

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 2-01 Box 541

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1900.

Number 141.

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.

The principal item of McKinley prosperity for the current week, the suspension of the Paterson (N. J.) Ribbon company, is the climax to a succession of stoppages of the large industries of that place which have occurred since the election. This ribbon company began business in 1883; it has a plant worth \$500,000; and creditors will be paid in full. The reason given for its suspension is "general business depression."

A proposition to have the state build a sea wall at Galveston, for the protection of the site of the new city that is expected to grow up there, is exciting a good deal of wholesome discussion in Texas. Inasmuch as such an improvement would enrich the owners of the Galveston site, people in other parts of the state fail to see the fairness of taxing themselves for the cost of building it.

In discussing the message of the American president, a prominent St. Petersburg paper says it does not regard the part which deals with the Chinese question as America's last word. The American policy having already undergone many changes, it thinks a further change not improbable. This Russian paper's opinion of Mr. McKinley is not unlike that of his own countrymen who recall his obsolete sentiments about forcible annexation and plain duty.

The postmaster general is greatly concerned again about second-class

mail matter. In his annual report he begs congress to narrow this privilege. But he is not concerned about the exorbitant prices his department pays to railroad companies for hauling the mail, and that is an enormously greater financial burden upon his department than the second-class matter evil.

On pretense of preventing frauds in the sale of oleomargarine, the lower house of congress has rushed through a bill imposing a tax of 10 cents a pound on oleomargarine when it is colored to resemble butter. This law is intended to protect butter makers from competition with oleomargarine makers. It has no other object. The point about coloring is a sham. If it is a fraud to color oleomargarine—which is as wholesome a food product as butter—why is it not a fraud to color one kind of butter so as to resemble another kind? Yet this is as common as coloring oleomargarine. The bill might reasonably be so amended as to put the 10 cent tax on both butter and oleomargarine when either is colored to resemble what it is not. Such a tax, at any rate, would not be a tariff for the protection of the butter industry against the competition of another industry equally desirable.

The Chicago judges decide that the Illinois anti-trust law is constitutional except as to a section which discriminates between corporations, subjecting some to its penalties and exempting others. They could hardly have decided otherwise, without usurping the functions of the legislature. But the next legislature might engage in worse business than doing what the judges couldn't do. They should repeal the law. An obstruction to

legitimate business combination, it in no wise prevents or modifies the trust evil. It accomplishes nothing beyond extorting an annual dollar for the secretary of state's office from all corporations that would rather pay the dollar and swear that they are not in a trust than submit to a fine of fifty dollars.

Some of the clergymen of Cleveland who are deeply concerned about the difficulty of getting a good attendance at church, contemplate a season of prayer and fasting behind closed doors to see what effect this will have. They say they have tried several other devices, including the preaching of sermons on subjects of popular interest. Have they tried the experiment of making their churches religious instead of pious?

One of the ablest political documents of recent times is William J. Bryan's letter to the public, which appeared in the Chicago American on the 10th. It is his first review since election of the political situation and outlook. Without assailing Grover Cleveland by so much as a single word, Mr. Bryan briefly but completely marshals the facts in connection with Mr. Cleveland's second term so as to make them tell their own story of treachery on the tariff question and party disruption on the money question. This recapitulation of facts will not be relished by Cleveland's admirers. But it is difficult to guess what objections they can urge against the reasons Bryan recites to justify the reiteration of the silver plank in the campaign of 1900. He makes out a perfect case, both upon the score of expediency and of common honesty. And while he admits that the republican party was able to make use of this action on the

silver question to threaten borrowers and scare bank depositors, he truly says that "this could not have been avoided without a complete surrender to the influences which control the republican party." Incidentally he administers a merited rebuke to the men who call themselves democrats but who in the recent campaign urged "opposition to silver as a reason for defending trusts, a large army and an imperial policy." But what is calculated most to strengthen the confidence of those democrats who believe in Bryan's democracy, and to draw others of their kind toward him, is his brief but vital discussion of the shifting issues of political campaigns. Because no one can foresee events, no one in 1896 could tell, he says, what would be the paramount issue in 1900, nor can anyone tell what will be the paramount issue of 1904. But, he continues—

while no one can foresee events, parties, like individuals, can have fixed and definite principles and can apply these principles to new issues as they arise. The man who is determined to obey the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," cannot foresee what temptation may come to him or what emergencies he may have to meet, but he can know that he will not take that which belongs to another, no matter how great the temptation may be.

In this habit of meeting the shifting problems of daily life by reference to absolute principle, trying both to know and to apply the principle aright, lies the strength of Mr. Bryan's character and the tenacious quality of his popularity. It is also the explanation of his unpopularity. The man who truly makes principle his mentor and guide is a dubious character to a large proportion of mankind. They don't understand that mode of life. There would seem, at any rate, to be no other reasonable explanation of the bitterness of hate which a large class of conventionally good people exhibit toward this young man of manifest ability, of proved

moral character and of stainless life. He lives in the concrete what they only preach in the abstract.

Mayor James K. McGuire, of Syracuse, makes a plausible prediction regarding the democratic presidential nomination for 1904. He believes that if conservative forces secure control of the party, David B. Hill will be the nominee; but "if the radical element of the party develops strength enough to again get into the saddle," that then the nominee will be Mr. Bryan. This prediction is doubtless as nearly right as can be expected of political forecasts, and it is a very clear indication of the present condition of the party. Hill would not be an ideal candidate for the plutocratic elements, but he approximates it as closely as they could hope for, since Cleveland, who is their ideal, is out of the question. And though a large proportion of the democratic element of the party do not regard Bryan as an ideal democrat, neither his superior nor his equal has yet been heard of. Over these two names, then, as well as can be judged at present, the plutocratic and the democratic elements of the democratic party are likely during the next four years to wage the conflict that will determine whether the democratic party shall any longer represent democracy in party politics.

"Fusion being dead in Kansas, the democracy will again assert itself," is the substance of an observation of a leading democrat of that state whose democracy is marked with the McKinley brand—Col. William H. Rossington, to wit. Since the democracy of Kansas is to assert itself because fusion is dead, it should be interesting to observe how the democracy of Kansas did assert itself before fusion was born. And interesting it is. Cleveland lost the state in 1888 by more than 80,000 votes. Now, as fusion in its "death struggle" lost it by less than 26,000—

Bryan the "fusionist" getting 60,000 more votes than Cleveland the "democrat," and McKinley only 5,000 more than Harrison—a question arises. Which is the deader, Kansas fusion or Kansas democracy?

An astounding political confession is made by the Buffalo Express. After supporting Mr. McKinley throughout the campaign, and though still holding the attitude of a McKinley paper, it completely collapses in its support of McKinley's Philippine policy. And what is especially notable is its recognition of the fraudulent character of the McKinley campaign with reference to the war in the Philippines. We quote from a leading editorial in its issue of November 30:

It is high time the American public got over its delusions about this war. It has deceived itself too long with the notion that it was fighting merely an ambitious rebel chief, representing only a fraction of a single tribe and maintaining his power as much by the terror he inspires as by any sense of patriotism. We are not fighting a government or an army, but a whole people.

But the American public has not deceived itself, as the Express assumes. It has been deceived by its public servants and their obliging newspapers. Mr. McKinley himself contributed to the deception. He helped make a gullible public believe that he was trying to put down an ambitious rebel chief, who represented only a small and barbarous tribe and maintained his power by terrorizing a peaceably disposed Philippine population who were yearning for American protection. Not only did McKinley and his supporters falsify the situation in that respect. They also assured the same gullible public—which consisted, however, as the vote indicates, of only about 54 per cent. of the voting population of the country—that McKinley's election would so discourage the Filipinos that peace with American sovereignty would follow immediately. But here is what the Buffalo Express of the date noted

above, and in the same editorial article from which the foregoing quotation comes, now considers to bethe true situation with reference to peace:

The conditions now existing in the Philippines are as near to peace as any that are likely to prevail for a good many years—probably for a generation, perhaps for several generations. They are the conditions under which we must expect to govern the islands so long as the population is hostile to us and we are determined to keep them under American sovereignty. Increasing the army will make no difference unless it should be raised to such size that a strong garrison could be put in every hamlet and a guard over every farm. A column of 500 American troops could probably march anywhere in the archipelago now. After such a triumphant demonstration of our power, let the same column be broken up into detached parties of 25 men each, and every man of them would most likely be killed or captured within 50 miles of Manila.

That is what the democrats said during the campaign. The republicans denied it then. But there is worse to come. In the same article, the Express admonishes the American public, whom for the sake of McKinleyism it joined last fall in deceiving, that when we abandon the Philippines we must exterminate the native inhabitants. After assuming that probably in the course of years, after the present generation both of Filipinos and Americans has passed away, hostilities may die down, it proceeds:

But if we are going to conquer the people, we must recognize the fact that we will have to fight the people, not an army or a government. We shall have to imitate the course of Great Britain in South Africa. Where an armed body of rebels appears we must burn the village that gave it shelter and destroy the crops on which it fed. We must concentrate non-combatants in small garrisoned districts, as the Spanish did. We must send all prisoners to distant exile. We must execute promptly any who are detected in breaking their oaths of allegiance. We must make our soldiers a terror to the whole population, because a people can be ruled by force only after they have been taught to fear. The work

of tyranny can be done only by the methods of tyranny.

There you have as lurid a picture of imperialism as any supporter of Bryan ventured to draw even in the most exciting moments of the presidential campaign. Yet it is now given us calmly by a leading McKinley journal. The election being over and won, the truth comes out. Lurid as the picture is, it is not over-colored. The opportunity was ours once, to foster a republic off the shores of Asia, a republic modeled after our own, and whose people would be our most grateful and devoted friends. Instead of availing ourselves of that opportunity, we first deceived those people, then bullied them, then fought them until their armies were scattered and their government demolished, and now, even according to this Buffalo organ of McKinley, we must either abandon them or reduce them to subjection by terror. And the Buffalo paper is right. Though wrong, terribly wrong when it supported McKinley and his imperial policy by helping to inspire the American people with delusions which it now begs them to get over, it is nevertheless right at last. The work of tyranny can indeed be done only by the methods of tyranny.

The British government is now well packed with nephews, sons and sons-in-law. Nepotism has never before flourished in England so luxuriantly. It was made a subject of debate in parliament on the 10th, when a member moved to the address to the queen an amendment expressing the regret of the Commons that Lord Salisbury had recommended so many of his own family to offices under the government. The motion was lost, but the fact that 128 members voted for it indicates that it was taken seriously. While the debate was on, Mr. Balfour, a nephew of Salisbury, and one of his governmental family, op-

posed the motion with the plea that "the unhappy accident of birth ought not to be a bar to public service." Mr. Balfour appears to be something of a humorist. That plea had always been used against nepotism. Mr. Balfour is the first person, either nepotist or nepotee, to give it the other turn.

Lord Salisbury's remarks in parliament apropos of the address to the throne in response to the queen's speech is significant of a radical and disquieting departure in the laws of war. Great Britain must make it felt, he said, that no one, by the issue of an insolent and audacious ultimatum, can force the British government to humble itself and abandon its rights; in such a case not a shred of independence should be left. It might be observed in passing that the "audacious ultimatum" which the Transvaal issued was a justifiable demand that the British government cease threatening it with military invasion, accompanied with an offer in return to withdraw the Boer troops from the British border and to submit the differences between the two countries to arbitration. That was not insolent, even if audacious. But the vital point about Salisbury's remarks is his cool contention that because this ultimatum was issued and in the hostilities following the Boers were defeated, they forfeited their independence. If any principle at all is involved in this contention, if it is not a mere assertion of unlicensed power, it means that Great Britain is asked by Salisbury to establish a principle and a precedent in international law for the extinction by victors in war of the independence of the defeated power. Let that principle be established, and the world is on its way with lightning speed back to the barbarism from which it has partly emerged.

In his argument this week before the supreme court, John D. Lindsay, the able New York lawyer who

represents Neely, the Cuban postal defaulter, raised legal objections to Neely's extradition to Cuba which are of the highest importance. Contending that the Cuban republic actually existed before American intervention, and was officially recognized by the United States in the war resolution, which declared that "the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent," Mr. Lindsay argues that in making war in this manner upon Spain the United States became the ally of the Cuban republic, and that, in consequence, upon the ratification of the treaty of peace, by which Spain "relinquished" sovereignty over Cuba, the authority of the president to exercise military power in Cuba ceased. This being so, Mr. Lindsay continues, his action in setting up a military government there is in flagrant violation of the constitution, such action being essentially a prosecution of war against the Cuban republic without authority from the law-making power. The argument is incontrovertible. But even incontrovertible arguments may be evaded. And judges—being human by nature and lawyers by education—are rather inclined to evade a sound argument than to let a spectacular criminal go unwhipt of justice or seriously to disturb the existing state of affairs. As supreme court judges are no exception to this rule, they may be depended upon to further in the Neely case what lawyers call "the ends of justice," though in doing so they have to validate the lawless American military government in Cuba. But it will be interesting to observe how they manage it.

A state document which is not likely soon to be forgotten has been contributed by the senate of Colorado to the literature of taxation. Besides being an exceedingly able state paper, it is the most complete and luminous exposition yet published of the methods of taxation now in prac-

tical operation in Australasia. We refer to the report of a committee appointed nearly two years ago by the senate of Colorado to inquire into the subject of public revenues. In Colorado, as in every other state, the annoyances and inequalities of taxation are a source of constant irritation. To find means of allaying this, the senate provided by resolution, March 27, 1899, for the appointment of a committee of three senators to investigate the state and local revenue laws, with a view to discovering their defects and proposing a remedy; and it particularly instructed the committee to investigate the tax laws of New Zealand and the Australian colonies, whose experiments in taxation, though but vaguely understood in their country, have attracted attention. The committee appointed consisted of Senators James A. Bucklin, as chairman, and William A. Hill and Thomas J. Erhardt. Although the committee was instructed to report on taxation in Australasia no fund for expenses was appropriated; but the chairman, Mr. Bucklin, bearing the cost himself, made a trip to that country, and by personal investigation procured the information which the committee is now about to submit in its report. It has been published in advance by the Denver News, in nine installments; and persons interested in it may probably procure it by sending to that paper for the nine copies in which the report appears. The price, as we assume, would be 45 cents, since five cents a copy is the regular price of the paper.

Describing the vices of the general property tax now in vogue in Colorado, as in the other states, and condemning it as both impracticable and unsound, the Bucklin report leads up through a review of a variety of proposed reforms in taxation to the fiscal methods in actual operation in Australasia. Most of these are not novel. But there is one which differs from any tax law we have in

America and of which the report says that "owing to its extensive adoption, prospective extension and radical departure from other methods," it may properly be called the Australian land value tax—a tax which falls upon "land according to its value, excluding all personal property and improvements therefrom." This tax, the report goes on to explain, "is simply a tax on the benefits or privileges which governments confer on land-owners, in exact proportion to the benefits so received—in other words, an application of the betterment principle, that the owner of the property benefited by law should bear the burden of paying for the benefit so received." Thus far it has been substituted in Australasia for other methods to so slight a degree that in New Zealand it is only 6.07 per cent. of the total ordinary revenue of the colony, while in New South Wales it is only 3.52 per cent. and in South Australia only 3.33. But it has had a beneficial economic influence out of all proportion to the tax collected. The bare fear of an extension of this tax has had a wholesome effect on checking speculative land values. Besides the colonial land value tax, a system prevails in addition in New Zealand, which allows localities to raise local revenues exclusively by land value taxation if they so decide by popular vote. Several localities have already availed themselves of the privilege with excellent results. After narrating the history of the land tax in the different Australasian colonies, and minutely describing and explaining its beneficial effects, the Bucklin report recommends a constitutional amendment allowing the people of Colorado gradually to adopt this method of taxation. Under the proposed amendment the voters of any county would be at liberty every three years to vote upon the question of exempting from local taxation all personal property and landed improvements, thereby shifting local taxes to land values—in other words, to make a local applica-

tion of the Australasian land value tax.

Another notable banquet has been added by the single tax men of Massachusetts to the several they have given at Boston during the past three years in aid of their movement. On this occasion the special guests were the Catholic clergy, of whom a score were present, including Vicar General Byrne. The proceedings were published in full by the Boston Herald of the 4th. The address of the evening, delivered by Father Johnston, rector of the Gate of Heaven church, was upon the single tax in its relations to the teaching of the Catholic church. It was a thoughtful and eloquent argument in support of the conclusion that there is nothing in the single tax method or principle at variance with the teachings of the Catholic church.

On the whole, the minority report of the ways and means committee of the lower house of congress, which advocates a reduction of not less than \$70,000,000, instead of only \$40,000,000 as the republican majority proposes, is a well-considered document. It is true there are flaws in it. For instance, it advocates taxes on production instead of consumption as a sound fiscal principle; whereas taxes should fall upon neither consumption nor production, but upon such property as their expenditure enhances in value. The report takes fair ground, however, in declaring that the minority will not oppose the reductions contemplated by the majority, but will seek only to enlarge them. It is wise also in suggesting that further reductions in taxation should be made by abolishing some of the tariff duties that foster trusts and enable them to sell goods abroad for lower prices than they get at home for the same kind of goods out of the same factories.

Good luck is one of the elements of success in lawsuits. This piece of

worldly wisdom has been again exemplified by the Standard Oil trust. In 1892 that organization was ordered to dissolve. The order issued from the supreme court of Ohio pursuant to the Ohio anti-trust law. But the company paid no attention to it. So the republican attorney general, Mr. Monett, began proceedings in 1897 to punish the trust for contempt in disobeying the order of dissolution. Attempts were made to bribe him. But he was proof against that, and the republican state convention consequently refused to renominate him. It also refused to renominate one of the judges of the supreme court who was known to be friendly to the anti-trust law. A new attorney general and one new supreme court judge were accordingly elected a year ago. And now the supreme court makes a decision. Or rather it fails to make one. It stands 3 to 3 on the question of punishing for contempt, which is the same thing to the trust as a favorable decision. The trust goes free. By a curious coincidence the new judge is one of the three who favors the Standard Oil trust. Was there ever such luck?

Wu Ting Fang, the talented diplomat who represents the Chinese empire at Washington, lectured last week before a large audience in New York on the five relations of man—sovereign and subject, parent and child, elder and younger, husband and wife, friend and friend—as taught by Confucius. In the course of his lecture Mr. Wu took occasion to compare the golden rule of the Christian with that of the Confucian. Since Christ taught men to do to others as they would have others do to them, while Confucius taught them not to do to others what they would not wish others to do to them, Mr. Wu inferred that the two precepts are identical. He considered as "hair-splitters" those who find in them different ideas. It is hardly hair-splitting, however, to say that

Christ's golden rule is positive, whereas that of Confucius is only negative, and to maintain that therein there is a substantial difference. But this aside, we may readily agree with Mr. Wu in his pointed rebuke that conventional Christians do not even try to live up to Christian precepts. Referring to Christ's command: "Love your enemies," Mr. Wu said:

Love your enemies! At this very moment Christian missionaries are crying for vengeance and bloodshed. Christian armies are hastening, sparing neither age nor sex, in their indiscriminate slaughter, and carrying away everything upon which they can lay their hands. What a vast difference between profession and practice!

In this connection it may be well to explain that the most numerous and vehement of the demands upon the president for vengeance against the Chinese are reported from the white house to have come from Christian ministers.

THE WASHINGTON CENTENNIAL.

At the city of Washington, as we write, there is in progress the first centennial celebration of the occupation of the District of Columbia as the seat of the American government.

By the constitution, which became operative in 1789, congress is empowered "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states and the acceptance of congress, become the seat of the government of the United States." At first the new government sat at New York and then at Philadelphia, but at the first session of the first congress steps were taken to secure a permanent place where the power of exclusive legislation thus conferred by the constitution might be freely exercised. This was not a simple matter. The sectional ill-feeling between the north and the south, which grew in intensity until it culminated in 1861 in the civil war, played an irritating part in the selection of a site.

That the site should be upon a navigable river was taken as matter

of course, in those days before the advent of railroads. The Susquehanna was a favorite with northern congressmen, but the matter settled down to an issue between the Potomac and the Delaware. Southern statesmen opposed the Delaware because they feared that if the capital were located above Mason and Dixon's line it would tend to give the northern states an undue influence in the general government. For corresponding reasons northern statesmen opposed the Potomac. The dispute was adjusted by a compromise.

Alexander Hamilton's scheme for cementing the American union and strengthening its credit by having the federal government assume the then existing state debts and pay them in full along with those incurred by its predecessor, the colonial confederation, had become one of the issues between Hamilton and Jefferson. As Hamilton was a northern and Jefferson a southern leader of opinion, this issue of assumption and the issue of a capital site possessed compromise possibilities. An agreement was consequently made, pursuant to which Jefferson yielded to Hamilton with reference to the federal assumption of the state debts, and with reference to the capital site the north in return yielded to the south. The Potomac was accordingly chosen by act of congress of July 16, 1790, for the seat of government; and in 1791 President Washington proclaimed that a site upon its banks had been selected and secured.

Originally this site comprised territory on both sides of the river—in Virginia as well as in Maryland. But in 1846 the Virginian part, about one-third of the whole, was permitted by congress to be withdrawn and restored to Virginia, the inhabitants voting, as they did by a large majority, in favor of the change.

Before that change the district was in shape a perfect ten-mile square, its four corners pointing respectively north, east, south and west. Except the villages of Georgetown on the Maryland side and Alexandria on the Virginian, it was an open farming country. On the Maryland side the land was hilly and

swampy. One of the hills was selected for the capitol and another for the executive mansion, the two to be connected by a wide street, the now famous Pennsylvania avenue, running through the intervening swamp. The corner stone of the capitol was laid by President Washington, with masonic ceremonies, in September, 1793. Streets and lots for a capital city were mapped out in the region of the public buildings, and June 15, 1800, was settled on as the date for the establishment of the federal government at this new city of Washington.

When that time came, however, the city was scarcely habitable. There was but "one good tavern"; and only a few houses, and they little better than huts, had been built. To know where members of congress were to find lodgings was a problem. But congress met there in special session in November, 1800, and in regular session in December of the same year, during the presidency of John Adams. It is in commemoration of that event that on this 12th day of the present month the centenary of the establishment of the government at Washington is celebrated.

Americans may well be proud of the century's achievement in raising up this magnificent capital city. By successive additions but with a gain rather than a loss in dignity, the capitol building has grown to be a massive and symmetrical structure. The white house, or executive mansion, also a survival from the foundation of the city, is a delight to all observers who appreciate grand simplicity in architecture. Most of the other public buildings also, are impressive models of good taste. While the parks, the monuments, the thoroughfares, all testify in the most gratifying manner to the possibilities of democracy in respect of technical and artistic development.

It is not, however, to the beauties of our capital city that we care most especially to call attention. Whoever is interested in these may get all the satisfaction he craves by reading the daily newspapers and magazines. None of the beauties of Washington are in danger of neglect.

None of its glories will be ignored in this its centennial year. What is in danger of neglect is not a beauty, not a glory. It is something so ugly that it would not be tolerated if it were architecture, so repugnant to every natural concept of justice that it would make all the outward beauty of Washington fade by comparison if it were in the same sense tangible and visible. It is an old evil, upon which there has been no improvement since the corner stone of the capitol was laid. Had the material development of Washington been as slow as reform in this particular, its hills would still be bare and its beautiful avenue a swamp.

We refer to this subject not because we prefer invisible ugliness to visible beauty, but because there is a superabundance of guides to the external beauty of Washington, and only a few if any at all, to this intangible ugliness. And we do it the more readily because the evil to which we allude is not peculiar to Washington. That city simply serves, now that it celebrates its centennial year, as a prominent example of a common species of neglect; regarding which, however, the general government, in exercising exclusive authority over Washington, has been specially derelict. Our allusion is to the fact that the pecuniary value of all the costly public improvements which have turned the hills and swamps of Washington into one of the beautiful cities of the world, is given almost without compensation, to a small class of Washington property owners.

It has often been charged that the selection of the site of Washington was a gigantic land speculation, and that President Washington was a party to it. Into that charge we need not inquire. Whether or not the selection was influenced by a speculative conspiracy makes no difference now. What does concern us now is the fact that, conspiracy or no conspiracy, land speculation not only was but still is fostered by the action of the general government. Instead of conserving for common uses those values which its magnificent development of Washington has created and continues to create and maintain, the govern-

ment confiscates them to the uses of Washington lot owners.

When the site of Washington was chosen, it had only a low acreage value. But as soon as Maryland had contributed \$72,000 and Virginia \$120,000 toward the erection of the capitol and the executive mansion, and the corner stone of the former had been laid, speculators began to buy building lots for a rise in value. This was the beginning of the evil to which we have referred as a moral blot upon the material beauty of our capital city. The effect in obstructing private improvement was soon obvious. In 1899, says Prof. McMaster (vol. ii., p. 489), "one could look over an area nearly as great as the city of New York, yet not see a fence, nor a house, nor anything save a few brick kilns and a few temporary huts for laborers." Land was held at so high a price as to discourage building. It had gone up from farm acreage values to 25 cents a square foot—equal to more than \$10,000 an acre; and nothing had caused this but the public improvements, actual and contemplated. The pecuniary benefits resulting and to result from the expenditure of public moneys in improving the capital city were thus diverted from the common treasury, where they belonged, to private pockets.

It is not necessary to suspect that this was pursuant to any conspiracy. So far as the result is concerned, it makes no difference whether it was so or not. We may just as well assume, what was not improbably the fact, that it was an innocent enough application of prevailing notions regarding land tenure and taxation. But that is why the continuance of this policy mars the otherwise splendid development of Washington. It is not occasional crimes against the public conscience that testify to civic stagnation; it is continued torpidity of the public conscience itself. A land speculation conspiracy, therefore, in connection with the location of the capital city, might be only an interesting historical episode; whereas a perpetual public policy of encouragement to land speculation by secur-

ing to the lot owners of Washington the pecuniary benefits of common improvements, testifies to a stagnant civic morality. It indicates, unhappily, that the development and beautification of Washington have been only external.

And precisely that policy has been perpetuated. It is exactly to-day what it was a century ago, when a price of 25 cents a square foot for building lots obstructed private improvement and diverted the pecuniary benefits of public improvement to the private pockets of a class. It is just the same, that is, except that now congress not only erects and maintains federal buildings but also pays 50 per cent. of all the expenses of the local government, and that the price of lots has risen enormously. And there is the same obvious relation as of old between what congress thus does and the enhanced price of lots. If these congressional expenditures were withdrawn and the public buildings permanently removed the lot values would collapse. It is the expenditures of congress, then, in the improvement of the District of Columbia—the expenditures, that is, of public money,—that constitute the basis for nearly the entire value of Washington lots. That value, therefore, ought in justice and good sense to be a public fund. From it the people should be reimbursed for their expenditures that produce it. But it is still confiscated from them.

This subject underwent a searching inquiry in 1892. The attention of congress was called by petition to the fact that lot values in the District of Columbia were assessed at only \$76,000,000, and that a new assessment about to be made would increase the old one to \$95,000,000, whereas it should be more than \$300,000,000. This petition complained also of gross inequalities of assessment as between individual lot owners, showing that the very desirable lots were assessed at less than 14 per cent. of their true value, while the lots of small home owners were put down at 70 and 80 per cent. of theirs. A special congressional committee was accordingly appointed, and it made the in-

quiry in question. Its report is a document of the house of representatives, and is distinguished as "Report No. 1469 of the 52d congress, 1st session."

The committee found that the facts complained of in the petition were substantially true, and reported that in consequence of their investigation the assessment of land in the district had been raised \$125,000,000. But still, as they further reported, "more than half the value of land in the district escapes taxation." They also found, and this is a remarkable showing in corroboration of the point we have been trying to make, that in the District of Columbia—

land values are increasing at an enormous rate—on a conservative estimate to the amount of \$40,000,000 annually, enough to pay off the entire bonded debt of the district in six months; that the assessment of buildings and the under assessment of land is operating to discourage greatly the growth and improvement of the capital; . . . and that on a fair assessment of land alone it would be easy to obtain, by a tax rate less than one-half of the present, all the revenue required for the needs of the district. This would make the tax rate of the city of Washington 60 cents on the dollar—a lower rate than that of any large city in the country. . . . While your committee do not deem the question of how far the national treasury should be called on to defray the expenses of the district government to be within the scope of the resolution submitted to them, they would report that their examination shows that the collection of only 12½ per cent. of the annual rental value of the land of the district—estimated at \$24,000,000—would suffice to raise the district's proportion of the increased sum of \$6,000,000 annual revenue which the district commissioners ask; that the collecting of 25 per cent. would suffice to raise the whole \$6,000,000 without taking one penny from the national treasury; that the collection of 50 per cent. would give, without any tax upon improvement or any contribution whatever from the national government, \$12,000,000 of revenue a year, or more than twice the amount the commissioners ask for—a sum which properly used would soon make the national capital the most beautiful and delightful city in the world. And this could be done without the slightest tendency to decrease the comfort or increase the cost of living of any resident or visitor. On the contrary, the very weight of the tax thus levied on land values would check speculation and make land needed for buildings much easier to be had by those who wanted

1799?

to improve it—an effect which in its turn would so increase population and prosperity as to greatly increase legitimate land values, and thus increase the fund that could in this manner be drawn on for all district needs. . . . At ten per cent. annual increase, the minimum rate testified to by witnesses before the committee, there would be an increment to land values of \$42,300,000 each year. This [now] represents the annual profit of land owners.

That report thus furnishes a definite official statement in support of the correctness of our contention that the pecuniary values which congressional appropriations produce in the District of Columbia are confiscated by the millions of dollars from the public treasury, where they belong, for the enrichment of local land owners. The same absurdly iniquitous condition, therefore, that existed when the century was young and Washington was little more than a governmental experiment, exists essentially now when a new century is about to open and Washington is one of the great capitals of the world. In this respect there has been no advance, no growth, no improvement.

That is the blot upon the century's development of the capital city of the great western republic. Nor is it any less a blot because so few now think of it as one. There were but few who thought slavery a blot upon the good name of the republic when it flourished in the District of Columbia. Less than half a century ago the public jail of the district was used as a slave pen and the sheriff as a slave keeper. Worse than that, men and women slaves were marched by slave dealers from the jail to their destination, openly upon the public streets, chained in gangs. Americans do not like to speak of this now. We are ashamed of it. That it was a blot upon all that was good and beautiful in what our growing capital represented has become all too plain. But it did not seem so then. Congress when appealed to to stop it as shocking to moral sensibilities and patriotic instincts, saw no reason for interfering. So is it with all institutional iniquities. But the greatest glory of a country consists in its discovery

of the true character of its iniquitous institutions and putting them behind it.

Greater is that than symmetrical architecture and fine statuary. While we should not be insensible to this external beauty, while we should enjoy it to the full in so far as it is expressive of exalted sentiment, no true American will ever forget that the noblest monument in Washington is the record of the abolition of slavery there. We could better spare all the beautiful art of the capital city, along with its magnificent growth, than that one act of national justice.

Feeling so, one cannot admire the external beauties of the city with the same unruffled emotions that one might experience if the common wealth they bring there were not still confiscated, through land monopoly, for the enrichment of a local class. May it not reasonably be hoped that the second century of our capital city will witness the end of this iniquitous policy in its government as the first did that of slavery? May we not think of our descendants a century hence as celebrating the beauties of civic righteousness which our capital city then displays, as well as its beauties of boulevard and monument and architecture?

NEWS

Business in congress has been pushed with unusual activity. Although the session is less than two weeks old, two important bills have already been rushed through the lower house, and another is well along upon its passage. One of the two bills that have passed the lower house is known as the "Grout oleomargarine" bill. It increases the present tax of 2 cents a pound on oleomargarine to 10 cents, when the article is colored to resemble butter; and it reduces the tax from 2 cents to a quarter of a cent when the article is uncolored. A substitute intended to recognize the value of oleomargarine as a wholesome and nutritious article of food, but to prevent its fraudulent sale, was defeated by a vote of 113 to 178, and the Grout bill passed on the 7th by 198 to 92. The other measure to

pass the lower house is the army reorganization bill. It increases the standing army, in round numbers, to a minimum of 58,000 and a maximum of 96,000, in the discretion of the president. There is a clause in the bill as passed which abolishes the army canteen by forbidding the sale of liquor of every kind upon any premises used for military purposes. The bill was passed on the 6th after two days' debate, by a vote of 166 to 133. The third bill to which we refer above, that which is well along upon its passage, is the bill for the reduction of war taxes. The debate upon it in the lower house, as it came from the committee on ways and means, began on the 11th.

In the senate the Hay-Pauncefote treaty for the abrogation of so much of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as relates to the Nicaraguan canal (see *The Public*, first year, No. 43, page 8; second year, No. 97, page 9) was discussed in executive session on the 6th; and on the 12th a batch of reciprocity treaties was received from the president, together with certain extradition treaties and a supplementary treaty with Spain. The latter provides for the cession by Spain to the United States, for \$100,000, of four or five small islands of the Philippine archipelago which were accidentally omitted from the peace treaty signed at Paris.

Across the Atlantic another great legislature is in session—the British parliament. It listened on the 6th to the queen's speech, which was so brief that it may be reproduced here in full:

My Lords and Gentlemen: It has become necessary to make further provision for the expenses incurred by the operations of my armies in South Africa and China. I have summoned you to hold a special session in order that you may give your sanction to the enactments required for this purpose. You will not enter into other public matters requiring your attention until the ordinary meeting of parliament in the spring.

The customary address in reply having been moved on the same day, a bitter debate followed in which Secretary Chamberlain was made the center of attack. He responded with a fierce reply. Lord Salisbury participated in the debate, and referring to the Transvaal war declared that the conflict would not cease

until the two Boer republics had been divested of every shred of independence. At a late hour in the day the government presented to the house the supplementary war estimate, but its contents were kept secret. On the 7th Secretary Chamberlain stated that Sir Alfred Milner would be appointed governor of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. He also outlined the government's plan of reconstruction. A vote was reached on the 10th upon a proposed amendment to the address to the queen expressing regret that Lord Salisbury had recommended so many of his own family to offices under the government. The amendment was lost by 128 to 230. The main purpose of the session was accomplished on the 11th, when, the secretary of war having disclosed the contents of the supplementary estimate showing that £16,000,000 was required for the army, that amount was appropriated by a vote of 284 to 8.

While parliament was engaged in London upon the extra appropriation for war purposes, an immense Irish convention was assembling in Dublin. Over 3,000 delegates, representing county councils, district councils, borough corporations and branches of the United Irish league were in attendance. The convention opened on the 11th, and was described by John Redmond, who presided, as "the parliament of the Irish people." A resolution protesting against the British war upon the two Boer republics, proposed by John Dillon, was adopted unanimously. By an almost unanimous vote Timothy Healey and J. L. Carew were ordered to be excluded from the parliamentary party. At the second day's session a resolution was adopted demanding the sale of Irish lands to tenants at fair prices, and urging the necessity of stopping emigration to the United States. The Irish members of parliament attended the convention instead of appearing in their seats in the house of commons. They took this course because parliament had been assembled only to vote war funds for the subjugation of the Boers, a measure which they could not defeat and in the passage of which they had no wish to participate.

President Kruger, whose departure from France was noted last

week, arrived at The Hague on the 6th, where he was warmly received both by local officials and the public. Neither the queen nor anyone representing her greeted him; but the second chamber adopted a resolution of welcome, and on the 9th he had an audience with the queen, to which he was conducted by a court official in a state carriage. On the 11th, however, the government definitely and finally refused to take the initiative in urging Great Britain to arbitrate her differences with the Transvaal, explaining that the initiative is for the great powers to take and not for the smaller ones. It is rumored that the czar has refused to receive Mr. Kruger, but the Transvaal legation at The Hague contradicts the rumor.

In encouragement of Kruger's mission in Europe an immense Afrikander congress was held on the 6th at Worcester, a town in Cape Colony, not far from Cape Town. More than 6,000 Boers from different parts of Cape Colony were in attendance. Fearing some revolutionary violence, the British had posted troops and planted guns around the town. But no occasion arose for using them. The congress was peaceable throughout, although it freely condemned the British policy regarding the two republics to the north. Its session closed with the adoption by acclamation of three resolutions and the appointment of a delegation to deliver the resolutions to Sir Alfred Milner, governor general of Cape Colony, for transmission to the British government. The first resolution demands the termination of the war, protests against the devastation of the country and the burning of farms, and declares that the independence of the republics will alone insure peace in South Africa. The second urges the right of Cape Colony to manage its own affairs and censures the policy of Sir Alfred Milner. The third pledges the congress to "labor in a constitutional way" to attain the ends defined in the two preceding resolutions. In reply to the deputation, upon receiving these resolutions, Sir Alfred Milner said:

I shall forward these resolutions to the imperial government with my strong disapproval. They were framed by clever men now engineering the present agitation and encouraging those who are carrying on a hopeless resistance.

Meantime the largest Boer force now in service, led by the ablest cavalry general of the war, DeWet, was reported to have been caught in a trap. After DeWet's capture of Dewetsdorp, reported last week, he was chased by Gen. Knox, who appears to have driven him first southward and then to the west into the angle formed by the Orange and the Caledon rivers. Both streams were said to be swollen with recent rains, while strong bodies of British troops controlled every avenue of escape. On the 10th a London dispatch told of a great battle in progress, the Boers refusing to surrender and both sides suffering heavily. According to other London dispatches of the same date this struggle had then been in progress for ten days. But on the 12th Lord Kitchener reported that Gen. Knox was engaged in a running fight with DeWet, who was moving toward Reddersburg. From this report it is apparent that DeWet has crossed the Caledon and again eluded the superior British force.

The only other news of fighting in South Africa comes from points hundreds of miles farther north. Between Pretoria and Rustenburg, which lies west of Pretoria, a force of Boers, said to be a detachment of DeWet's command, attacked a British convoy on the 5th, killing 15 British soldiers and wounding 23; and on the 11th another attacked the British post near Barberton, killing 3, wounding 5 and capturing 13.

American difficulties in the Philippines continue to be as exasperating as those of the British in the Transvaal country, and for reasons not very dissimilar. In a letter of October 29, just published, Judge Taft, the president of the Philippine commission, explained:

The reelection of President McKinley will be a long step toward the complete pacification of these islands and will, I hope, end what remains of the insurrection, which is now continued only for election purposes, to influence the result in America. . . .

But these assurances are not borne out by events. Though it is now five weeks since Mr. McKinley's reelection, the Filipinos are still fighting with the patriotic ardor that has characterized their resistance to invasion from the start. On the 7th

four engagements in Luzon were reported—one on the Nehico river, two near Bulacan and one near San Roque. Besides these, several minor engagements have recently been fought in Luzon; and from the island of Bohol increased military activity is reported. The Filipinos fall back at all contested points, avoiding battle, but they resume their positions as soon as the Americans get out of range. On the 11th an engagement was reported near Santa Cruz, Luzon, along with several minor encounters in the neighborhood. And so the story runs. It is probably worse than the regular dispatches indicate. For while the censorship has been removed, correspondents are still subject to military discipline. Moreover, the Hong-Kong correspondent of the London Mail, who is evidently not a Filipino sympathizer, declares, in his letter published on the 10th, that—

reliable mail advices from Manila show that the position of the Americans is becoming increasingly hopeless. Money is freely subscribed to purchase arms and ammunition that are imported for the insurgents. The Americans will never capture the rebel contraband running vessels. While, in order to flatter the official view the trade is flourishing, goods are permitted to be freely imported into Manila, they are distributed from that point to the insurgents, who are murdering and pillaging all sympathizers with Americans.

American casualties since July 1, 1898, inclusive of the current official reports given out in detail at Washington to December 12, 1900, are as follows:

Deaths to May 16, 1900 (see page 91)	1,847
Killed reported from May 16, 1900, to the date of the presidential election, November 6, 1900.....	100
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	468
<hr/>	
Total deaths to presidential election	2,415
Killed reported since presidential election	17
Deaths from wounds, disease and accident, same period	76
<hr/>	
Total deaths	2,508
Wounded since July 1, 1898	2,373
<hr/>	
Total casualties since July, '98....	4,881
Total casualties to last week.....	4,881
Total deaths to last week.....	2,508

Regarding the Chinese situation,

it now appears that the British minister has not yet received instructions to sign the joint note we summarized last week. All the other ministers, however, except the German, have been instructed to do so. The negotiations, therefore, await the action of the British and the German governments. Some difficulty has arisen with reference to the credentials of Li Hung Chang and Prince Ching, the Chinese envoys. They possess only telegraphic authority from the emperor. But it has been decided to waive this informality, and, as soon as the British and German ministers receive instructions to sign the joint note, to begin the negotiations with the envoys.

The twentieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, which opened at Louisville on the 6th, was made notable by the presence, as regular delegates, of three women and the occupation for a time of the president's chair by one of them—Miss Esther King. A warm debate took place on the 10th over a resolution requiring the federation "to go into the next national campaign with this single demand (direct legislation), upon which all lovers of freedom and justice can stand." The resolution was supported by socialist delegates, and opposed by those who object to political action by the federation as a body. By a vote of 70 to 50 it was lost; but a resolution indorsing the initiative and referendum was adopted—70 to 56. On the 12th, while adopting a resolution advocating the establishment of a governmental department of labor with its chief a cabinet officer; a clause in the resolution requiring such officer to be a bona fide trade unionist was defeated by a vote of 78 to 47. The federation is still in session.

NEWS NOTES.

—Russian reports indicate a renewal of Armenian massacres by the Kurds.

—The American Economic association will hold its thirteenth annual convention in Detroit December 27-8-9.

—In the Quebec provincial elections held on the 7th the liberals made almost a clean sweep, electing 67 members out of 74 in the provincial legislature.

—The Michigan state legislature met for the second time this year, in special session, in response to a call

by Gov. Pingree, to act on the taxation bills indorsed by the people at the recent election.

—Henry Russell, the famous English composer and song writer and the author of "A Life on the Ocean Wave" and "Cheer, Boys, Cheer," died in London on the 6th, aged 87 years.

—A bill providing for a popular vote on whether or not a constitutional convention shall be held in Alabama to eliminate the illiterate negro vote was passed by the legislature of that state on the 7th.

—The United States transport Hancock arrived at San Francisco from Manila on the 10th with the bodies of 1,500 soldiers and sailors who either were killed in battle or succumbed to wounds and disease in the Philippines and China.

—Hon. Charles A. Towne, recently appointed by Gov. Lind of Minnesota as the successor of the late Senator C. K. Davis, took the oath of office on the 10th. He will serve until the legislature elects a successor for Senator Davis, whose term expired March 4, 1901.

—Harvard won the annual debate with Yale for the third consecutive time at Cambridge on the 7th. The question debated was the desirability of the permanent retention of the Philippines. Harvard supported the affirmative side of the question. One of the Harvard debaters was a negro—Roscoe Conkling Bruce, son of the late Senator Bruce, of Mississippi.

—A strike of telegraphic operators on all the lines of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe railway was declared on the 8th by the Order of Railway Telegraphers. Twelve hundred operators quit work. New men were readily procured by the company, which now asserts that the backbone of the strike is broken. The strike leaders claim on the contrary that it is still effective.

—William M. Salter's lecture on "Fair Taxation and the Teachers' Grievance," which Mr. Salter was to have delivered before the Ethical society at Steinway hall, Chicago, at the regular Sunday morning meeting on the 9th, was postponed on account of Mr. Salter's illness and will be delivered on the 16th. On the same day at three o'clock in the afternoon Miss Margaret A. Haley will speak upon the same subject before the Henry George association at Handel hall, 40 Randolph street.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, and closes with the last issue of that publication at hand upon going to press.

Senate.

Dec. 3-8, 1900.

On Monday, December 3, Mr. Frye, as president pro tem. of the senate, called that body to order for the second session of the Fifty-sixth congress, which was opened

with the reading of President McKinley's annual message to congress (printed on page 2). After disposing of the message, memorial resolutions on the death of the late Senators Gear and Davis were adopted and W. P. Dillingham, of Vermont, was sworn in as successor of the late Mr. Morrill. Mr. Stewart introduced a bill on the 4th to create a supreme court for the Philippines, composed of five judges, with a salary of \$20,000 a year each, which was referred to the committee on Philippine affairs. Mr. J. P. Dolliver was sworn in as senator from Iowa to succeed the late Senator Gear, and the senate took up senate bill 727, entitled "An Act to Promote the Commerce and to Increase the Foreign Trade of the United States," more commonly known as the shipping subsidy bill, upon which Senator Frye spoke at length in favor of the passage of the bill. The consideration of this bill was continued on the 5th, when Mr. Frye finished his speech. On this day a bill was passed naming December 12 as a public holiday in the District of Columbia and providing for a celebration in honor of the centennial anniversary of the occupation of Washington as the nation's capital. No business of importance was transacted on the 6th, and on the 7th consideration of the shipping subsidy bill was resumed, after which the senate adjourned until Monday, the 10th.

House.

Speaker Henderson called the house to order on Monday, December 3, to listen to the reading of the president's annual message to congress. A bill providing for the centennial celebration, on the 12th, of the occupation of Washington as the nation's capital was passed on the 4th, and on the following day the house in committee of the whole began the consideration of the army reorganization bill, which authorizes the president to maintain a standing army with a minimum strength of 53,000 men and a maximum of 96,000. McCall (rep.), of Massachusetts, made a vigorous speech in opposition to the bill, the consideration of which was continued on the 6th when Littlefield's anti-canteen amendment, which is printed on page 111, was adopted after a lively debate, and the bill finally passed by a vote of 169 to 133. On the 7th consideration of the bill for the regulation and taxation of oleomargarine and other butter substitutes, commonly known as the Groust oleomargarine bill, which is printed on page 135, was begun, and after an interesting debate and the rejection of a substitute bill (printed on page 151), finally passed by a vote of 196 to 92. Nothing of importance occurred during the session of the 8th.

MISCELLANY

OUR CLOUDED STARS.

For The Public.

When that fair Queen of the Tropic Seas,
Beautiful Cuba, bleeding lay
At the tyrant's feet, and the southern breeze
Bore us her wall, each passing day.

We drew from its sheath our Sword of th' Free,
And smote the oppressor "hip and thigh,"
Resolved, that never, this side the sea,
Should Justice languish nor Freedom die.

And the world's best conscience said:
"Amen,"

And honored Our Flag and our heroes
there;

We were doing God's righteous service
then—

What of our service other where?

What of Our Flag in the farthest East?
Our childish greed and our broken faith?
Our bridal unbridaled of court or priest,
Whose dark bride pales to a pallid
wraith?

Do Our Stars still shine in the Philippine
sky?

"We bo't them," 'tis said, and 'twas well,
perhaps;—

Spain's greed and injustice we did not buy,

That freedom and progress and love
might lapse.

"Results accomplished," are words we hear,
As though an accomplished wrong must
stand,

And, despite the pitiful moan and tear,
A slave, once branded, must keep his
brand.

Black shame to us, now, that Our Stars are
dim,

That a cloud looms dark in our bannered
blue,—

Have we lost all reverent love for Him,
Whose golden precept still rings true?

"Do unto others," the Master said;—

We know the rule, with its shining gold,
The lesson that needs to be ever read;—

Is there yet time to find the fold?

UNION VETERAN.

A UNIVERSITY LOST.

An extract from the San Francisco Star's editorial on the recent dismissal of Prof. Ross from the faculty of Stanford university, published in the Star of November 17.

This week the state has lost what promised to be a great public institution, and has received in exchange a sort of sycophantic monument to the memory of Senator Stanford. Such an exchange is an incalculable loss to the state at large, and the loss is rendered greater by the fact that the institution which has been so degraded still masquerades under the old name.

Stanford university is no longer what its title implies. It is simply one more establishment for the glorification of its founder, and for the dissemination of such theories as its founder believed in. It is no more a university than is any subsidized newspaper or any penny-a-line biographer willing to depict his patron as having every virtue and all wisdom.

Stanford university has practically been reduced to the grade of a college during the past week, through the disclosures of narrow, arbitrary, and unprogressive management on the part of its absolute ruler—Mrs. Jane L. Stanford.

It has this week been made plain that it is intended to teach at this institution, not the truth as the brightest and most highly trained minds may see it, but the opinions of those who pay the salaries of the professors.

"A GHASTLY TRAGEDY."

A portion of a private letter written by a former captain in the British army, now residing in London, to an American friend.

Our election has gone khaki, as you say, but by no means to the extent that the physical force party expected—they expected to gain at least 50 seats.

In some respects I am sorry they did not. Five years of unrestrained indulgence in the brutalities of mili-

tarism would, I think, have done much to kill the evil thing.

But people are getting somewhat sobered over here. Given a spell of declining trade, which is by no means impossible, and the pinch would immediately be acutely felt. As it is, we are threatened with an enormous increase in the bill for human butchery appliances, apart from South Africa.

I ventured to predict that this latter affair would ultimately develop into a mere war of extermination, and it is so. Lord Roberts is proving himself better at that game than Weyler, and, in some respects, the equal of Alva and Tilly. The hopeless part of it is that he has the approval of the greater part of the people. A large number of the better-hearted and clearer-headed folks are against it, but what can they do now against the great mass of the brutalized who revel in this war, because it is with them one of revenge and hatred? As their apostle, Rudyard Kipling, puts it, "They are wiping something off a slate."

I cannot see how any profit is coming out of it. The war will cost from 120,000,000 to 150,000,000 pounds. If the mines have to bear the burden of it, there can necessarily be little left for the stockholders, because the capital will have to be repaid in 30 years. Few, if any, of the mines have more than 30 years to live. In addition, being a wasting security, stockholders have to replace their own capital. How they are going to do it, I don't know.

It is a ghastly tragedy, look at it how you will. The feather-brained democracy thought the business of stealing these two republics could be concluded in two months, at a cost of about ten or twelve millions. Their bestial press, the Times, Telegraph, Standard, Daily Mail, assured them of it. And, behold! 12,000 English slain, or died of disease, 40,000 more practically dead for all the good they will ever do in this world, and Christianity—where? It is a shameful, an infamous episode in the career of a nation that calls itself great. It bodes no good for the future.

FRENCH INFORMATION IN REGARD TO THE SITUATION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

A news article translated for The Public from the Revue Diplomatique of November 18. The Revue Diplomatique is published in Paris every Sunday, 17 Boulevard Haussman; August Meulmans, editor.

The representative of the Philippine republic in Paris has communicated to

the newspapers a long telegram on the situation in the archipelago.

According to that information the greatest disorder reigns in Manila, and the commander in chief of the American forces, not being able to conquer the resisting Filipinos, employs the same processes of coercion which the English are using in the Transvaal.

The natives who refuse to comply with the municipal decrees, which require that they should recognize the American sovereignty, are imprisoned. At Cebu, 411 Filipinos have thus been incarcerated, and there only remain 71 electors to constitute the municipality.

All attacks of Filipino troops upon American detachments are immediately punished by the pillage and burning of the villages and the imprisonment of the inhabitants without defense, including women and children. The prisoners are employed upon public works.

At Mongondo, in the province of Cavite, the Americans forcibly entered the house of the Filipino Gen. Riego de Dios, and carried off all articles of value, after having ill-treated the aunt and the sister of the insurgent chief.

The American prisoners who were in the hands of the Filipinos at Mindoro. Arayat and Abra, have been set at liberty. Twenty of them have requested to be allowed to enter the ranks of the Filipino army.

In spite of all the violence which has been brought to bear not more than 1,000 Filipinos out of 10,000,000 have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States.

A manifesto signed by 2,000 inhabitants of Manila has just been addressed to the American congress, asking for the independence of the islands.

The Filipino representative in Paris, Mr. Agoncillo, is also addressing the American people on the eve of the presidential election, requesting them to apply to the Philippines the principles of their own declaration of independence. He declares that the insurgents will persevere without ceasing in their struggle for liberty—a struggle which it would have been impossible to sustain until now, had they not had the support of the whole Filipino people.

In his capacity of president of the Philippine republic, Aguinaldo signed last August a decree in which, inspired by the most liberal considerations, he ordered all the American prisoners to be put at liberty, only requiring that they should deliver up their arms, and furnishing to them the necessary means to reach such destination as they should fix upon. The American

soldiers who should give themselves up were to receive 80 pesos for each rifle, and might, if they wished, establish themselves in the country under the protection of the Filipino authorities; they would not be admitted into the ranks of the native army.

A PETITION FOR A PETITION AGAINST AMERICAN ATROCITIES IN THE PHILIPPINES.

For The Public.

For the sake of humanity, let us do something to stop this horror. Innocent multitudes are made homeless and are even murdered by American soldiers in our imperial colonies.

No, I do not refer to the war of subjugation in the Philippines. I refer to what no civilized man calls war, but looting and massacre. If we can trust reports in republican papers, this devastation has already begun; but it is as yet as nothing compared with what it soon will be if the "feelers" in the shape of propositions of "military experts" for "sterner" measures in suppressing the rebellion should meet with approval from the American public.

It is of no use to protest against the war itself. Our last election proved that we stand on too low a level of civilization yet to repudiate the basest war of subjugation in history. But I do hope that we have yet enough manhood left to demand that in this war our soldiers obey the rules of civilized warfare.

The following barbarity is proposed, and it seems already sporadically practiced: Wherever the American soldiers are shot at, the whole neighborhood is to be devastated, and the destitute inhabitants—women and children among them—driven into the woods to perish by hunger and exposure. Prisoners of war, especially if caught singly, are to be executed for murder and arson.

If every man in the Philippines were a rebel, this would still mean the murder of countless innocent women and children who never have lifted their hands against the august power of the American empire. And one must go back to the darkest days of the Thirty Years' War to find another instance in history where nations calling themselves civilized executed prisoners of war.

And if our college presidents, professors and bishops, in and out of the Philippine commissions, have not lied to us in their very expensive reports, the majority, the vast majority of the natives want American rule. The rebels are only a small minority of des-

perate adventurers. Then how enormous is not the crime of destroying a whole loyal village just because a band of robbers happen to invest the neighboring jungle!

Fellow citizens, can we stand this?

No! Every civilized person rightly outside of prison and madhouse can have but one opinion on this subject. **THESE ATROCITIES MUST STOP.**

Could not the "Public," the "Nation," and, for that matter, every paper that claims to stand for civilization, start a crusade against this the deepest disgrace of the American name? Could not petitions be started by these papers; and could we not thus exert a sufficient pressure on congress to have this "crowning" shame of the nineteenth century stopped before the beginning of the twentieth?

All decent people would sign such a petition. Only thugs and human hyenas would think of refusing. I have many republican friends and acquaintances, and though they voted to continue the war, not one would want to authorize a massacre. Most of them voted for the war on the impression that thus would peace and quiet be most quickly restored in the unhappy islands. So I feel confident that I voice the sentiment of every respectable American when I propose that we demand **THAT THE AMERICANS MUST BEHAVE AS CIVILIZED BEINGS, EVEN IN THE PHILIPPINES.**

P. M. MAGNUSSON.

St. Cloud, Minn.
Dec. 4, 1900.

WHAT THE SHIP FELLOWS SAY.

"I don't know very much about legislation," remarked the shoe clerk, "but I can't see any great benefit the people will derive by the passage of the ship subsidy bill."

"Mr. Shoe Clerk, your ignorance is appalling," said the inspired idiot. "It is a sad commentary on the boasted intelligence of the American people when a man with your sized head can't see the common advantages coming from a ship subsidy law. In the first place, it is a practical demonstration of the truth that it is a heap better to give than to receive. The revenue stamp act did a little along this line, but the ship subsidy law will bring it home to you in an express wagon.

"The ship companies go down to Washington and say to congress:

"Gentlemen, the American people are paying foreign ship owners more than \$100,000,000 a year for carrying our freight. This vast sum rightfully belongs to American ship owners, whom we are proud to represent. We build the best vessels in the world and

to-day we have more orders than we can handle. Now we should like to get that 100,000,000 plunks, but we feel that the American people ought to pay us for going after it. You, gentlemen, can't expect us to earn \$100,000,000 a year without being paid for our trouble. You are intelligent men, and it is not necessary for us to tell you what a good thing this is for the peepul.'

"If you didn't have an impediment of the intellect, Mr. Shoe Clerk, you could see the mule sense of the ship men's argument. They want to do what they can to reestablish the American merchant marine and keep those hundred millions from dropping into the pockets of the degraded and pauper ship owners of Europe. Now, if labor is worthy of its hire, packing freight across the raging main ought to be worthy of its subsidy. Think of the perils of the American ship owner declaring dividends while his good ship is far away on the bounding wave! He doesn't know what minute she may get in a storm and the passengers adopt resolutions thanking the captain for his gallant conduct in saving a bag of American potatoes from being washed overboard. Think of the danger he runs as he tacks into the treasury and draws his hard-earned subsidy, kicking himself because he didn't ask congress for a bigger one.

"Shipbuilding in this country has been going on only a hundred years, and, therefore, is an infant industry. It is in the nature of an experiment. If it is fed a little subsidy food it may pull through. It takes two or three thousand years for shipbuilding to pass through the measles and mump age, and then it has to have the croup and typhoid fever. If it survives these there is hope. Right now is the critical time and the application of a hot subsidy may bring the bed-ridden kid through all right.

"You never will be a captain of industry, Mr. Shoe Clerk, for there is too much of the lobster in your makeup. If you were out of a job and heard of one paying \$12 a week you would not apply for it. If you were not two-thirds lobster you would see the wonderful possibilities within your reach. Instead of grabbing at the job as if you hadn't had a meal ticket in a year, you would go to Washington and ride in a cab up to the capitol. Then you would hand some three-for-a-halves to the members of the committee and get busy.

"Gentlemen,' you'd say, 'I have been offered a job at \$12 a week. I

have been out of work for 54 years and I am stopping with my wife's folks till I can get something to do. I need work like the dickens, but I can't afford to take the job. I came here to make you a proposition. If you will subsidize me I will take the position. It is needless for me to point out the incalculable benefits the American peepul would derive from my going to work. But you can see I can't afford to work for a salary unless I am paid from taking it from the cashier.'

"Talk that way and you will be breveted a captain of industry, with the promise of promotion at the first vacancy. Don't touch that \$12-a-week job, or you will be deranked for actions unbecoming an officer. You will notice that the ship companies are not rushing after that hundred-million freight business till they know what congress is going to do with the subsidy bill.

"The American peepul are cheerful givers. Just let them get the notion that something or other is for the benefit of an industry in the foundling home and they begin to dig in their jeans. It is a noble spirit and is easily worked. A few years ago the southern sugar planters said all they needed to make life an endless round of pleasure was a subsidy. Did the national government have one it wasn't using? If so, send it down prepaid. Congress looked over its stock of subsidies and found one not in use. It was a small one for \$8,000,000.

"It is the best we have at present,' said congress, 'but you are welcome to it if it will be of any use to you.'

"It will help a little,' said the planters. 'We are raising the best sugar in the world and our forefathers did before us, too, but we thought that a subsidy or two would liven things up a little. Please send the subsidy by certified check and as often as possible.'

"We are a great peepul, Mr. Shoe Clerk, and we hand a punch on the jaw to the man who says we are not. We are ready to protect ourselves at any stage in the road and we will go out of our way to protect our industries, infant or otherwise. 'Have a subsidy or a protection with us,' we yell. 'What do we care for money; brother's rich and father draws a pension. Fill 'em up again, them on us.' Some day we will vote a subsidy for every man, woman and child on earth. What are subsidies for, anyway, if not to use?'—Chicago News of Dec. 8.

THE TURN OF THE TIDE.

The following account of the recent meeting in New York of the New York State Conference of Religion, was written for The Public by the Rev. W. B. Allis, of Plymouth church, Brooklyn.

Quietly following the imposing Fifth avenue parade of the recent political campaign, there gathered in New York city a convention which has an interest reaching outside state lines. This was the meeting of the New York state conference of religion. Rarely does a gathering call out a stronger list of speakers, but as the addresses are to be published they are here passed over. The significance of the meeting is in the gathering itself even more than in its utterances.

Less ambitious than the world's parliament of religions in range, it yet was a force where the parliament was simply a comparison. This was a conference of religion, not of religions. It began with a frank recognition of differences in worship and religious belief. Yet there was no hysterical appeal for a basis of agreement. It declared quietly but positively: We are agreed. One felt that this was no attempt at picking out distinctive features of each form of faith represented and building them into a Nebuchadnezzar's image which would have after all the weakness of the clay. Nothing was said about theology, religions or sects. There was complete agreement that to dwell on these at such a time would be mere quibbling. It would be just as sensible to collect a dozen leaves from as many trees and try to discover a single basis of unity in them. The unity is in the earth, mother of them all. And so this conference went back to religion, declaring that it alone, because common to the life of all men, can be made the basis of unity. Church, state, schools, politics, business, all unorganized religious forces—these are the channels in which religion runs and not religion itself. Any attempt to create one church, or to save the world by one idea, or to unite men in one credal worship is the attempt to build a dam across the river of God and make of all humanity one great lake. Even if it could be done it would simply mean stagnation.

It needs no prophet to see that this conference has put the whole question of religious unity on a new and permanent basis—on religion rather than any expression of religion. More than that it proved unity to be possible. Here taking part in a single session were a Congregationalist as president, a Baptist as secretary, a Methodist as chairman, a Unitarian, Episcopalian,

Hebrew, Baptist, Socialist and Presbyterian as speakers. And these men were there not to declare the goodness of each particular house of faith (the Baptist found fault with his denomination as being too narrow), but to speak in brave, strong words for those who while religious at heart are outside the organized religious life, for the outcast of the world, and for the social righteousness which shall mark the coming of the kingdom of God upon the earth. Equally remarkable was the devotional service of each session. It was not a side issue, as so often, attended by a few conscientious souls and meeting before the real business of the convention, but a part of each session after people had gathered. A book of common worship had been prepared by a Hebrew, an Episcopalian and a Unitarian. No one claims that this book is a finality. It served its purpose, however, in voicing the common spirit of reverence which so pervaded the whole gathering that it could be felt. The conference was inspired with a faith that God meets with men—all men. It realized its faith.

But, after all, it was the message of the conference which lingers as marking the turn of the tide. There was here no romancing of social dreamers or coldness of mere ethical philosophy. Social and ethical believers were there with the rest. Yet every plea for a purer ethics and real brotherhood was made to glow with the spirit which was in Christ himself. Although on a broad basis which some are disposed to call only natural religion, this conference measured up to the highest that revealed religion can teach. Hebrew and Christian alike spoke and listened with a passionate eagerness, and both echoed the same amen. Neither in social congresses nor in ethical schools have I listened to such fearless, positive application of religion to life. Men realized here, some for the first time, that not only is religion common to all men, but that there is no thorough-going cure for human ills except the religious. A social Elijah coming here from his cave heard the still small voice. An ethical John the Baptist would have listened to a message which would have taught him beyond all questioning that men are preaching a gospel to the poor and outcast which will be marked by increasing wisdom and effectiveness. The old-type individualist would have gone away sobered and thoughtful over the note which will be heard again and again—the single rather than the double standard of ethics in business, in society, and in private life. A corpora-

tion building itself on brutal methods of stifling competition and buying special privileges, would have been startled at hearing such methods denounced in fearless words as unbusiness-like, unethical and un-Christian. The very fact that this note was struck so forcibly in the conservative commercial center of the country is a proof that the tide is beginning to flow from speculative toward applied religion. Neither pulpit, nor press, nor school, nor office can any longer escape a like fearless dealing with these questions of human life. They are no longer the burden of this ism or that reformer. Henceforth they are the burden of religion in whatever form.

This conference has left a high optimism. It has shed not only light but sweetness. In place of the sense of jarring discord in religion it has shown the web of a common faith already uniting men. It has taught us not to waste any more time in seeking a common ground, but to begin work on the ground which is even now common. Men are seeing that unity is not in religious expression, but in religious men. This tide of which this conference is only a wave, setting so strongly toward applied religion, is not of men but of God. There is no longer a social or political or business problem as such. At heart they all are religious, for men are God's humanity.

Brooklyn, N. Y., Nov. 30, 1900.

THE INJUSTICE OF OUR PATENT LAWS.

For The Public.

When the question of amending or doing something else with our patent laws comes up—as it doubtless will shortly — for discussion, the professors and presidents of our colleges and universities and their satellites, the consolidated aggregation of "business men" and wise boys generally, who know almost nothing about the question, will in all probability have more advice to deal out than you could spread over a ten-acre lot. It is because of the fear of being lost in the shuffle later on, that I desire now to say a few words on the subject from the standpoint of an inventor, who has been "up against" what appears like a brace game.

The theory of the patent law resembles that of a contract between the public and the inventor. The public agrees, in consideration of the inventor's telling all about his invention instead of keeping it secret, to hand him a vested right or monopoly for a certain time in what is

new and useful in his invention. Hence patents are not valid if any essential part of them is withheld, and if a patent should have been granted for anything already belonging to the public, it will be inoperative. The purpose of the law is to encourage invention, by the stimulus of the large reward which a monopoly of any useful instrument must yield.

The patent office is a branch of the interior department, and has a commissioner with a large staff and three examiners in chief.

Patent laws are of comparatively recent origin. Nothing like them was known to the ancients. In England the idea is but little more than 200 years old, and the patent law in France bears date of 1791. The patent laws in the United States rest on a statute of 1790 and others made subsequently. The latest amendment was made in 1861.

In a nut shell, the law as it now stands provides for a patent being granted the original inventor of anything new and useful, provided application for patent be made within two years of the time the idea was first employed. If, for instance, an inventor be employed for more than two years before an application is filed with the patent office at Washington, it is public property, according to the law, and no patent will be granted if the facts are known to the commissioner.

If the fact of the invention having been employed, as above set forth, is withheld from the commissioner, and he, in his ignorance of the true state of affairs, grants a patent, anyone can make complaint, and the court will, upon proof being furnished, vacate the grant, and the patent will be worthless.

With this preliminary statement, I wish to call attention to the fact that there are two sorts of things that ideas may be employed in.

First, things that need never be sold and that are used solely for the purpose of making other things; such as machinery for making boots, cloth or pins. The inventor of this sort of thing could keep his invention secret, and enjoy all the accruing advantages that any patent monopoly could assist him to.

Second, things that must be sold if any pecuniary benefit is to be derived from the idea employed. This includes such things as engines, bicycles and automobiles, and things to keep doors closed. The inventor

of this sort of things could not keep his invention secret, to his commercial advantage.

With these preliminary remarks, let me call attention to the fact that patents are frequently granted on things never put to practical use. These patents are a constant block to progress in the arts. In fact, every patent is to a greater or less degree a menace to inventors. To illustrate: I recently invented a voting machine that is so far ahead of anything of the kind yet invented that none of the others are even a good second. I had never seen even a drawing of any other voting machine before I had my plan completed. When I came to examine the patent records, I found that 76 patents had already been granted on voting machines, and I know of only one that is in actual use. Now these 76 patents tie up almost every conceivable mechanical movement in the deck, and though my machine is entirely new, and many of its points are broadly novel, I can't build it without infringing some one of these 76 patents, though 75 of them have never been put to use, and probably never will be. My experience is that, of all patents issued, this fairly illustrates the ratio in which they are actually used. My machine will probably never be built, at least not by me. This is one way the patent laws operate to land the inventor in "Queer street." Here is another:

A little less than two years ago I invented an important device in connection with ——. I succeeded in getting capital interested in my invention, with the understanding that the money would be forthcoming, if on investigation the patents proved to be valid, and if the devices covered by them did not infringe existing patents.

While the attorneys for the capitalists were engaged in making the required investigation, I secured a contract which had in it a provision that some responsible party should guarantee the customer protection against any litigation that might arise from the use of my invention. The customer required this because of the threats that had been made by a trust which controls nearly all the business in the line. These threats were in the form of letters, which called attention to the fact that they (the trust) owned many patents, and that it was scarcely possible that any system of ——— could be built without infringing their patents.

Shortly after I secured this con-

tract the capitalists received from their attorneys a report on the patents. The report was all that could be wished for. It stated that the invention was "broadly novel," and that any suit brought against its employment could be "successfully defended."

When, however, the capitalists saw what was required by the first customer in the way of protection against litigation, they refused to advance the money unless some one could be found who would act as guarantor for the company. They refused to act in the capacity themselves, because of the obligation involved, and others refused for the same reason. Up to this time I have spent about \$6,000, and nearly two years' time, trying to get my invention on the market. If the patent laws had been so drawn that once a patent was granted it became inviolable and unassailable, I should have experienced no difficulty in exploiting my invention. If, on the other hand, there had been no patent laws whatever, I should have turned my invention over to my employers, and continued in their employ. Nearly all inventors take the latter course, anyway. Take, for instance, such a concern as the Western Electric company. They employ about 50 draftsmen, who are constantly working on special machinery, and, incidental to the problems they have to contend with, they discover new and useful things. Almost invariably the patents on these inventions are assigned to the company, and the inventors get nothing for them—not even, a pleasant look.

A friend of mine has invented a machine for making type. It is by far the most important and ingenious invention in the art. It enables him to do for two cents what it now costs the trust 32 cents to do. If no patent laws existed, he could keep his invention secret for years; as it is, he is in danger of losing, at any moment, the advantage his invention gives him. Witness his dilemma. If he takes out a patent on it, the trust can get a copy of the specifications and use his ideas in a machine somewhat differently constructed. If he tries to keep his invention secret, the trust can make claim in court that he is infringing their patents, and the court will compel him to make a full disclosure of his secret to experts in order that intelligent evidence may be submitted. This evidence will completely expose his invention, and if he has used it for more than two years

it will be common property, and the trust can make an exact duplicate of it. In any event, his advantage will be gone. Turn it any way you please, and the patent laws make an inventor look like a five-cent piece with a hole in it.

If a poor man invents some article which he agrees to let others use on a royalty it will not be long before he discovers that some concerns are using it without having made any arrangement with him. He can sue the infringers, but it will cost him all he gets from his royalties to carry on his suit, and in the end he may lose the case. If he wins, he is no better off than he was before he began the suit, because some one else may start in at the same game at any time, and he will have the same ground to go over again. Of course, if his patent is not valuable, no one will bother him with infringements; likewise if he has a white elephant, he need not spend much time or money to prevent its being stolen. In fact, he may frequently wish some one would steal it. I have a patent now that I understand a man is preparing to infringe. I understand this man is going to build a machine according to the specifications I furnished the patent office. I hope he will, because I don't like him.

Some people—mostly those who have never been burnt—will say in answer to all this: "Well, isn't it a fact that some inventors do well on their inventions?" My answer is: "Yes, it is true some of them do. It is also true that occasionally a man gets struck by lightning, but it is not often; and just as you do not regard the danger of being struck by lightning great enough to be continually guarding against it, so I do not believe that, simply because an occasional inventor is benefited by them, we should maintain patent laws that for the most part can only result in annoyance to inventors.

The importance of the information afforded the public through the operation of the patent laws is another very much exaggerated bit of buncombe. The best information on mechanics is to be found in books and magazines devoted to the art. Here are to be found splendid articles, written by men who, by actual experience, are qualified to teach. Scarcely any inventor ever thinks of searching the patent records for ideas. Certainly no mechanic would do so.

The advance made during recent years in surgery and therapeutics has, I believe, been quite as important as

in mechanics; yet there are no laws to artificially encourage invention in this direction. It is of the very nature of things that men delight in letting the world know the result of their investigations (that is what prompted me to write this article), and if they are left free and unhampered to use their genius, as they will, their work will be all the greater for it.

F. M. J.

The game is done and the darkness
Falls on the vanquished team
Like balm upon their bruises—
Or plaster—or cold cream.
And a feeling of sadness comes o'er me,
That is almost akin to pain,
As I silently count the dollars
I lost on that football game.
—The Club Fellow.

Some folks have a mistaken idea that philanthropist must necessarily be wealthy.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

Investors doubtless feel the need of some handy publication to which they may refer for data of American "Industrial" securities. To supply this need John Moody has compiled and edited "Moody's Manual of Industrial and Miscellaneous Securities" (New York, 6 Wall St.: The O. C. Lewis Co.), a book of over 1,100 pages. It is an annual publication, the first number being the issue for 1900. Although intended primarily for the convenience of investors, this manual is a handy reference book for writers and speakers on public questions, and also for the intelligent newspaper reader. It is arranged in twelve sections. The first of these comprises a directory of the stock exchange members of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and Boston, together with financial statements of all New York moneyed institutions and details of United States and foreign government securities. The succeeding eight sections are devoted to the data of eight different classes of industrial corporations, inclusive of mining and water companies, while the tenth and eleventh deal respectively with miscellaneous corporations and guaranteed railroad stocks, and the twelfth contains articles on the corporation laws of New Jersey, Delaware and West Virginia. The work is emphatically a directory of trusts; and as its chief object is to furnish information to the investing public, its data may be relied upon when cited for purposes of economic controversy, as having the flavor of authority.

The edition of "The Public" this week is 6,000.

Lectures by S. W. SAMPLE of MINNEAPOLIS.

POLITICS AND ECONOMICS:

1. The Political Economy of the Lord's Prayer.
2. Direct Legislation.
3. The Trust Problem.
4. The Lost Chord of Christianity.
5. Americanism vs. Imperialism.

PROPHETS OF THE PRESENT CENTURY:

1. Ralph Waldo Emerson.
2. Victor Hugo.
3. Count Tolstoy.
4. Henry George.

GENERAL TOPICS:

1. The Drama of Human Life.
2. The Cost and Power of Ideas.
3. Abraham Lincoln.
4. Arouet de Voltaire.
5. Lessons from Longfellow.
6. Lowell and Whittier.
7. Heroic Sides of Unheroic People as Shown by Charles Dickens.

Address: S. W. SAMPLE, Minneapolis, Minn.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 616, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Telephone, Main 2711.

HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
805 Chamber of Commerce Building,
CHICAGO.

NELLIE CARLIN,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
1202 Ashland Block, Chicago.
Telephone Central 925.

Houston.

EWING & RING,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
HOUSTON, TEXAS.
Fresley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call. 1358 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.



The Best Flour is H. R. Eagle & Co.'s BEST

Made from the finest
Minnesota Hard Wheat
by the Most Improved
Process. TRY IT.

H. R. EAGLE & CO., 76 and 78 Wabash Ave.,
CHICAGO, ILL.

HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

LECTURES GIVEN AT
HANDEL HALL,
40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor,
EVERY SUNDAY AFTERNOON
At 3 o'clock sharp.

Program for Sunday, December 16th:

Miss Catherine Goggin,
President of The Chicago Teachers' Federation, and
Miss Margaret Haley,
"THE INSIDE AND OUTSIDE HISTORY
OF OUR TAX FIGHT."

ADMISSION FREE!

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,
1401 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

To Smoke or Not to Smoke is Not the Question if they are MOOS' CIGARS.

J. & B. MOOS,
95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn Street,
CHICAGO, ILL.

BOOK BARGAINS

Encyclo. Britannica, Scribner's. Cost \$150. \$40.00
Medical and Surgical History of War of Re-
bellion. 8 volumes. 25.00
Hitchcock's Bible Analysis, 1/2 Morocco.
Cost \$7 50. 2.50
Sidgwick's Political Economy. Cost \$4. 2.00
Cunningham's Theol. gy. 4 vols. Cost \$24. 3.75
Stier's Words of Jesus. 3 vols. Cost \$13. 2.75
Book of Mormon, Morocco. Lamont, 1874. 2.00
Life of Henry George, new. 1.50
Plain talk in Psalm and Parable. Crosby. New 1.50

Prices include all charges. Condition guaranteed or return at my expense. For any book on earth write to **H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter,** Catalog Free. **CONNEAUT, OHIO.**

THE PUBLIC

will be sent to any address in the
United States, Canada or Mexico.

ON TRIAL

for the purpose of introducing it to
new readers, for the term of

SIX WEEKS

for

TEN CENTS

Send subscriptions with addresses
to **THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago.**