "sincerely believes that he can do nothing else in the circumstances, which are not of his making or within his control," the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, a republican paper, asks if there was ever "at a great crisis a more abject confession of weakness." But isn't it in his weakness that Mr. McKinley has always been strongest?

One of our plutocratic organs not long since railed at what it called the "cussed unanimity" of the Henry George men. There is indeed a union of sentiment among these men in gratifying contrast with the diversity of opinion that prevails among all other classes of social reformers. If

you meet a socialist, for instance, you can form no conception of his philosophy until you know to which of all the various schools of socialism he belongs; and even after you know that, you need not be astonished to discover in the course of argument that he does not hold strictly to the philosophy of his school. But with single tax men it is different. When you know the philosophy of one you know the philosophy of all. Though some may call themselves "limited" single tax men, and others "unlimited," there is no fundamental difference. The reason for this "cussed unanimity" is not that single tax men have committed a lesson to memory. It is because they are radical in the true sense. They have gone to the root of the subject. To vary the metaphor, they have got hold of the "clew" end of the yarn. This gives them an attitude toward the social question which enables them not only to see it right, but to see it alike. Their "cussed unanimity" is due to their "cussed rationality."

It is this "cussed rationality" that brings single tax men in conflict on the one side with what somebody has called the "political economy of gush," which holds that business should be altruistic in method, and on the other with the political economy of gouge, which confuses privilege with business and holds that both should be equally protected by law. The single tax man insists that no matter how complex society may be, everyone who works produces his own compensation by adding that much to the general wealth. He therefore holds that the labor problem resolves itself into the simple proposition of allowing everyone to keep what he earns, a proposition that can be put into practical operation by the simple method of abolishing privilege and leaving everybody free to make his own bargains in a condition of equal natural and social opportunity. That would be neither gush nor gouge.

One of the foreign correspondents tells of a lunatic who stepped into the

royal castle at Stuttgart, took possession of a vacant suite of rooms, bullied the servants and cut up mad antics generally. Yet it was not until he had had his way for nearly twenty-four hours, that the servants discovered he wasn't a royal personage. The incident suggests the kind of treatment that the servants of royal personages are accustomed to.

DEPARTMENT STORES.

In the city of Chicago and its suburbs, one of the burning issues of the late political campaign was the department store question. The great department stores of the city were denounced as giant monopolies, which had already driven thousands of small storekeepers out of business, and were steadily and surely concentrating in a few hands all the retail business of the community.

This indictment of department stores was supported by an enumeration of the vacant small stores of Chicago, made by one of the political parties, which revealed to an astonishing degree the havoc that department stores have caused in the business of small traders. Among small traders themselves, no enumeration of empty small stores was necessary to make an impression. That class had already felt the pinch. Some had felt it to the extent of being driven out of business, and all the rest had felt it in declining patronage and sinking profits. Probably every small retail dealer in Chicago, not even excepting liquor dealers, is painfully conscious of this pressure. The great body of that class, at any rate, dread further encroachments of the department stores.

Demands are urgent, therefore, among the small retailers of Chicago and their friends, for the obstruction, and if possible the suppression, of the business of department stores, by legislation. This was the sentiment that stirred up one of the political parties to adopting the question as an issue in the campaign. It is a sentiment that deserves candid and sympathetic consideration.

But to grasp this department store question, it is necessary first to understand what storekeeping is, especially the uses it serves. Before proceeding further, then, let us make that inquiry.

Evidently, storekeeping is not a primary occupation. If each man supplied all his own wants by the direct application of his own labor to his natural environment, he would have no use for a storekeeper. Storekeeping is one of the consequences of trading.

When men specialize their work, each making only part of the things he needs, trade is absolutely necessary. Thus, if one man, who wants food, clothing and shelter, devote himself wholly to food making, depending upon others for his clothing and shelter, the only way in which he can obtain clothing and shelter is by offering his surplus food for them in trade. Inasmuch, then, as in civilized countries all work is specialized, each man making only one—indeed, only a small part of one of the many things he wants, trade is necessarily a universal phenomenon of civilized life. We all live by trading.

But the natural conditions of trading do not permit each maker of one thing or part of one thing, to trade his product directly with the makers of the products he desires. This is prevented by a great number and wonderful variety of obstructions, not least effective among which is the impossibility of any one man's having a sufficiently extensive personal acquaintance. Various devices are therefore invented to facilitate trading, and among them is storekeeping.

The storekeeper makes a business of collecting at one point in a neighborhood, all the different kinds of things, wherever in the world they may be made, that are ordinarily required by the people of that neighborhood. He collects these things at that point, in the quantities and at the seasons that best enable him to accommodate local wants; and he trades them upon demand for the limited variety of things which the people of that neighborhood make. In form, he may take money instead of truck from his customers, leaving them to get the money by selling their truck elsewhere. This is the more usual method of the present time, though truck stores still survive. But form makes no difference. The essence of the matter is this, that the worldwide system of storekeeping enables the makers of particular things or parts of

particular things anywhere, to trade them everywhere for the things they want. It is a system, that is to say, which brings the whole civilized world together in trade. Such are the uses of storekeeping.

In the evolution of storekeeping, there has grown up, broadly speaking, two kinds of stores, the wholesale and the retail. Of each there are numerous grades, some of which assume distinctive names; but these are the two grand divisions of the business. Wholesale storekeeping consists in collecting for the accommodation of retailers, while retail storekeeping consists in collecting for the accommodation of consumers.

The compensation of storekeepers is estimated in what are called "profits." When a storekeeper has collected goods in his store for the accommodation of those who buy of him, he charges for the goods a higher price than he has paid for them. The difference is his "profit." But out of that profit he must pay all the expenses of his business, including compensation for his own work.

Further than this into the character of "profits" and the different grades of stores it is not necessary for the present purpose to go. But we shall find it helpful in apprehending the department store question to consider the principle that determines the distribution of retail stores over a country. To that point, therefore, let us for a moment turn our attention.

If we imagine a small community at some distance from a large trade center, a community without a store, we shall have no difficulty in understanding how the people there would do their trading. To some extent peddlers might serve them, but they would more or less often be obliged to go to the distant trade center for the purpose of selling products and buying supplies; for the purpose, that is, of trading the limited kinds of things which they had made, for the various things which the rest of the world had made and they wanted.

This journey, if infrequent, might be an excuse for a holiday. But if local needs made its frequent repetition necessary, it would become part of

the regular duty of each family; and so, instead of being a welcome excuse for a holiday, would be work. And not only would it be irksome work, but it would interfere with other work.

At that point, the natural desire for economy suggesting some improvement, it is easy to imagine that the different families might hire some one to make it his especial duty to "go to town" as a truckman for all the rest, delivering what they sent and buying what they ordered, they paying him wages. That is not an unusual arrangement in such circumstances. And it is an arrangement that could not continue long without the truckman's discovering, if he were bright, that by laying in a supply of staple articles, he might save himself an occasional trip to town. He could thus at times satisfy the requirements of his employers out of his own stock, which would fully serve them and yet enable him to economize his labor.

Furthermore, he might see the wisdom of proposing a modification of his arrangement. Instead of often driving back and forth to the distant town, carrying goods either way for wages as a hired man, he might offer to open a local store, where he would buy local products outright, and also keep on hand at all times a well selected supply of goods from which his neighbors could satisfy their wants. If he did this, he would be serving his neighbors in his capacity of storekeeper, precisely as he had served them before in his capacity of truckman. But they would now be better served, and he would get his pay no longer in wages but through the profit of buying in a cheaper and selling in a dearer market.

It is not to be understood that the foregoing example illustrates literally the origin of local stores. As a rule, stores are opened in new places not by direct evolution from trucking, but by men trained to storekeeping who believe that a store is needed and speculate upon their belief. The trucking example nevertheless illustrates the extension of storekeeping in principle. It directs attention to the fact, and this is a fact, that irrespective of the special circumstances that may lead to the opening of a store in

any particular place, the store is in principle an evolution from trucking. That is to say, the local storekeeper saves his neighbors the necessity of going or sending to a distant place to trade. Essentially he is their servant. They buy of him because it is more economical and satisfactory to allow him his profit than to do for themselves or through hired truckmen the work which he does for them.

It is for their accommodation, and not primarily for his own profit, that his store is there. Consequently, if another storekeeper undertakes to accommodate them just as well and they buy of him, the first storekeeper can offer no reasonable objection. His neighbors are not under any obligation to allow him a better income for doing their storekeeping, than some one else is willing to take for doing it.

The same principle would apply if some enterprising store in the distant city should offer to receive orders by mail and to deliver goods daily at lower prices than the local storekeeper demands. What objection could he urge to that, even if it drove him out of the storekeeping business? None. His store is a local convenience, nothing more; and when a greater local convenience supercedes it, it has no reason for being.

With the understanding then, that a storekeeper, in his capacity of storekeeper, is only a servant to his neighbors, and that when for any reason his service costs them more than equally good or better service can be had for, it is no longer a service but a burden—with that conception clear in our minds, let us advance from a consideration of the principle of storekeeping in general to the business of storekeeping in and about the region of department stores, and from imaginary to real conditions.

In Chicago and its suburbs a vast number of retail stores have sprung up and flourished. The particular circumstances of their origin are immaterial. They came because their projectors believed that the people in their respective localities needed them, and they flourished because they enabled those people to satisfy their store wants economically—more economically than in any other way.

But now come the department stores. These keep in store all kinds of goods, from testaments to playing cards, from soda water to whisky, from a paper of pins to a bicycle, a piano or a set of furniture. Almost anything you want you can get here, in any quantity, and at prices which are not only lower than ordinary retail prices, but lower than ordinary retailers themselves can buy the same goods for of the manufacturers. Inevitably the department store must be prejudicial to all ordinary retailers, and destructive to the business of many.

It is not remarkable, therefore, in these days when business is clamoring wildly for congressional and legislative protection, that the retailers of Chicago and vicinity should put forth a plea for protection by legislation from the encroachments of department stores.

But is legislative protection possible? Reflection should satisfy anyone of the contrary.

It is not the department stores, but retail buyers that are closing the small stores. All that the department stores do is to offer goods at low prices. Buyers do the rest. If department stores are really, all things considered, more economical and otherwise satisfactory than the small retail stores, the people will keep on buying of them; and no law that either is or ought to be constitutional can stop it. If they are really economical it would be as futile to attempt to legislate against department stores in the interest of small stores, as to legislate against railroads in the interest of canal boats or stage lines, against electric cars in the interest of hack drivers, against steamships in the interest of sail vessels, or against labor saving machinery in the interest of trade unions. The economical instinct is too potent a force for any legislation long to resist.

On the other hand, if department stores are not more economical than small stores, no legislation is necessary. They may last a little while as a fad; but unless they really do economical service for consumers, consumers will soon forsake them.

The question is wholly one of econ-

omy; wholly a question of labor saving. It is another form of the question of labor saving machinery. What small storekeepers now complain of is the same thing in essence that printers complained of when the type setting machine displaced 75 per cent. of their number. The cry of pain which the small storekeeper emits merely shows that the labor problem is now pinching him for a solution, and that the problem is by no means so funny nor its solution so simple as he thought when it only pinched "workingmen." Being a question of economy, like all other phases of the labor question this department store question must be settled not by legislative restrictions upon the economical instinct, but by giving to that instinct free play.

Not alone is it true that legislation cannot suppress department stores if they are a genuine advance in the direction of economy, but it is also true that legislation ought not to be used for that purpose if it could be effective. Such legislation would be in essence legislation against buyers, to prevent their economizing. That is a purpose for which legislation cannot be rightfully used. It would be legislation for the purpose of forcing the community to support men in a business which has ceased to be serviceable. And that is a purpose for which legislation cannot be rightfully used. No man, no class, has the moral right to invoke the lawmaking power to maintain them in a business which the people when left to themselves refuse to support. The lawmaking power that responds to such a call prostitutes its functions.

Would we, then, see men thrown out of all employment by the encroachments of economizing improvements? By no means. We would labor and plead, on the contrary, for a complete emancipation of the opportunities for employment, so that no one could possibly be idle against his own will.

There is no limit to the work that men want done. No machinery can lessen it, no possible extension of the department store system can lower the demand. The cheaper we get things the more things we want and

the more work we therefore require. Demand for work is always in excess of the supply.

If this demand were free to express itself, new machines would mean more work instead of less, and department stores would put greater life into trade instead of stagnating it. But the demand for work is held in check by monopoly of opportunities for work—monopoly created and maintained by law.

While this exists, every new labor saving machine threatens the livelihood of great masses of workingmen; and every extension of economies in trade, by means of department stores or other forms of concentration, becomes a growing menace to the business of small storekeepers. But if legalized monopoly were abolished, all economizing processes would be blessings alike to consumers and producers, to buyers and sellers.

The department store problem, like the labor problem, is at bottom only a phase of the problem of monopoly. It is to be solved not by further protective legislation, but by legislation destructive of the legislation upon which monopoly rests. When that truth once takes possession of men who feel the pinch of social conditions, and of those who sympathize with them, a new light will dawn. Then competition will be recognized as cooperation, and fostered until it is wholly free; then everything that saves labor will be welcomed by everyone who lives by labor.

NEWS

Elections were held in the United States on the 8th, in 42 states. In most of these, state officers as well as congressmen were voted for; but in some the contest was for congressmen only.

Of course the important vote throughout the country was the vote for congressmen, because upon that hinged the question of endorsement or condemnation of President McKinley's administration. It also involved in greater or less degree the financial issue of 1896. From the best reports at the present writing the following about indicates the complexion of the next congress:

SENATE.

Republicans	53
Democrats	27
Other parties.....	10
Total.....	90

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Republicans	185
Democrats	160
Other parties and doubtful.....	12
Total.....	357

In the present congress the republicans have 46 senators and 202 representatives. They therefore gain 7 in the senate and lose about 17 in the house. Their majority in the house will be from 13 to 18.

Among the defeated members of the present congress are Lewis, of Washington, and Jerry Simpson, of Kansas. Barry, editor of the San Francisco Star, who was nominated by the democrats in Maguire's district, was also defeated. But John J. Lentz, of the Twelfth Ohio district, whose former majority was about 100, and whose defeat was especially sought by Senator Hanna, has been reelected by almost 800 majority.

The general vote in the states indicates that they have taken on the political complexion attributed to them in the following table:

REPUBLICAN STATES.

California.	New Hampshire.
Connecticut.	New Jersey.
Delaware.	New York.
Illinois.	North Dakota.
Indiana.	Ohio.
Iowa.	Pennsylvania.
Kansas.	Rhode Island.
Massachusetts.	Wyoming.
Michigan.	Washington.
Maryland.	Wisconsin.
Nebraska.	

DEMOCRATIC STATES.

Alabama.	Montana.
Arkansas.	North Carolina.
Florida.	South Carolina.
Georgia.	Tennessee.
Kentucky.	Texas.
Louisiana.	Utah.
Minnesota.	Virginia.
Mississippi.	West Virginia.
Missouri.	

FUSION STATES.

Colorado.	South Dakota.
Idaho.	Nevada.

From the foregoing table it appears that there is a change of political complexion, as compared with two years ago, in several states. Minnesota changes from republican to democratic; Nebraska, from fusion to republican; Washington, from

fusion to republican; West Virginia, from republican to democratic, and Wyoming from fusion to republican.

But with the exception of Kansas, Nebraska, Washington and Wyoming, the changes in the political complexion of the states are only nominal.

In Minnesota, which gave a republican majority of 60,000 at the gubernatorial election of 1894, and one of 53,000 at the presidential election of 1896, John Lind, the democratic candidate for governor, is elected by 5,000. But the significance of this reversal is modified by the fact that the republicans have elected the rest of their ticket.

West Virginia can be said to have reversed her position only because of changes in the congressional delegation. All the members of congress from West Virginia are now republicans; but among the members elected on the 8th two or more are democrats.

But in Nebraska, Kansas, Washington and Wyoming the reversals are upon their face substantial republican victories. All those states were carried for Bryan in 1896, and they have now been carried by the republicans. It is impossible, however, to make a fair generalized comparison of the recent elections with the national election of 1896. No valid inferences as to the drift of public sentiment can be drawn from any comparison which does not consider the vote in detail, and the vote in detail of the recent election is not yet available.

Aside from the interest in congressional results, and in possible indications of drifts of popular opinion, there were no elections of national interest except in five states—New York, California, Washington, Idaho and Michigan.

In New York, Col. Roosevelt, of "rough rider" fame, was the republican candidate for governor against Judge Van Wyck, brother of the mayor of Greater New York. Judge Van Wyck was regarded as the candidate of Tammany hall. Roosevelt has been elected by a plurality of about 20,000. Gov. Black, also a republican, whom Roosevelt is to succeed, was elected in 1896 by nearly 213,000.

The campaign in California was pe-

culiar. Congressman James G. Maguire having been nominated for governor by a fusion of democrats, populists and silver republicans, challenged the republicans to meet the issue of the domination of California by the Southern Pacific railroad ring. But the republicans, who nominated Henry T. Gage, refused that challenge, and attacked Maguire as a single tax man. To this attack Maguire refused to respond, insisting that the single tax was not and could not be an issue in the campaign, and that the railroad question was. Consequently the fusionists, with Maguire as their candidate, made their campaign against the railroad monopoly, ignoring the single tax; while the republicans made their campaign against the single tax, ignoring the railroad question. Gage, the republican, was elected, defeating Maguire by a plurality which cannot yet be estimated.

Washington had a campaign which was not unlike that in California, as to the single tax question. At the session of the legislature in the winter of 1897, by a non-partisan vote, an amendment to the constitution was ordered to be submitted to the people. This amendment had reference to the question of taxation. It required the taxation of all property at its value in money, provided, among other things, that it should be—

optional with each municipal corporation in the state to fix and determine by majority vote of the qualified electors voting thereon, the class or classes of property upon which taxes for municipal purposes shall be levied, which tax shall be uniform as to persons and class.

This proviso was intended, as will be observed, to enable every locality to decide for itself, by popular vote, as to the kind of property that should bear the burdens of taxation. It was a provision for what is known in most states as "local option in taxation," and undoubtedly had for its ultimate purpose the adoption in localities of the single tax as a local fiscal system. When the populists, democrats and silver republicans came together in fusion this fall, they approved this proposed amendment in their platform. The republicans thereupon raised the single tax issue. As in California, so in Washington, the fusionists refused to contest the issue, and in consequence, in Washington as in California, the merits of the question were discussed only on the opposition side. Attacks upon the single tax

went unanswered, and arguments in its defense were withheld. At the election, the proposed amendment was defeated and the republican ticket elected.

Another issue in Washington lends national interest to the election there. This was over a proposed amendment to the constitution, providing that "the elective franchise shall never be denied to any person on account of sex." That amendment, also, was defeated by a majority not yet reported.

While Washington defeats woman suffrage, Idaho ushers in its adoption. For the first time, the women of Idaho voted on the 8th for state officers and congressmen. Though the reports from Idaho are delayed, it is known that the women very generally voted and that they ignored party lines, casting their votes for the best man. There were none of the usual shooting and stabbing disturbances and general riotous behavior about the polls, an improvement which is attributed to the presence of women, who were at the voting places in great numbers taking the liveliest interest in the proceedings.

Gov. Pingree makes the Michigan election especially interesting. In 1896, Mr. Pingree was elected by a plurality of 83,000, running 26,000 ahead of President McKinley. This was due to the pronounced stand he had taken against some of the monopolistic tendencies of his own party. Having been still more pronounced in this respect since his election in 1896, a large and financially powerful element opposed his reelection. But Pingree has been reelected triumphantly. His plurality is about 65,000, or 12,000 more than McKinley received two years ago.

For the first time in its history, the socialist-labor party has scored a victory in a legislative election. It has elected two members of the Massachusetts legislature, both from Haverhill. One of these successful socialist candidates is James F. Carey, who has been president of the common council for a year. The other is Louis M. Scates. Scates carried the strongest republican district in the state, while Carey won by a clear majority of 357 over three other candidates.

The expected race conflict in North Carolina did not occur on election day. This was because the negroes, in fear of slaughter, submitted to dis-

franchisement. The result is that 15 coast counties where the republicans and populists together are largely in the majority, have been carried by the democrats.

An incident of the election at Rochester, N. Y., is of universal interest and exceptional importance. All the voting in 73 election districts was done by means of a voting machine, which worked without a hitch, and enabled the officials to deliver at headquarters a complete report of the entire vote of the city within forty minutes after the closing of the polls. These machines were so simple that they were easily understood by every voter. They were used without difficulty even by the blind. There was no delay in voting. Complicated split ballots were voted within a minute.

Apart from the American elections the important occurrences of the week have been few. The only decisive event on either side of the water is the resignation of the Greek cabinet, which took place on the 7th. This cabinet was formed October 3, 1897, by M. Zaimis, as president of the council and minister of foreign affairs. It succeeded the Ralli ministry, which came in at the close of the war with Turkey, and was almost immediately obliged to resign upon a vote of want of confidence. In the disturbed condition of the time M. Zaimis undertook the formation of the cabinet which has just resigned. The reason given by the ministers for their resignation is that the exceptional circumstances under which they assumed office in 1897 no longer exist. M. Zaimis has been requested by the king to form another cabinet.

The new ministry of France made its declaration of policy before the chamber of deputies on the 4th, at the first meeting of that body after the fall of the Brisson ministry, of which we told two weeks ago. The declaration was read by the new premier, M. Dupuy. It was vague as to specific questions, but declared the intention of this ministry to rely upon a purely republican majority, and was approved by a vote of 429 to 64.

No marked progress appears to have been made by the Spanish-American peace commission at Paris. It was reported on the 4th that the Spanish commissioners, at the joint session of that day, had formally replied to the

American proposition, which we noted last week, for the cession of the whole Philippine archipelago upon the assumption by the United States of the debt incurred by Spain for useful purposes in the island. They declined. Another joint session was to have been held on the 8th, but at the request of the American commissioners it was adjourned until the 9th, when the American reply to the Spanish refusal to cede the Philippines was presented, and a further adjournment was taken until the 12th.

NEWS NOTES.

—David A. Wells, the economist, died at Norwich, Conn., on the 5th, aged 70 years.

—President McKinley voted at Canton on the 8th, and Col. Bryan voted at Lincoln.

—Russia is planning a ship canal from Riga, on the Baltic, to Kherson, on the Black sea.

—The Literary Digest says that the Turkish government has forbidden the migration of Jews into Palestine.

—The emperor of Germany left Jaffa for Beyrout on the 4th, arriving at Beyrout on the 6th and at Damascus on the 7th.

—In the football game at Cambridge on the 5th, between Harvard and Pennsylvania, Harvard scored 10 and Pennsylvania 0.

—The Joint Traffic association of the great trunk lines, recently declared by the supreme court to be an unlawful conspiracy, formally dissolved on the 4th.

—The press report of last week that the transport Panama had sunk off Cape Maysi, with sick soldiers on board, was contradicted after last week's Public went to press.

—A gas explosion in the chamber of the supreme court at the capitol in Washington on the 6th produced a fire which caused damage to the amount of \$20,000, besides destroying valuable historic papers.

—At the election in Texas a constitutional amendment was carried which authorizes the pensioning by the state at eight dollars a month of all ex-confederate soldiers who were settled in Texas prior to 1880.

—The Yellow or Hoangho river has left its bed near the city of Tsi Nan Fu, capital of Shantung province, and flooded 2,000 square miles of territory, causing the destruction of hundreds of villages and bringing suffering to a million people.

—A stereotypers' and pressmen's strike in San Francisco was defeated this week. All the newspapers acted as a unit under the government of a

publishers' association, formed upon the same plan as that of Chicago.

—Gen. Miles has made an elaborate and exhaustive report of the operations of the army from the beginning of the Spanish war, which he has filed with the war department. It is hinted from Washington that some parts of the report may be suppressed by the department.

—William Dean Howells, Bolton Hall, Ernest H. Crosby and Isaac N. Seligman, of New York; Jane Addams, of Chicago; William Lloyd Garrison, of Boston; Rev. George D. Boardman, of Philadelphia, and N. O. Nelson, of St. Louis, are assisting Tolstoi in locating in this country a Russian sect known as Dhoukhoborsti, or spirit wrestlers. This sect, founded in 1750, has suffered Russian persecution for 100 years.

—Prof. George D. Herron's noonday lecture at Willard Hall, Chicago, on the 7th was upon the subject of "Public Resources and Spiritual Liberty." He declared that the common ownership of the earth is the only ground upon which true prosperity and liberty can be built, the only soil in which individuality may take root. Prof. Herron's next lecture at the same place at noon on the 14th will be "Christian Doctrine and Private Property."

MISCELLANY

NERO-THEN.

(After Kipling's "Truce of the Bear.")
For The Public.

Yearly, with plow and oxen, the weary toilers go
By the pass called Rentomiland, to till in the fields below.
Yearly, at Rentomiland, he sits as the tollers pass—
Godzerth, the palsied outcast, weaving his mats of grass.
Bent with his years of labor, slow with his weight of speech,
Begging a word with the toilers, whispering low to each,
Over and over the story—beckoning near with his hand—
"Pay ye no tribute to Nero-now for tilling the Lord's free land!
"Here, shut out on the mountain, I gather this withered grass,
Offer these mats at a penny to toilers as they pass.
Giving a word for a warning, telling a tale of the lie
That shadows your lives in the living and blackens them ere you die.
"I, at a great commandment—'twas many years ago—
Went to the valley of Plenty—went where you now go;
And Nero-then in the causeway, cried:
"Tribute! the pass is mine."
I paid and went to my labor, he took and turned to his wine.
"Then was this pass called Bondage—in the time when I went through—
And the tribute paid was service—the whole that man could do.

And Nero-then, the master, was as cruel,
heavy, and strong
As Nero-now is dainty, with his blighting,
blasting wrong.

"I knew the times and seasons—the moods
of earth and sky.
I felt the strong arm's swelling, the strong
soul's lust to try.

My heart held joy for women, my hands
held peace for men—
But I stopped and paid all tribute to the
hands of Nero-then.

"I knew naught of his cunning—I know it
now, and fear!—
For I gave him hopes for heartaches, gave
laughter for a tear!
I tolled in the days of children, I tolled in
the secret night;
But Nero-then took nearly all, in his scorn-
ing, sneering might.

"He came when the greed-flash burned
him—came and took what he saw,
Carried it off to his castle—his passion his
only law.

He lived like a grim old robber, deep in a
rock-walled den—
Oh! Nero-now is an unlike man to the hor-
rible Nero-then!

"I tolled till the girls were women, I tolled
till the boys were men;
Then gathered we there and drove him
out—drove Nero from his den—
Cursing, crying, howling, maddened with
anger and wine,
He fought till the night was falling, but
Nero-then was mine!

"Splashed with the blood of the combat,
cold as the mountain stones,
His head we took for a trophy. We scat-
tered his broken bones.
Back we went to the valley—back to the
valley with glee,
And Godzerth then was happy, for then
Godzerth was free!

"But a year—and there came a stranger,
who spoke with a smile and bow—
Manzerth, the pleasing talker—Manzerth,
your Nero-now!
He praised the eyes of women, he stole the
children's hearts;
And they cast me here on the rockland—
here where the mountain parts.

"You pay now at the portal—at Manzerth's
smiling gate.
You give?—God's mercy to you! You get?—
You wait and wait!
You leave your goods at the Rent-house,
you leave your strength in the field;
Leave hope ere the harvests' ending, leave
love as your hearts grow steeled.

"You shudder at all my story, you dread as
you pass me by,
But I give you word of a warning—word
of the Nero lie—
He of the rock-walled castle, or he of the
smiling gate—
He takes your goods and pleasures. He
gives?—You wait and wait!"

Bent with his years of labor, slow with his
weight of speech,
Begging a word or a bargain, begging a
time to teach—
Godzerth, the palsied outcast, weaving his
mats of grass,
Begg a word with the toilers—begs it as
they pass!

There in the golden morning, there in the
heat of day,
There in the cool of evening, he tells the
only way.

He tells it o'er and o'er—beckoning with his
hand—
"Pay ye no tribute to Nero-now for tilling
the Lord's free land!"
E. J. SALISBURY.

WHO OWNS THE CHICAGO LAKE SHORE?

Lincoln Park Commissioner Dunton's
proposal to do away altogether with
the sea wall, which tumbles down dur-
ing every storm, is viewed differently
by different persons. An unanswer-
able objection to the paved beach which
Mr. Dunton would substitute for the
sea wall is, however, presented by a
prominent and wealthy resident of the
Lake Shore drive. "The change," says
this gentleman, "would destroy the
character of the drive; the beach would
attract loungers and thus become un-
sightly." Clearly, therefore, the sea
wall must remain, even though it has
to be rebuilt every two weeks. For it
is obvious that to make the Lake Shore
drive a resort for the lower classes,
with their lunch baskets and baby car-
riages and other plebeian parapherna-
lia, would be an innovation which would
threaten the stability of our social fab-
ric. The growing tendency of the
masses to disregard the comfort and
privileges of the better classes is one
of the most alarming developments of
the end of the century, and Mr. Dun-
ton's plan would foster this tendency.
Let the working people and the lower
orders generally be content with their
present privileges, according to their
social superiors the respect and defer-
ence due to high birth and exalted sta-
tion. Let us hear no more of Mr. Dun-
ton's anarchistic proposition to turn
the Lake Shore drive into a mere loung-
ing place for the proletariat.—Chicago
Chronicle.

THE LAND QUESTION IS AT THE BOTTOM OF THE TROUBLES IN JAMAICA.

For the last two or three weeks the
attention of the outside world has been
especially directed to this island by the
condition of incipient rebellion said to
have been reached by the so-called Ma-
roon tribesmen, who inhabit the moun-
tain fastnesses of the eastern and west-
ern ends of the island.

The recent trouble is the old land
question, raised to an acute crisis by
the deplorable industrial condition of
the island. Owing to the success of Eu-
ropean beet sugar in killing the West
Indian cane sugar industry, nearly all
the sugar estates have been abandoned.
Fruit culture has been substituted to
a large extent, but this cannot support
a teeming population of 700,000, as the
sugar industry did. The result is that

the island is overrun by thousands of
unemployed and for the most part
starving negro laborers.

The land is being held by landlords
and cannot be gotten by the working
people. The peasant proprietary form
a comparatively small class of the popu-
lation. Many landlords will neither
sell nor rent their lands. Those who
agree to do so impose the condition
that bananas are not to be cultivated,
as their cultivation might glut the mar-
ket, where the landlords now enjoy a
monopoly.

It is inevitable that such a condition
of affairs should create widespread
popular dissatisfaction. The landlords
are held immediately responsible, the
government remotely so.—Asso. Press
Correspondence, from Kingston, Ja-
maica, Oct. 18.

IN VIOLATION OF THE DEMOCRAT- IC PRINCIPLE.

The identity of the governing and the
governed is of the very essence of the
democratic principle. Let this iden-
tity be broken up in any part
of the state, let a differentiation
take place between the class that
governs and another class that is
governed, without having completely
the right to determine how it shall be
governed, and the same differentiation
will tend to spread to other parts of the
state and become more and more gen-
eral. Plainly, if we accustom ourselves
to see millions of persons who live with-
in the territories which belong to the
United States excluded from the rights
of citizenship on the ground that they
are not fitted to exercise them, the
question will presently be raised—in-
deed, here and there it has already been
raised—whether on the same ground
millions of persons now exercising the
franchise within the limits of the
United States ought not to be deprived
of their rights. That universal suffrage
is the indispensable safeguard of lib-
erty; that no class, however well inten-
tioned, can be trusted to legislate for
another; that even the so-called lower
classes know where the shoe pinches
them better than their superiors in
education can know it for them—these
elementary truths will then tend to fall
into oblivion, and a habit of mind will
be generated consistently with which
democratic institutions cannot live.
The masses of the people and all citi-
zens who have not yet lost their faith
in the capacity of the masses to become
politically regenerate have every rea-
son to oppose with the utmost earnest-
ness the proposed policy of imperi-
alism. It is anti-democratic, as its very
name implies.—Dr. Felix Adler, in The
International Journal of Ethics.

THE WAR DEPARTMENT DID NOT SUCCUMB TO THE IMPOSSIBLE.

The Red Cross furnished food in bulk to 32,000 half-starved people in the first five days after Santiago surrendered, and in addition thereto fed 10,000 people every day in the soup kitchens managed by Mr. Michelson. I do not wish to make any unjust or invidious comparisons, but I cannot refrain from saying, nevertheless, that I did not happen to see any United States quartermaster in Cuba who, in the short space of five days, had unloaded and stored 1,400 tons of cargo, given hot soup daily to 10,000 soldiers and supplied an army of 32,000 men with ten days' rations. It is a record, I think, of which Miss Barton has every reason to be proud. But her work was not confined to the mere feeding of the hungry in Santiago. She sent large quantities of cereals, canned goods and hospital supplies to our own soldiers in the camps on the adjacent hills; she furnished medicines and food for sick and wounded to the Spanish prison camp as well as to the Spanish army hospitals, the civil hospital and the children's hospital in the city; she directed Dr. Soyoso, of her medical staff, to open a clinic and dispensary, where five surgeons and two nurses gave medical or surgical aid to more than 3,000 sick or sickening people every day; she sent hundreds of tons of ice from the schooner Morse to the hospitals, the camps and the transports going north with sick and wounded soldiers; she put up tents to shelter fever-stricken Spanish prisoners from the tropical sunshine while they were waiting to be taken on board the vessels that were to carry them back to Spain; and in every way possible and with all the facilities she had she tried to alleviate the suffering caused by neglect, incompetence, famine and war.—George Kennan, in *The Outlook*.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS.

It is the business of a private company to make gas for the sake of making private profit for the owners; it is the business of a publicly owned company to make gas without profit for the benefit of all the people. That is the proposition that is before us as regards the gas plant, reduced to its simplest terms. This property may be made an incalculable blessing to our people if we take hold of it with a truly patriotic spirit.

To say that we are unable to deal with a proposition of this kind is to confess the failure of the institution that we call government; to urge that

the city is unable to employ men of such ability as a private corporation can find, is belied by our experience in the management of such institutions as are now publicly owned. I refer to our public schools, our public library, our parks, our city waterworks, our police department, our city fire department, our city streets—all of these are publicly owned, and the popular argument that a certain property can be managed cheaper by a private corporation than by the city is as applicable to any one of these as it is to the city natural gas department. Private contractors can be found without limit who will promise to educate our children, provide us with literature in the public library, operate the city waterworks, put out our fires, take care of the streets as they now do the work of improving them under the system of private contract, and they will agree to do all this cheaper than we ourselves are now doing it; and I think that it is as reasonable to urge that any one or all of these functions be turned over to some individual or private corporation to be operated for private profit, as I would think of turning over for such purpose the natural gas department.—Hon. S. M. Jones, Mayor of Toledo, O., in his annual message to the Council, Oct. 24.

HIS DREAM OF EMPIRE.

The scandalous attitude of the United States in relation to the fate of the Philippines is no surprise to The Democrat. From the very first it has pointed out the essentially vicious tendencies of the administration in every phase of the trouble with Spain, and there has never been a doubt in our mind that greed and jobbery would prevail. The question of justice, of national honor, of broad humanity, of international morals, is not considered. Imperialism is the administration watchword and in the pursuit of imperial dominion for private gain the trust president and his monopoly advisers coolly ignore national traditions and roughly trample in the dust those high principles of freedom which are the foundation stones of the republic as they have been the pride and boast of more than a century of American citizenship.

Possibly the secret history of this most disgraceful episode in an affair that has cast little of the halo of glory over an administration that from the beginning has played a sinister part in an international drama of surpassing interest may never be divulged; but one incident of the sudden disappearance from the markets of Europe of

\$40,000,000 of Spanish bonds just before the facts in the Philippine deal were permitted to leak out may account for much that would otherwise be inexplicable. Those bonds have doubtless come into the hands of thrifty investors who were given an advance tip on the action of Maj. McKinley's peace commissioners, and it may be supposed that some of the profits of the speculation will be turned to good account in the campaign which Mark Hanna will inaugurate for Maj. McKinley after next Tuesday.

What the plain people of the United States will say to this monstrous breach of good faith and of international morals we have no means of knowing. But surely they will not complacently accept a disposition of this great matter that at once humiliates the republic and saddles upon it the responsibility of a vast territory on the other side of the globe and a population alien in all essentials of politics, religion, industry and modes of life and thought. For in this unjustifiable grab for Spanish territory we are not alone breaking faith with ourselves and with the nations; we are not alone borrowing no one can ever imagine how much and how serious trouble; we are not alone prostituting a war for humanity to the predatory ambitions of American syndicates and promoters; but we are betraying a brave people who have been bravely struggling for the same freedom that our fathers fought for against the tyranny of George of England; we are betraying our own principles; we are prostituting our own consciences and our own fame; and we are laying up wrath against the day of wrath which our children's children may have to face as the penalty of McKinley's dream of empire.—Editorial in *Daily Democrat*, of Johnstown, Pa.

THE SCENERY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

In British Columbia the Columbia river takes its rise, and flows through lakes and between mountains until it empties into the Pacific near Astoria. No other river in the United States or Europe offers such grand scenery as the Columbia. Beside it the Hudson and the Rhine are tame. But the glory of the Columbia is eclipsed by the Frazer, which is all within the limits of British Columbia, and which, while it is neither so large nor so long, pursues its devious course through gorges and between mountains which make its scenery probably the grandest of any river in Europe or America. These are two of the chief rivers of the province;

others almost worthy to be ranked with them are the Skeena, the Stikeen, the Liard and the Peace. . . .

Those who have crossed the continent by the Canadian Pacific railway have had a glimpse of its mountains, lakes and rivers. I am quite familiar with what may be seen from railways in Europe, America and Japan; but nothing that I have elsewhere found compares for grandeur with what is passed as the train moves through the Rocky mountains and the Selkirks. The regions around Glacier, Laggan, Banff, and especially Mount Stephen, seem to me to surpass even the Alps at Zermatt—and language can go no further. But this is only the culmination of glorious scenery which is approached, if not reached, in many other places. Vancouver's Island, for instance, near its northern limits, is Alpine in its ruggedness, and the mountains rise abruptly from the sea. The coast from the southern end of Vancouver's Island to Alaska is as wonderful as Norway—the fiords are as deep, the coast-line as picturesque, and the mountains higher. If one is in search of sublime scenery, he may find a surfeit of it in British Columbia. . . .

There is comfortable room for about 3,000,000 people on the arable land of the Province, but the estimated population is only about 100,000, of which probably about 55,000 are white, 35,000 Indians, and the remainder chiefly Chinese. The only towns of any importance are Victoria, the capital, Vancouver, and New Westminster. The type of life and the appearance of the people are essentially English, but English tinged by American. . . .

Victoria is relatively an old town, and Vancouver a new one. The former is more a place of residence, and the latter of business. The government buildings in Victoria would be an ornament to any city in Europe, while the location of the city surpasses even Naples. From its park one looks across the Straits of Fuca to Puget Sound; on the right the Olympic mountains, tipped with snow, rise in endless forms of beauty and grandeur; to the left Mount Baker lifts his majestic peak, with at least eight and perhaps ten thousand feet of perpetual snow; around this giant are lesser peaks, while, if the day is clear, directly over the middle of Puget Sound dimly looms the form of Mount Tacoma (or Rainier), the highest of all the mountains of the coast until Mount St. Elias, in Alaska, is reached.—Dr. Amory H. Bradford, in *The Outlook*.

Democracy means not "I am as good as you are," but "You are as good as I am."—Theodore Parker.

THE NAME "SINGLE TAX."

There has been considerable discussion as to the appropriateness of the name single tax, as applied to the reform advocated by Henry George. Some complain that it does not express the inner purpose and higher motive of the reform. So far as I have observed the manner, or principle, if it may be so called, in which names are usually given, I think the name single tax fills all the requirements that should be expected in a name. Before proceeding to analyze these requirements I will prepare the way by an illustration. Every action has within it a method and a purpose, but it is called and named not from the method and purpose, but from the action itself.

There is a machine which has quite an extensive use in this country, and this machine is used for a purpose, namely, the promotion of commerce. It is not, however, known by the name of commerce-promoter. It is also used in accordance with a method, since the method by which commerce is to be promoted is by deepening channels. Yet this machine is not known by the name of channel-deepener. It is not named in a way to express its purposes or its methods. It is named from its action. It digs mud, and therefore it is properly and suitably called a mud-digger. When it digs the mud it deepens the channel and promotes the commerce, and if it does not dig the mud the methods and purposes are but empty dreams. The final and outermost and most evident action includes all, and is the effective accomplishment of the end desired. Therefore the outside, and not the inside, gives the name.

Mr. George states the purpose of his reform in book vi., chapter 2, of *Progress and Poverty* thus: "We must make land common property." But the name by which the movement should be known is not that of an association for making land common property, since such a name is so broad and general that hardly two persons would have the same understanding of what is meant by it.

Mr. George further defines his meaning by stating in the same work, book viii., chapter 2, the method, as that of confiscating rent. But who thinks it suitable to call the representatives or advocates of this reform by the name of confiscators of rent? This name would be more misunderstood even than the other.

But when Mr. George proceeds to state that he proposes to appropriate rent by taxation, it is then seen to be a clearly defined action, which all

can understand. It is a method of collecting revenue for public uses, and it is understood by all that when they pay money for public uses they pay a tax. The purpose of our reform is to collect this tax in a different way, that is, to put on the assessment roll the land values only and omit all other valuations. When we can do this we can perform the effective action which will include all. It will carry out the method and accomplish the purpose, and until we can do this, all plans are but dreams. The word single makes the distinction clear between our plan of collecting revenue and the one now in use. Not the purpose but action, not the inside but the outside, gives the name. The name single tax, in my judgment, answers to all the requirements of a name. It is descriptive, discriminative, inclusive. If we were to study from now till doomsday we could not find a better.—J. H. Wells, in *The New Earth*.

MR. DOOLEY ON THE FRENCH CHARACTER.

"Th' Fr-rinch," said Mr. Dooley, "ar-re a tumulchuse people."

"Like as not," said Mr. Hennessy, "there's some iv our blood in thim. A good manny iv our people wint over wanst. They cudden't all've been kilt at Fontenoy."

"No," said Mr. Dooley, "'tis another kind iv tumulchuse. Whin an Irishman rages 'tis with wan idee in his mind. He's goin' for'ard again a single inimy, an' not stone walls or irne chains'll stop him. He may pause f'r a dhrink or to shy at a polisman—f'r a polisman's always in th' way—but he's as thrue as th' camel's eye, as Hogan says, to th' objec' iv has hathred. So he's been f'r four hundred years, an' so he'll always be while they'se an England on th' map. Whin England purrishes th' Irish'll die iv what Hogan calls ongwee, which is havin' no wan in the weary wurruld ye don't love. . . .

"'Tis unforch'nit but 'tis thrue. Th' Fr-rinch ar-re not steady ayether in their politics or their morals. That's where they get done be th' hated British. Th' diff'rence in furrin politics is the diff'rence between a second-raté safe blower an' a first-class boonco steerer. Th' Fr-rinch buy a ton iv dynymite, spind five years in dhrillin' a hole through a steel dure, blow open th' safe, lose a leg or an ar-rm, an' get away with th' li'abilities iv th' firm. Th' English dhress up f'r a Methodist preacher, stick a piece iv lead pipe in th' tails iv their coat in case iv emargency an' get all th' money there is in th' line.

"In th' fr-ront dure comes th' Englishman with a coon king or ayether ar-rm that's jus' loaned him their kingdoms on a prom'ssory note, an' discovers th' Fr-rinchman emargin' frim th' rooms iv th' safe. 'What ar-re ye doin' here?' says th' Englishman. 'Robin' th' naygurs,' says th' Fr-rinchman, bein' thruthful as well as polite. 'Wicked man,' says th' Englishman. 'What ar-re ye doin' here?' says the Fr-rinchman. 'Improv'in' the morals iv th' inhabitants,' says th' Englishman. 'Is it not so, Rastus?' he says. 'It is,' says wan iv th' kings. 'I'm a poorer but a betther man since ye came,' he says. 'Yes,' says th' Englishman, 'I pro-pose fr to thruly rayform this onhappy country,' he says. 'This benighted haythen on me exthreme left has been injooed to cut out a good dale iv his wife's business,' he says, 'an' go through life torminted be on'y wan spouse,' he says. 'All crap games bein' particular ongodly'll be undher th' con-throl iv th' governmint, which,' he says, 'is me. Policy shops'll be r-run carefully, an' I've appinted Rastus here Writer-in-Waitin' to Her Majesty,' he says. 'Th' r-rum they dhrink is these par-rts,' he says, 'is fearful,' he says. 'What shall we do to stop th' ac-cursed thraffic? 'Sell thim gin,' says I. 'Tis shameful they shud go out with nawthin' to hide their nakedness,' he says. 'I'll fetch thim clothes, but,' he says, 'as th' weather's too warrum fr clothes, I'll not sell thim annything that'll last long,' he says. 'If it wasn't fr religion,' he says, 'I don't know what th' 'ell th' wur-ruld wud come to,' he says. 'Whose religion?' says th' Fr-rinchman. 'My religion,' says th' Englishman. 'These pore, benighted savidges,' he says, 'll not be left to ye're odjious morals an' ye'er hootchy-kootchy school iv thought,' he says, 'but,' he says, 'undher th' binif'cent r-rule iv a wise an' th'ue governmint,' he says, 'll be thurly prepared fr Hivin,' he says, 'whin their time comes to go,' he says, 'which I thrust will not be long,' he says. 'So, I'll thank ye to be off,' he says, 'or I'll take th' thick end iv th' slungshot to ye,' he says.

"Th' Fr-rinchman is a br-rave man, an' he'd stay an' have it out on th' flure, but some wan calls: 'A base th' Chinnyman, an' an' off he goes on another thrack. An' whin he gets to th' Chinnymen he finds th' English 've abased thim already. An' so he dances fr'm wan par-rt iv th' wurruld to another like a riochous an' happy flea, an' divvle th' bit iv progress he makes, on'y thrubble fr others an' a merry life fr himsilf.'"—Chicago Journal.

BISHOP POTTER ON EXPANSION.

When we had reduced Spain to the point where it was inevitable that she must surrender her hold upon Cuba, Porto Rico, and possibly the Philippines, there was for a moment a curious consensus of opinion that, whatever disavowals of territorial aggrandizement had been made in congress or by the executive, we could not disown a responsibility of sovereignty which conquest had practically created. Few people seemed to remember that, if our own most solemn declarations were to be considered in any other than a Pickwickian sense, we had not undertaken any war of conquest, or any other than a business of righteous intervention on behalf of an oppressed people. We had brought their oppressors to their knees, and were in a position to say to them: "See here! These oppressive methods of yours, these deliberate cruelties, these monstrous extortions, must cease, and you must reform them altogether. See to it that you set about ending this reign of brutality and greed! And that you may do it, we will stop awhile and see that you do!"

This was the obvious line, in view of the grounds on which originally we had justified our interference. But that we did not honestly believe in our own professions speedily became apparent. The commercial class shouted: "Trade demands new channels, and the party in power must give them to us, or step down and out!" The Jingo screamed: "Here is a chance for an imperial destiny! Disregard it at your peril; for if you do you make yourselves the laughing stock of the civilized world! What is a great nation without colonies? And what are colonies but the credentials of empire!" And besides these, the philanthropists and missionary enthusiasts protested: "Consider what you have to give to these pagan or only half Christian and wholly superstitious peoples! Ours is the pure light of the Gospel! Look at the Sandwich islands, and read the history of the 'Sons of Missionaries,' and see what a blessing the 'American religion' has been to those benighted peoples!"

Well, we have been looking, but we do not need to look so far. The proposition before us to-day, whether in the farther or the hither islands that are this moment within our grasp, is substantially this: "Here are certain subject races. Come and rule them, enfranchise them, ennoble them." What now are the indications that we have any single qualification for such a task? The question ought not to be difficult

to answer, for in a comparatively short space of time—less than a century—three subject races, so to speak, have been dropped into our lap, and the record of our dealings with them may be known and read of all men. One of them is the Indian race, another the negro race, and another the Chinese. If any honest man, by any ingenuity—and in spite of our tardy efforts in connection with one of them, the Indian, to redeem the dishonor of our dealings with him—can extract any ground for anything else than shame and confusion of face in view of our dealings with these races, I congratulate him upon his ingenuity. The story in every case, in greater or less degree, has been one long record of cruelty, rapine, lust, and outrage. "The best Indian," an army officer has been quoted as saying, "is a dead Indian;" and the best negro or Chinaman apparently is one who has been strung up at a lamp post or grilled alive on a village bonfire. And this is the nation, with such a record to demonstrate its capacity to deal with subject races, which is to give a new and more benign civilization to the Spanish West Indies and the Philippine islands!

If, indeed, it is to be done, it is greatly to be hoped that our members of congress, Jingo newspaper editors, and political contractors may be drafted for service in the ranks—not anywhere above them—of our armies of occupation. These people are responsible for the tens of thousands of physical wrecks that have come back from Santiago, Chickamauga, Camp Alger and Montauk. Their principles of civic and military administration have given us the infamous results which have turned the glory of our victories into the shame of our most criminal incompetency in every department of the practical administration of a great army. And the fruits of such a policy—a policy that trades in positions of grave responsibility, and barter civic and military appointments for a political "pull"—are, it is to be hoped, teaching our people that the "imperial" idea has for this republic no better promise than identical results, only in far larger proportions; to the further degradation of subject races, and to the greater dishonor of those who are to rule them.—The Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, in Harper's Weekly of Nov. 5.

"CONFISCATION."

Henry George, while expressly stating that it was not necessary to confiscate land, did undoubtedly propose to "confiscate rent." This use of the word "confiscation" is, in my judgment, to be regretted, because it has been the

chief stumbling-block in the minds of conscientious men to the acceptance of the general doctrine of the Single Tax. It has very naturally led most readers to believe that Mr. George proposed to punish land owning as if it were a crime. This impression has been confirmed by other passages in Mr. George's writings, in which he spoke of private property in land as a gigantic robbery. The misapprehension thus arising is due to the extreme accuracy with which Mr. George endeavored to express ideas which could not easily be expressed in familiar words, and to his using many words, in a strictly scientific sense, in accordance with their original and proper meaning, regardless of the great perversion of that meaning which had taken place in popular usage. There is no better example of this than in his use of these two words "confiscate rent." In the general public mind, "confiscation" means a form of punishment for crime, especially, for treason and smuggling. In common usage, "rent" means the annual price paid for the use of houses and improvements upon land, quite as much as for the use of the land itself. But the scientific, original and only strictly proper meaning of the verb "to confiscate" is merely "to take into the public treasury;" and the only scientific and strictly proper meaning of the word "rent" is the price paid for the privilege of using land, irrespective of buildings or other visible improvements. Mr. George explained, once for all, that he used the word "rent" in this sense, and in this only. And, although he did not make the explanation, it is none the less a fact that he used the word "confiscation" only in the sense of taking into the public treasury, which is its precise meaning. Within that meaning, every tax is a confiscation.—Thomas G. Shearman, in *Self-Culture*.

THE TAX SYSTEM OF MANITOBA.

Frequently as are the virtues of the province of Manitoba extolled few, if any, writers point to a great contributing cause for the general good conditions prevailing amongst the farmers of this progressive province. How the fact, and fact it is, that Manitoba has done so remarkably well because of other important causes than those generally attributed and escaped general observation, the writer is unable to explain.

It is true, nevertheless, without an exception, that Manitoba among the Canadian provinces leads in agriculture, not only because the land is particularly fertile, but principally because land

is cheap and taxation of industry almost nil.

Altogether there are 73 rural municipalities in Manitoba with a total of 13,651,375 acres, of which 2,371,441 are under cultivation. The population, male and female, is 109,000, resident farmers numbering 28,372.

So abundant are the harvests that every year it is necessary to bring in from eastern Canada from 3,000 to 5,000 farm laborers to work in the fields, the total grain crop (1897) being over thirty-two million bushels.

That cheap land has brought Manitoba into deserved prominence as a most desirable home for agriculturists can't be questioned, and likewise has the system of taxation in vogue enabled those situated there to gather and retain the fruits of their labor to a large extent of that which they are now possessed.

Whether the tax laws under which the rural districts of Manitoba are governed do, or do not, encourage the farmers who farm the farm (and not farmers who farm farmers) it will be somewhat difficult to prove from the following enactment that farmers are not at least specially favored.

As a test of this fact one need only draw a comparison between the tax system of Manitoba and the methods uniformly prevailing elsewhere throughout the world.

Under the assessment act of 1890, and subsequent amendments of 1892, for instance: "All lands in rural municipalities improved for farming and gardening purposes shall be assessed at the same value as such lands would be assessed if unimproved."

Substantially it means, in other words, that the man who industriously improves his land by tiling and draining, builds a home for himself and family, puts up barns for his live stock and field products, and constructs a fence for the protection of his property is not taxed for so doing.

The unimproved or prairie value of land alone in this respect being taxed for municipal expenses.

There are other good features associated with the one just referred to, adding much to the importance rightly attached to the tax system of Manitoba.

This is evidenced in clause (h) relating to: "All grain, cereals, flour, live or dead stock, the produce of the farm or the field in store or warehouse."

And again restated in clause (j) as follows: "All produce from lands occupied as a farm or a garden," the same being exempt from taxation.

In clause (j), however, "Live stock and farming implements," (designated

as chattles) are exempt to the extent of only \$1,500.

Notwithstanding the unfortunate error in specifying the amount up to which exemption is allowed, in effect practically, there are very few excepting bonanza farmers whose chattels are liable for any taxation whatever.

Still further is the principle of not taxing wealth—the products of industry—evidenced in clause (m) in which is specified: "Household effects and furniture, books and wearing apparel of any kind whatsoever," as being exempt from taxation also.

Summed up altogether we find that: All grain, cereals, flour, live and dead stock, the produce of the farm or field, houses, barns, fences, implements and all improvements made in or upon the land, household effects and furniture, books and wearing apparel, are free from taxation; and that all lands improved for farming and gardening purposes, are alone taxed for municipal expenses at the same rate of valuation as its unimproved or prairie land.

In respect to speculators in land (such being nonproducers) many who have held land and paid taxes for years are continually relaxing their hold and offering these lands for sale at very much less than what they paid for them years ago.

Is the Manitoba tax system feasible? Is it also equitable? And are the people satisfied under its administration?

The system is feasible because simple. The value of land being easily determined, many years of experience have proved its thorough practicability.

It is equitable, because the value attaching to labor products properly belongs to the producer—while on the other hand, the value of land naturally belongs to the community which creates it.

That the people are satisfied with the system is testified to by the fact that from no quarters, nor at any time have complaints from farmers been made against it.

Furthermore, the system involves little labor and very slight expense—an assessor being necessary but once in every three years.

Considering this method with the ordinary course—where a score of assessors are almost constantly seeking after fleeting and immovable property—the absurdity of the latter course is readily apparent.

Superior as the tax system is over fast dying methods still operating elsewhere, there is one drawback to the full and free advancement of Manitoba's agricultural population, and that is the Canadian Pacific Railway monop-

ly, which this huge corporation holds, and under which its charter precludes the province from dealing even-handed justice all around.—George J. Bryan, in Toronto Evening News of Oct. 15.

SIoux INDIAN NURSES.

At the Third Division hospital are a number of patients, who, when they get restored to health, can have the distinction of saying that they have been nursed back to health and strength by the work of four sisters, who are direct descendants of some of the Sioux tribes of Indians of the Dakotas.

These Indian nurses may be aptly compared with the regular trained nurses as the regulars in the army are compared with the volunteers. They are regular missionaries, used to all sorts of privation and hardships, and coming from a race and being descendants of warrior chiefs of renown, they are well able to meet and stand conditions that would be too much for the average nurse to undergo. The order volunteered to come to the front when the war broke out, with the end in view of following up the line of battle, and of taking care of the fallen and wounded on the battlefield, but it was only recently that their proffered services were accepted, and so they have responded and come from the far-away north, and have begun active work in the sunny southland, and will continue their work even into Cuba.—Jacksonville (Fla.) Correspondence St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

People living amidst the hubbub and bustle of London can have no idea how deeply the recent financial exposures are affecting the minds of that quiet, law-abiding, thrifty and at the core Puritan, class of our rural population, —the "real heart of England." And I, for one, would like to utter my warning, that the recurrence of similar revelations as to "company-promoting Peers" will do more to shake the constitution of the House of Lords than years of Radical agitation.—Correspondent of the London Spectator.

At a meeting where a committee was being condemned for their management, the speaker said: "Perhaps you think that in our committee half do the work, and the other half do nothing. As a matter of fact, gentlemen, the reverse is the case."—London Spectator.

At Killarney every visitor hears some laughable stories. Here is one—new and fresh, I think—which I picked up during my last visit to the glorious lakes. A number of boatmen who were

quarreling about the division of "tips," indulged at the top of their voices in a good deal of profane language, which the marvelous echo repeated verbatim. "Arrah, look at that now for a schandal," said one of the party who was of a pious turn. "Tachin' the poor harmless echo to curse and sware."—London Spectator.

Corea is being modernized. The emperor has on several occasions been lectured by political clubs, and upon his remark that people should not rashly criticise without being in a position that enables them to judge, he was informed by the Independent club that popular opinion must be respected.—Literary Digest.

PRINCE TATTERS.

Little Prince Tatters has lost his cap!
Over the hedge he threw it;
Into the river it fell "kerslap!"
Stupid old thing to do it!
Now Mother may sigh and Nurse may fume
For the gay little cap with its eagle plume.
"One cannot be thinking all day of such matters!
Trifles are trifles!" says little Prince Tatters.

Little Prince Tatters has lost his coat,
Playing he did not need it!
Left it right there by the nanny-goat,
"And nobody never seed it!"
Now Mother and Nurse may search till night
For the little new coat with its buttons bright;
But—"Coat-sleeves or shirt-sleeves, how little it matters!
Trifles are trifles!" says little Prince Tatters.

Little Prince Tatters has LOST HIS BALL!
Rolled away down the street!
Somebody'll have to find it, that's all,
Before he can sleep or eat.
Now raise the neighborhood quickly, do!
And send for the crier and constable, too!
"Trifles are trifles; but serious matters,
They must be seen to," says little Prince Tatters.
—Laura E. Richards, in St. Nicholas.

"Bribed by the rich to rob the poor." was the scathing verdict pronounced by Hon. Wayne McVeagh upon the legislators of Philadelphia, who leased the gas works created by the vote of the people without any resort to the vote of the people; and in the address at the commencement exercises of the University of Pennsylvania last year the same honored gentleman said to the students of that institution that the "black flag of the corruptionist is more to be feared than the red flag of the anarchist."—Mayor Jones.

Dewey's little joke about the christening of the Paris and New York with the names of Harvard and Yale has the Vermont flavor of humor. Having two little Spanish gunboats in his posses-

sion, he said he thought seriously of renaming them respectively "The Massachusetts Institute of Technology" and "The Philadelphia College of Physicians and Surgeons!"—Springfield Republican.

The liberty of the world will be due only to the liberty of each nation.—Victor Hugo.

WANTED FOR DONATION TO LIBRARIES:

Henry George's Standards: 1887: Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26. Vol. 2, Nos. 1, 4, 5. Mail what you can, no matter how mutilated; they are very hard to obtain. 1888: 56, 68, 79, 81. 1889: 106-7-8, 12, 19-20, 3, 5, 7, 36, 7, 8, 42, 4, 52, 4. 1890: 181, 5, 6, 9, 91, 9, 202. 1891-3: 215-6, 282. Couriers: Any of the first 119 numbers, and No. 149. If sender's address appears on the package, postage will be returned—4 cts. a lb. Will anyone knowing of any portion of an index, please inform me. Ellery Ware Ellis, 26 Morris St., Everett, Mass. 1f

ANNOUNCEMENT.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office. . . . \$0.02
Quantities delivered at office, per 100. . . . 1.00
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid.03
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100. . . . 2.00
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100. 1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:
1. *A Business Tendency* (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. *That favorable Balance of Trade* (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).

FRIENDS

of this paper are requested to send us the names and addresses of persons of their acquaintance who would be interested in reading it regularly.

THE PUBLIC

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 822,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:
Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 140
Wason Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St
West.