

The Public

Dr. HJ Woodhouse
Nov 3-00 Box 511

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 5, 1900.

Number 109.

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.

President McKinley's oriental dependent, the polygamous sultan of Sulu, though not what we call civilized in domestic relationships, is capable of giving points to his suzerain chief as to one phase of civilization. He knows that the foreigner does not pay tariff taxes. So at least the newspapers imply. They tell of his complaining to the British that the Americans, in disregard of a treaty of 1877 between Great Britain, Spain and Germany, in which Germany guarantees free trade for his dominions, have established a tariff that nearly doubles the prices of the goods that his subjects import.

By his resolution in the senate, demanding the evacuation of Cuba by the 4th of July, Senator Mason shows how vastly superior in shrewdness as a politician he is to the fatuous crowd in his party that surrounds McKinley. No one thing could do more at this moment to restore confidence in the republican party than the actual withdrawal of our troops from that be-deviled island. It would prove, what nothing less can prove, that the administration has no designs upon the independence of Cuba. If the republican party goes into the campaign with American military forces still in Cuba, it will confront a universal conviction that Cuba is to be Puerto-Ricanized.

The assessments of franchise values in New York city, under the new law, have been reduced by the state tax commission by \$41,323,631. In the case of the Metropolitan Traction company the reduction is over \$9,000,-

000. In that of the Manhattan Elevated it is about the same. While the reduction for the Brooklyn Rapid Transit is over \$6,000,000. From these figures one thing is very obvious. Either the original assessments were grossly excessive, or the reduction is scandalously corrupt. No such differences in the valuation of franchises could be made honestly. The probability is that the original assessments, though high were not excessive, and that the reduction is the result of some exceedingly strenuous pull.

That was a great joke on our Canadian friends at Windsor, who thought to rebuke some American school children for sending a message of sympathy to Oom Paul, by encouraging their school children to send a like message to Aguinaldo. So many Americans recognized the propriety of such a proceeding, not as a rebuke to any of their fellow citizens, but as a tribute to one of the weaker peoples fighting for liberty, that the school authorities at Windsor were overwhelmed with encouraging letters from the states. This incident may forcibly help our patriotic Canadian brethren to understand that some at least of the sympathy of this country for the South Africans, whose independence is threatened by British jingoes, is inspired by no traditional antipathy to Englishmen, but springs from the same democratic impulse that finds expression at home in sympathy for Aguinaldo's people whose independence is threatened by American jingoes.

The recalcitrant republicans of the house have taken advantage of the necessity of modifying the Puerto Rico government act, to force an amendment of the great franchise grab clause. And they have suc-

ceeded. Under this amendment, certain franchises must be approved by the president before they become operative, and all franchises are to be subject to amendment, alteration and repeal. There is a measure of safety here. Aside from the manifest outrage of allowing a foreign government to deal out franchises for any people under any circumstances without their consent, it probably makes the franchise clause unobjectionable. Not that the requirement that the president approve is of much value. A president who belongs outright to the great plundering interests of the country, who was elected by them and depends upon them chiefly for renomination and reelection, is not likely to disturb their plans to any serious degree. But in the reserved right to repeal, there is at least promise of ultimate protection to the Puerto Ricans from American franchise grabbers.

It is interesting just now to watch the trade and financial papers in their struggle with the McKinley "prosperity" problem. When the bottom dropped out of steel, it burst all their pretty soap bubbles. If prices hadn't been cut, they could have charged Gates with arbitrarily making ducks and drakes of investors, consumers, workingmen and all, and called him "a real wicked man." But the price of steel did drop. It had to. Gates had not created a bad situation, he had taken advantage of one. So the truth is beginning to come out. We have not had any genuine firmly based prosperity. It has been all soap bubbles — pretty to look upon but dreadfully sensitive to the touch.

One of the first financial papers to recognize the true character of our "prosperity" is in all respects the best paper of its class—the Commercial

and Financial Chronicle, of New York. In its issue of April 21, it says, referring to the Gates episode:

Of course we all know that such a circus as described above could not have been gotten up were the market and its surroundings in a perfectly normal state. There are conditions now existing which encourage attacks; we have often referred to them. Among others, prices of stocks and commodities are high, and, depending as they do for stability not upon present dividends but anticipations of future developments which may or may not be realized, they are easily broken on any plausible rumor. High prices for securities which have no support but such as is afforded by hopes of dividends or increased dividends not yet earned are based on so narrow and tottering a foundation that they are a promising object for a gunning expedition of any man ingenious enough to devise a few collateral developments, as, for instance, like closing mills and bearish telegrams and cables from centers of activity at home and abroad.

Precisely. Stocks and commodities which depend for stability "not upon present dividends but anticipations of future developments which may or may not be realized," are the kind that represent the prosperity of which the masses have heard so much and experienced so little. Such prosperity is a delicate thing, and that is the reason stress is laid by prosperity "touters" upon what they call "confidence." Without confidence, a prosperity that depends upon "hopes of dividends or increased dividends not yet earned," is of few days and full of trouble.

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, from which we take the foregoing, is greatly troubled also about the increasing tendency of gold to leave the country. Not that it cares so much for the departing gold. But it cannot reconcile this tendency with the splendid trade balances which our excessive exports have established in our favor. After reviewing the figures it suggests that their chief significance is—

the anomaly presented by the high rates of foreign exchange ruling in the face of such a trade balance as we have now fled up.

Anomaly indeed. And since that was written gold has actually begun to go.

This leads the Springfield Republican to remark:

For 15 months past, we have exported \$641,851,167 more in merchandise, gold and silver, than we have imported, and the conclusion of it all is that gold is to be exported. Have we been giving away so much property as that? Have we so much loaned abroad that we are willing to lend more? Or is the balance largely or entirely fictitious? Before hurrahing further over the big trade balance, it would be well to determine whether it actually exists or not.

That is exactly the point. Does any trade balance exist? In other words do the statistics of excessive exports imply that the United States is piling up a balance against which it may draw, as a customer may draw against his account at the bank, or do they imply that it is about so much to the bad? We have all along insisted that statistics of excessive exports imply a drain, and now events begin to prove our contention in a somewhat startling manner.

A New York judge of the suggestive name of Freedman, is entitled to the prize for carrying government by injunction to the furthest limits yet. Of course it is in a trade union case. This injunction forbids "picketing," in which respect it is not unique. But it also enjoins the labor organizations sued—

from paying or offering or promising to pay to any former employe of the plaintiffs any sum of money for the purpose of inducing such person or persons to refuse to enter plaintiffs' employment, and from paying and promising to pay to any former employe of the plaintiffs any sum of money for the purpose of continuing organized, concerted and combined action on the part of said former employes of plaintiffs, with the object and purpose of interfering with and preventing the plaintiffs from carrying on their business.

There is a plain case of forbidding by arbitrary court order the carrying on of a peaceable labor strike. Its transparent purpose was to break up the strike by depriving the strikers of pecuniary support, and it is difficult to conceive that the judge who issued the injunction did not consciously participate in that purpose. Before an appeal could be taken the purpose

would be accomplished; and the labor union officers who violated this clause of the injunction, while scrupulously obeying it in other respects, are justified in their course. The legality of the injunction can be determined by the higher courts in proceedings on contempt just as well as by appeal from the injunction, and meantime the rights of the strikers will be preserved. Judge Freedman's injunction belongs to the kind of judicial actions that give strength to a growing conviction that courts are the agents of the rich and the enemies of the poor.

Admiral Dewey's Chicago reception fell far short of being a successful affair. The sidewalks along the line of procession were only fringed with people, and there was but little decoration of buildings. The manifest failure of this demonstration may have been due in great part to the willingness of its original promoters that it should fail. This explanation has been suggested. But we are ready to be convinced that it was in greatest measure due to the fact that the glamour of military heroism is losing its charms. That the greatest military hero of the Spanish war should have been received with so little enthusiasm on the second anniversary of his distinguishing victory is certainly evidence of a better spirit regarding military heroes. At least we incline to look upon it in that way. Not that military heroes have no proper place in human affairs. They have. But at best they represent a function we should be glad to get rid of and dread to foster. It is proper to reward them for their services, and to reward them with distinction for distinguished service. But to recognize military service as the noblest of all, is to turn backward in the path of progress. It is cause for congratulation, therefore, that Dewey as the hero of Manila bay is so soon forgotten.

In saying this we are not unmindful of the effect upon public opinion of Dewey's conduct subsequent to his

victory over the helpless Montejó. His pitiable exhibition of moral cowardice with reference to the Filipinos, with whom he formed an alliance which he afterwards tried to deny at the instance of the administration, must have had a prejudicial effect upon his popularity. McKinley's casting him aside like a squeezed lemon after "making use" of him as he confessed to "making use" of Aguinaldo, must also have had an influence; for this threw him into the shadow with all the powerful newspaper and other agencies of the administration. The ridiculous gift-house affair, too, was a factor in undoing him. And, then, to cap all, he made an astounding exposure when he concluded to run for president. The influence of all these circumstances we fully recognize. But a military hero is not so easily unhorsed. He holds the affections of a military people in spite of intellectual and moral weaknesses, in spite of his exposing himself to ridicule, in spite of everything except the one fact that he is a military hero. For that reason we incline to believe what we hope, that Dewey's decline is really due to the fact that the American people are losing their morbid disposition to exalt military heroes.

The pneumatic tube swindle in connection with the post office system received a temporary knock down last week in the lower house of congress. Representative Moody charged open bribery to promote legislation in its favor, and other members explained that the government was paying annual rentals in excess of the capitalized value. This explanation would indicate that the tube people have taken a lesson from the railroad people, who charge the post office department more for the rent of a postal car for one year than the car could be built for. But the tube people are somehow not "up to snuff." Their swindle, unlike that of the railroad, has been voted down. A motion to strike out the appropriation for pneumatic tube service was adopted by 87 to 50. This ought not to cripple the

postal service. It only raises a question of whether the postal department shall maintain its own pneumatic service system or leave it to the corruption of private contracting. On that question there should be no disinterested dispute. A postal pneumatic service is legitimately no more a private business than is the cancelling of stamps.

The disposition of the senate, though by a slender majority, to suppress a declaration of sympathy with the Boers in their struggle to maintain the independence of their republics, is not a gratifying fact. Under the circumstances it is deplorable. For a distinct impression had been created that the American government sympathizes with the British. This impression is deepened by the attitude of the administration, and it will be deepened still further if the senate remains silent upon the subject. So it will go abroad that the British, in the war of subjugation they are waging, have the sympathy of the American people. Yet that is not the fact. The American people, by an overwhelming majority, sympathize with the Boers. No one of intelligence here doubts this. Every observer knows it to be true. Max O'Rell, who has just returned from this country to England, assures the English of it. Some expression, then, of the national feeling ought to be made in an authoritative manner. If the government were really neutral, there would be no impropriety in maintaining silence. But as the government is not neutral, as it impresses all Europe as well as the British ministry with its British leanings, as it gives color to Chamberlain's assertion that there is "an understanding between statesmen"—for these reasons the senate owes it to the country to set the country right in the eyes of the world.

The one fact to be borne in mind at this stage of the South African war, is that it is confessedly on the part of the British government a war of subjugation. The Boers have of-

fered not only to arbitrate the issues, but to make peace on any terms, with the sole reservation that their continued independence shall be respected. This offer the British ministry rejects. Independence, therefore, and nothing but independence, is the issue. It is to maintain that, and only that, that the Boers are fighting. It is to destroy that, and for no other purpose, that the British ministry continues the war.

A peaceable disposition on the part of the British ministry would lead it to accept the proffered arbitration. A friendly disposition on the part of the American government would dictate that England be advised in the interest of peace to do so. This advice cannot be given diplomatically. In the first place, diplomatic etiquette would interfere; in the second, a disposition is absent. But the senate could proffer it by resolution as an expression of American sentiment. Nor should any notion that England cannot arbitrate with dignity be allowed to interfere. It is an absurd pretense that England cannot arbitrate because the South African republic is not a sovereign state. It is a sovereign state, except in the narrowest technical sense. There are some treaties which it cannot make without England's consent. Technically, that takes it out of the category of sovereign states. But it is as sovereign as England herself respecting its internal affairs. And it is over internal affairs, not over foreign treaty affairs, that the present war is waged. With perfect dignity, therefore, and in entire harmony with the spirit of international law, England could arbitrate those questions. And she would do so if her ministers were better disposed toward peace and amity and less inclined to swap English blood for colonial conquests.

The British idea of arbitration has been parroted by Frederick W. Holls, who acted as secretary to the United States delegation to The Hague peace conference. In a lecture before the

Chicago Commercial club last week Mr. Hollis said that "arbitration is as impossible between Great Britain and the Transvaal republic as it would have been between the north and the south in our civil war, or, as it would be between Great Britain and Ireland on the question of home rule." The American who utters that sentiment must have either a misty conception of the fundamental law of his own country, or a defective knowledge of the treaty relations between Great Britain and the Transvaal. The northern and southern states had by mutual consent formed a nation of which the states were subordinate members. The issue between them was whether that nation could be disintegrated except by the consent of all these members; and of course that was not a question which could be submitted to foreign powers for decision. It had to be determined by our courts, subject only to an appeal to arms under the reserved right of revolution. Precisely so with Ireland and Great Britain. Legally, they are parts of one nation. However unjustly this condition may have been established, it is an established condition. Consequently, Great Britain, which is legally the law maker for Ireland, could not consent to arbitrate the propriety of the laws she enacts for Ireland's government. But with reference to the Transvaal, there was and is no such condition. The Transvaal was a sovereign nation in the full technical sense until 1877. She was then subjugated by Disraeli. In 1881 her independence was restored in degree; and in 1884 it was completely restored, with the single reservation as to treaties. Then arose the conflict. It was not over any question of the treaty revision power reserved to Great Britain. It was over questions of internal government, regarding which the Transvaal was as independent as she had been prior to 1877. To say that Great Britain cannot arbitrate those questions, any more than she could arbitrate the parliamentary question of home rule in Ireland or than the north

could have arbitrated the constitutional question of secession with the south, is to assume that in international relations there is no eternal fitness of things.

While on the subject of the South African war, we wish to call attention to an article published some time ago in the *Anglo-American*, from the pen of Thomas G. Shearman. We shall refer to the final paragraph only, because the rest of the article, while it compares the Boers to the British very much to the advantage of the latter, advances nothing to justify the cause for which the British are fighting. But the final paragraph has been several times referred to us as embodying an analogy in conclusive justification. We give it in full:

Let any American ask himself this question: even if our own country had acted in a threatening, and, if you please, a bullying manner toward Mexico, but had still religiously abstained from entering upon Mexican territory, and then the Mexican government had suddenly demanded, by telegraph to Washington, that our government should withdraw all soldiers from within 500 miles of the Mexican boundary line and should pledge itself never to the end of time to send another soldier into California or Texas, giving notice that unless this pledge was telegraphed back within 48 hours Mexico would begin war, what would have been or ought to have been the response of the American government and people? Let him ask himself, further, if the Mexican government on receiving no answer in 48 hours had immediately invaded California and Texas and declared a considerable part of each state annexed to Mexico, what response he and all other Americans would make. Let him ask himself whether he would, for a moment, after that, have discussed the question of the previous attitude of the American government, or whether he would not, if able to do so, have rushed to the front as a volunteer to defend his country and to drive out the impudent Mexicans. I have never yet met a Boer-loving American who was willing to answer these questions, for the simple reason that they can be answered only in one way, and that is precisely the same way in which the British have answered the challenge of the Boers.

The great strength of Mr. Shearman's question lies in its minimizing if not ignoring, the most vital facts. What, for instance, are we to infer

from the assumption that the British "had still religiously abstained from entering" Transvaal territory? Surely not that Mr. Shearman never heard of the British conquest of 1877 nor the Jameson raid of 1895. He may, of course, have concluded that the former was not a conquest by the British but an abdication by the Boers. But to do so he must disregard the necessity of those formalities which should attest every abdication of independence, for there were none. So he may regard the Jameson raid as an unauthorized filibustering expedition. But as a filibustering expedition that affair was remarkably enveloped in British officialism. The leader was the agent of the chartered company, and his little army, largely officered by British army officers, entered the Transvaal carrying the British flag. On the surface of the facts at least, it is not altogether consistent with unbiased judgment to speak of the British as having "religiously abstained from entering" Transvaal territory. Doubtless Mr. Shearman intends to limit his remark on this point to the period immediately preceding hostilities. But the Jameson raid cannot be so lightly disregarded as one of the causes of the war.

There is another omission, one that goes to the heart of the subject, in Mr. Shearman's Mexico-Transvaal analogy. Besides ignoring the offer to arbitrate which accompanied the Boer ultimatum, he disregards the hostile action of the British which provoked it, except as he may have intended to summarize it in the mild and indefinite phrase "threatening and bullying manner." The ultimatum did not come like a bolt out of a clear sky, as Mr. Shearman's analogy would imply to the uninformed reader. Let us try, then, very briefly to recall the leading events of which it was the culmination. All through the summer of 1899, negotiations were proceeding between the two countries, ostensibly, on England's part, for the sole purpose of securing a naturalization law which would give full voting

privileges to foreigners after five years' residence. This was a domestic question over which the Transvaal government was supreme. While these negotiations were in progress Great Britain was advancing troops toward the Boer frontiers and bringing extraordinary supplies of troops from India and England into South Africa. That was not a "threatening" or a "bullying." It was a distinctly evident preparation for invasion—one which, if not guarded against, would have put the Boers at a fatal disadvantage; and to meet these preparations, the Boers advanced troops towards the frontiers on their side. After several fruitless propositions in August, the Boers offered to concede all that Great Britain had specifically asked and to arbitrate all other disputes, provided this concession should not be taken as a precedent for further interference in the domestic affairs of the Transvaal and that a recently asserted British claim of suzerainty should be abandoned. The offer was declined. After it had been declined the Boers withdrew it, intimating that they had made it upon a semi-official notification that it would be accepted. This action on their part was followed by a warning from the British ministry that on this account Great Britain would now propose terms of her own for final acceptance. There was no other inference, under the circumstances, than that she intended to back up some as yet unrevealed demands with military force. That was about the 20th of September. Nothing further was heard from her until October 7—more than two weeks; and during all that time she kept pouring more troops into South Africa and up about the Boer frontiers, until her regular force was exhausted. Then, on the 7th of October, without having yet notified the Transvaal of the terms they intended to propose for final acceptance, the British ministers called out the army reserves and assembled parliament. What did it all mean, if not that Great Britain intended to invade the Transvaal with an over-

whelming force? The British press so understood it. The rest of the world so understood it. How could the Boers have regarded it otherwise? They could not and did not. But not until two days afterward, October 9th, did they issue the ultimatum, which Mr. Shearman describes as if it had been an unwarranted if not unprovoked demand. And when they did issue it, they did not confine it, as Mr. Shearman's analogy implies, to a demand upon Great Britain. They offered also to withdraw their own troops from the frontier, and to submit all questions to arbitration. These facts are derived not from Boer but from British sources. They are derived from official British sources. And since they are so derived we submit that Mr. Shearman's analogy, however fair he intended to make it—and of his just intentions we have no doubt—is in fact misleading.

Reports from China by way of London do not picture the Philippine situation in the agreeable colors that characterize Gen. Otis's dispatches. The Hong-Kong correspondent of the London Daily Mail, for example, asserts that the condition of affairs is far from satisfactory. With reference to commercial conditions he acknowledges the truth of Otis's reports that the ports are open for ships to come and go; but he says that no one can leave the towns to collect merchandise in the interior. For there the Filipinos are in power. Consequently, as soon as the stocks accumulated at seaports were exhausted, commerce at those ports practically ceased. He compares the situation in the interior to that in Acheen, which the Dutch have been trying to conquer for 100 years, but without securing a foothold further inland than the fringe of shore line. While this report is less satisfying than Gen. Otis's censored dispatches, it bears a deeper impress of truth. And it is sadly confirmed by the latest military reports which tell of the destruction of an American garrison, 20 out of 30 of them being killed.

Newspaper reports of public speeches are as a rule so untrustworthy that we hesitate to accept as true the one which tells of Senator Tillman's lecture at Ann Arbor on the 28th. Though quite prepared to believe that his sentiments were essentially undemocratic, since his subject was "The Race Question in the South," we are not prepared to believe, without better proof, that he deliberately insulted a negro gentleman in the audience. According to the news report—

The audience was composed of students. Directly in front and alone sat a colored student, and the senator looked at him in making his remarks. "You scratch one of these colored graduates under the skin," he said, "and you will find the savage. His education is like a coat of paint, like his skin."

That is something which no man, himself possessing the instincts of a gentleman, could possibly say, under the circumstances described, even though his race prejudices were never so bitter. And while Senator Tillman is notable for his scathing language, it is not to be believed without good authority that he would indulge that faculty in a manner so cruel and unprovoked.

The dubious report from which we quote goes on to describe what followed Senator Tillman's alleged assault upon the negro student. "There were hisses," it says, "from various parts of the house." Senator Tillman smiled and retorted:

You must excuse me for my frankness. There is nothing of hatred in my nature for the negroes. When that man who hissed gets ready to give his daughter in marriage to a negro, and proves by his action and not by his hisses that he means business, I will apologize, and not before.

Wholly aside from the question of whether Senator Tillman said this, the sentiment deserves a moment's consideration upon the theory that he did say it. In fact this is something which he might not improbably have said. For while he is a much better democrat in some important respects than many a man who professes a higher regard for the negro,

his sentiments respecting the negro race are decidedly undemocratic and antique. Take for example this expression about intermarriage. It is as old as slavery. When slavery flourished in this country, it was one of the most familiar arguments against abolishing it. There seemed to be a universal dread, so effective was this argument then, that if negroes were emancipated white men's daughters would surely want to marry them. But the modern mind, unless Senator Tillman's be an exception, has abandoned that argument. It really proves nothing. Suppose the unwisdom, or, if you please, the unrighteousness of intermarriage be conceded, what then? That does not prove that negroes ought to be slaves, or to be denied civil and political rights, or to be discouraged from acquiring an education, or to be excluded from any privilege whatever which you would accord to a white man to whom you were not ready to give your daughter in marriage.

Another of those idiotic misconceptions of Markham's famous poem, "The Man with the Hoe," is floating through the plutocratic press. This one tells of an intelligent looking, well-dressed, clean-shaven man who seemed quite at home amid the surroundings of a magnificent hotel. When interviewed by a reporter, he professed great anxiety to know whether he looked like a man with the emptiness of ages in his face, or seemed to be bearing on his back the burdens of the world, or was "dead to rapture or despair, a thing that grieves not and that never hopes," or showed a loosened and let down jaw, a brow slanted back, a darkened brain, or the mien of one stolid and stunned—a brother to the ox. He asked these questions, he said, because he wanted to learn if Markham knew what he was talking about when he wrote "The Man with the Hoe." For said this splendid American toiler—

I raised on my farm in Illinois last year 10,000 bushels of wheat, 12,000 bushels of oats, 40,000 bushels of corn and 1,000 head of cattle, to say nothing

of other stuff and stock, and I'm just back from a European trip. He raised! Why he raised nothing. What he did was to let other men raise those things for him and to pay them a trifle out of the product for doing it; pretty much as the tramp offered to allow all comers to catch drift wood in the Mississippi on shares. This is not Markham's man with the hoe. This is only the kind that makes Markham's kind. And he would know it if his brow were not somewhat slanted and his brain a little darkened. He is the type of man upon whom Markham calls when he addresses the "masters, lords and rulers in all lands." To him the degraded man with the hoe stands in the relation of effect to cause; stands as the slave to the master, as the serf to the lord, as the robbed to the robber.

Ohio is going through the throes of a decennial valuation of real estate for purposes of taxation. The throes would not be severe if the assessors were disposed to obey the law as to valuations, which is not only plain but simple. It requires merely that property be assessed at its "true value in money." Such a requirement would cause no serious dispute, and none at all as to its interpretation, if the property were to be appraised for purposes of partition among heirs. But since it is for taxing purposes, all sorts of differences of opinion, prompted of course in great measure by personal interests, are reported. In Cleveland, for instance, the majority of the assessors, says the Cleveland Leader, "seemed to be in favor of deducting 40 per cent. from the market value!" Could anything be more absurd? What the law obviously means by "true value in money," is market value; yet these over astute assessors would arrive at that valuation by reducing it 40 per cent. Store goods are usually sold at their true value in money. Would a customer therefore expect to buy at 40 per cent. discount upon market value? The only sensible view of the duty of assessors under the Ohio law which the Leader reports is that of Peter Witt. He de-

clared, says the Leader, that "he would return the true value in money, and that value was fixed at the price the property would be sold at."

The death of Sidney A. Kent, a Chicago millionaire, has drawn from George A. Schilling a suggestion that the working people erect a modest stone over Mr. Kent's grave bearing this simple inscription:

Here lies the body of Sidney A. Kent, the millionaire packer of Chicago, who, in 1886, championed and conceded the eight-hour day to his employes. He believed its universal adoption would result in a broader intelligence and a higher standard of life for the masses and would insure the more peaceful progress of society.

Mr. Schilling's story of the incident that entitles Mr. Kent's memory to this mark of respect is very interesting. In consequence of his establishment of the eight-hour day in his business as a packer, the system was for a time adopted throughout the Union stockyards; and Mr. Kent's loyalty to the eight-hour principle remained unshaken even after his associates had forced back the old ten-hour system. And the confidence he had inspired continued. He was nominated in 1899 for United States senator, by R. M. Burke, a labor senator of the state of Illinois, who said in the nominating speech that he nominated Mr. Kent—
not because of his millions, but because his noble mind and heart shine through his wealth.

The modest tribute proposed by Mr. Schilling would honor those making it no less than him whose memory among workmen it was designed to perpetuate.

The English press is smarting under a recent judicial decision which holds that any publication calculated to bring a court or judge into contempt or to lower his authority, and consequently personal scurrilous abuse of a judge, is a contempt of court and may be summarily punished as such. Judges in this country have tried to establish the same principle. But they have not very generally succeeded. That publications calculated

to influence the decision or disturb the proceedings of a court during a trial may be so punished is true. They ought to be. It is upon this principle that some newspaper comments upon an unfinished trial are properly so dealt with. But to allow punishment for contempt upon the basis of scurrilous publications regarding a judge personally, not calculated to affect a lawsuit before him, is to give to judges special personal protection. It is to enable them to try their libelers without indictment or jury, and to punish them at their own discretion. The legal remedy for libel is well understood. It is available to judges as well as to other people; and since there is no other remedy for other people there should be none other for judges.

The Chicago Inter Ocean has unearthed a neat bit of public plundering at Evanston, of which the corporation of the Northwestern university, as a large owner of vacant lots, is the chief beneficiary. It seems that the municipal waterworks at Evanston is a highly profitable institution. But instead of cutting down water rates, the local authorities manage to apply the surplus income from them to general revenue purposes. The effect is well described by the Inter Ocean when it says that in this way—

consumers of water are compelled to bear not only their share of the general taxation, but all deficits arising from the unequal and unjust assessment of taxation against owners of unimproved property. The system in vogue at Evanston, it seems, is one which aims to cut down the taxes of owners of unimproved property and non-consumers of water to the very lowest possible notch, and to make owners of improved property and consumers of water meet all deficiencies in the municipal revenue.

THE HONOR OF THE NATION.

"We do not enter upon a war with Spain for conquest. We do not seek aggrandizement by territorial acquisition."

That, in substance, was the disclaimer published to the world by this na-

tion, speaking through its chief executive and congress, just before and just after the beginning of the Spanish-American war.

What, then, was the avowed purpose of that war?

In the name and for the sake of humanity, to liberate Cuba and the Cubans from the devastating tyranny of Spain; and to establish the Cuban republic by giving to the Cubans their independence and permitting them to erect and maintain their own government.

What is the sequel?

The Cubans have not their independence, but are subjected to military rule of the United States. The secretary of war says that this rule will continue indefinitely.

Further. In lieu of the nation living up to its righteous disclaimer, by the acts of the administration a deliberate purpose to secure self-aggrandizement by territorial acquisition is being carried out, even to the extreme of subjugating by armed might the Filipinos, and confiscating by official acts of perfidy Puerto Rico and its resources of material wealth.

And, in the face of all this, it is stoutly maintained in many quarters that the sovereign people of this republic will, at the ballot box next November, ratify what has been done.

One who is an American from and for principle, and not from and for expediency, may be pardoned for believing and saying that this is a calumny.

The American conscience is not so seared over by the withering heat of greed that all sense of honor has become deadened. This great people will not deliberately put upon their national escutcheon the shameful and shaming word "Hypocrite!"

As a nation, we erect our head among the peoples of earth, and upon our fore front is the mystic word "Christian." Shall that be blotted out by the blood of our fellows slain to appease the insatiate mandate of the tyrant Greed? And shall there be inscribed in its stead in letters black as the vault of Erebus that other word, "Hypocrite"?

No, never!

We are too great, too proud a people to bring upon ourselves the opprobrium, the contumely and the scorn

which are merited by such a characterization.

Wherefore, it is only reasonable to say, that, far from ratifying, this great honor-loving, justice-loving people will put their stamp of disapproval upon the acts of the administration in so overwhelming and pronounced a manner as to convince the world that we as a nation are yet honest, yet truthful, aye, if you please, yet Christian.

JOHN AUBREY JONES.
San Francisco, Cal.

NEWS

In closing our last report of the war in South Africa we were able to tell of the withdrawal of the Boers from Dewetsdorp followed by their abandonment of the investment of Wedener, and that they were retreating over the Ladybrand road along the Basuto border. That brought the news down to the 26th. It is now conclusively reported that they have escaped the net spread for them by Lord Roberts and have carried away with them an abundance of grain. On the 27th a large British force concentrated at Thaba N'Chu, which was along the line of the Boer retreat. A detachment of Boers guarding the general retreat then held the eastern outlet of the town. It was immediately attacked by the British and fighting was still in progress there on the 28th. After that authentic news ceased for three days. Rumors were current on the 30th of several sharp engagements in the neighborhood of the town since the 27th, but it was not until the 2d that Gen. Roberts was heard from. Even then his dispatches, dated the 30th and the 1st, gave but little information. The London correspondents inferred from them that heavy fighting was going on somewhat to the north of Thaba N'Chu, and that the Boers were there putting the British upon the defensive.

The Boer report of last week that Lord Methuen had retreated to Kimberley from Boshoff proves to have been untrue. He is still at Boshoff. But it is a fact that the Boers are extraordinarily active in this western region. They were reported on the 1st as being in strong force between Kimberley and Fourteen Streams, which is north of Kimberley, and the communications of the British force at Warrenton were said to be in dan-

ger. Word comes out of Mafeking from time to time, indicating the stress of the beleaguered inhabitants and garrison. But they were still holding out on the 2d. Lord Roberts has urged them to hold out until May 18. He makes no explanation, but probably alludes to the success by that date of a new relief expedition now organizing in the south to cooperate with the expedition through the Portuguese territory mentioned last week.

A sensational incident in connection with the war is the destruction of the Begbie ironworks at Johannesburg, used by the Boers for an arsenal. They were destroyed by an explosion in a building in which dynamite was stored. Over 65 persons were killed and many wounded. Among the latter was the manager of the works, who charges that the catastrophe was caused by a conspiracy. The building where the explosion occurred had been undermined, he says, and the cases of dynamite stored there were fired by means of electric wires connected with the lighting system of the town. Several arrests have been made, and on the 30th the Boer government ordered all British subjects, with few exceptions, to leave the republic within 48 hours. This order was made after an inquiry into the cause of the explosion, which indicated that it had been deliberately planned and excited a suspicion that British sympathy had prompted the act.

Philippine news is scanty. Such as has come relates chiefly, with two exceptions, to the fighting in the northern part of Luzon about the middle of April, to which the reports of last week referred as some of the bloodiest of the war. The native mayors of four towns in that region having been detected in giving aid and comfort to the Filipino forces were imprisoned by the Americans, who burned the town hall of one of the places by way of punishing the inhabitants.

One of the exceptions referred to above is the issuing by Gen. Otis on the 1st of an order for the purpose of restricting Chinese immigration, and another making changes in the Spanish criminal procedure still in vogue. The latter order gives an accused person the rights of habeas corpus, of being confronted with witnesses against him, an open trial, and of exemp-

tion from testifying against himself. It also establishes the American system of bail and pleading, and abolishes the priests' exemption from trial by secular courts for crimes.

The second exception is startling. It relates to nothing less than the destruction of an American garrison at Catubig, in the northern part of the island of Samar. This island lies south of and next to the island of Luzon. The American garrison at Catubig consisted of 30 men quartered in a church. It was surrounded by a Filipino force and after two days' fighting the church was set on fire. The garrison refused to surrender, managing to shelter themselves behind the charred walls of the church, and the fighting continued three days longer, when the garrison was relieved by reinforcements. There were only 10 survivors then, and they were physically exhausted.

American casualties in the Philippines since August 6, 1898, inclusive of all current official reports given out at Washington to May 2, 1900, are as follows:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Killed | 475 |
| Died of wounds, disease and accidents | 1,244 |

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Total deaths | 1,719 |
| Wounded | 2,103 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Total loss | 3,822 |
| Total loss reported last week . . . | 3,790 |
| Total deaths reported last week . | 1,698 |

Several state conventions have been held during the week to choose delegates to national conventions. The Alabama democratic convention on the 26th instructed for Bryan. The convention of the same party in Michigan, which met on the 1st, also instructed for Bryan. It recommended Charles A. Towne, the famous silver republican, for vice president. The New Hampshire democrats met on the 2nd and elected a delegation to the national convention, instructing them unreservedly for Bryan. Two republican conventions are reported — that of Indiana, which was in session and partly reported in these columns last week, and that of Massachusetts. The latter recommends Secretary Long for vice president. The Nebraska republicans held their convention on the 2nd and in their platform indorsed the administration and the financial legislation of congress. They opposed imperialism of

the European type, but approved the Philippine policy. The regular populists of Illinois instructed for Bryan for president and Howard S. Taylor, of Chicago, for vice president.

Mr. Bryan is credited this week with a notable interview on the trust question. While in Chicago on the 29th he was questioned about the recent action of the steel trust, and this was his answer:

It has emphasized three facts about trusts. First, how they can lessen the demand for any article by abnormally raising the price of the same; second, how helpless employes are in the hands of trusts; and, third, how consumers are plundered by private monopolies. While I do not know anything regarding the details of this deal save what I have heard of and read, I should say the recent transaction shows that stockholders are to be duped the same as others.

In a minor way, though by no means without its political significance, the trust question has brought on a ye and nay vote in the senate. It was in connection with the army appropriation bill. Senator Berry, of Arkansas, moved the following amendment to that bill:

The quartermaster's department, in making contracts and purchases of articles and supplies for the military service, shall give preference, all other things, including price and quality, being equal, to articles of the growth, production and manufacture of the United States; and, as between the producers, manufacturers, merchants and dealers of the United States preference shall be given, all other things, including price and quality, being equal, to those producers, manufacturers, merchants and dealers who are not members of or in any way connected with any trust or combine formed to produce, manufacture or sell the articles which are being contracted for and purchased by the quartermaster's department for the military service.

The question came to a vote on the 1st, and the amendment was lost by 18 to 29. Those who voted for the amendment were Pettus, Berry, Jones of Arkansas, Kenney, Taliaferro, Bacon, Clay, McEnnery, Money, Bate, Turner (democrats), Teller (independent), Heitfeld, Harris, Butler (populists), Wellington, Davis and Pettigrew (republicans). The negative vote was cast by Aldrich, Bard, Carter, Chandler, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Frye, Gallinger, Hawley, Hoar, Kean, Lodge, McBride, Mc-

Comas, Penrose, Perkins, Platt of Connecticut, Proctor, Ross, Scott, Sewall, Shoup, Simon, Warren, Wetmore, Wolcott (republicans), Jones of Nevada (silver), and Stewart (independent).

This significant vote on the trust question had been preceded only the day before by one on the South African war. On the 30th Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota, called up his resolution on this subject and moved its immediate consideration; but his motion was defeated, the vote being 20 in the affirmative and 29 in the negative. Those voting for the motion were Bate, Berry, Clay, Jones of Arkansas, Kenney, McEnnery, Martin, Vest (democrats), Allen, Harris, Heitfeld, Turner (populists), Chandler, Hale, Hoar, McCumber, Mason, Pettigrew, Ross (republicans), and Teller (independent). The senators voting against the motion to consider the resolution were Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Carter, Clark of Wyoming, Davis, Fairbanks, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Gear, Hawley, Kean, Lodge, McComas, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Platt of Connecticut, Platt of New York, Sewell, Shoup, Warren, Wolcott (republicans), Jones of Nevada (silver), Stewart (independent), Morgan, Pettus and Sullivan (democrats). The resolution so pigeonholed was as follows:

Whereas, from the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other peoples to free themselves from European domination; therefore be it resolved, that we watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the South African republics against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty.

Another subject of general interest which has come under the consideration of congress during the week is the question of an interoceanic ship canal. The long story of this agitation, extending from early in the 16th century, was summarized in these columns some 15 months ago. The summary will be found in No. 43 at page 8. There is a question between a sea level canal through the isthmus of Panama, and one with locks across the mountains of Nicaragua. On the 21st of January, 1899, the senate passed a bill for a government canal by the Nicaragua route, and during the present week a bill authorizing the

building of a canal by that route to be controlled by the United States came before the lower house. A great deal of opposition was developed, not to the idea of a canal but to this particular project. Mr. Hepburn, chairman of the interstate commerce committee, was the principal advocate of the bill. He conceded that it would disregard the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 50 years ago, which stipulates that neither England nor the United States exclusively shall control any ship canal between the two oceans, and also the recent Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which is not yet ratified; but his idea seemed to be that congress may with impunity disregard the old Clayton-Bulwer treaty as obsolete, and he assumed that if this bill were passed by an overwhelming vote in the lower house the senate would regard it as a popular mandate and refuse to confirm the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The strongest opposition was to the purpose of the bill to Americanize the canal, it being insisted that the canal ought to be neutral. The bill came to a vote on the 2nd, and was passed by 225 to 35.

A joint resolution regarding the Puerto Rican government bill was also an important congressional matter of the week. The conferees of the two houses, which were in disagreement over the subject, came to terms on the 30th, and on the same day both houses adopted their report. The necessity for this resolution was caused by an oversight in the government act, whereby the present officials in Puerto Rico were legislated out of office from May 1, though in many cases they could not be replaced for months to come. The president, therefore, addressed a special message to congress, and the resolution noted above was the result. Taking advantage of this opportunity, the republicans of the house, who had reluctantly voted for the Puerto Rican bill, proposed an amendment, one calculated to draw the fangs of the franchise clause of the act. It was over this that the conferees fought, Senators Foraker and Perkins insisting upon retaining the original franchise provisions. They were obliged to yield, however, when the house conferees threatened to defeat the joint resolution altogether if their franchise amendment were not accepted. It was accordingly adopted. Under this amendment all

railroad, street railway, telegraph and telephone franchises, privileges or concessions in Puerto Rico must be approved by the president of the United States before becoming operative; and all franchises, privileges or concessions must provide that they shall be subject to amendment, alteration or repeal. Moreover, the issue of stock or bonds except for cash at par or its equivalent is forbidden, as is the declaring of stock dividends; and in the case of public service corporations their charges are to be subject to regulation, and their property to purchase "by the public authorities at a fair valuation." There are clauses, also, which are intended to prevent the acquisition by corporations of large landed estates in Puerto Rico; and the restrictions of the amendment are made applicable to corporations not organized in Puerto Rico as well as to those that may be.

The American civil governor of Puerto Rico, Charles N. Allen, arrived there on the 27th, and on the 1st he was inaugurated. The Associated Press describes the ceremonies as impressive and the enthusiasm of the people as "greater than expected," while the staff correspondent of the Chicago Record says that "a lack of enthusiasm was noticeable."

May day was celebrated by labor organizations in the United States, especially by the socialists. In Chicago it was made the occasion of ratifying the fusion of the socialist labor party with the social democratic party and the nomination of Debs and Harriman for president and vice president. The New York papers report 30,000 workers in the parade in that city. Many of the banners bore the names of Debs and Harriman. On the other side of the ocean, a good deal of relief was expressed by the press at being able to report orderly conduct in the cities in which police interference has usually excited disorder in connection with these May day demonstrations. On this occasion the European police everywhere appear for the first time to have refrained from all irritating interference.

NEWS NOTES.

—President McKinley on the 30th signed the Hawaiian territorial bill.

—An explosion in a coal mine near Scofield, Utah, on the 1st caused the death of more than 260 miners.

—Michael Munkacsy, the Hungarian artist, whose fame is identified with

his painting of "Christ Before Pilate," died in an insane asylum at Bonn, May 1st, aged 54 years.

—The Boer peace envoys, Messrs. Fischer, Wolmarans and Wessels sailed from Rotterdam May 3 for America, having completed their mission in Europe.

—Several hundred Finns, the first of a large emigration movement of that people, have arrived in northern Michigan, in the iron region, where they will work in the mines.

—Gen. John R. Brooke has been selected to take charge of the department of the east, succeeding Gen. Merritt, who has asked to be relieved, as he will soon go on the retired list. The transfer will take place May 10th.

—Mrs. Susan Winans, who had the double distinction of having been the first white child born on the site of Chicago and the last survivor of the Fort Dearborn massacre of 1812, died at Los Angeles on the 27th, aged 88 years.

—Eleven trade unionists were indicted by the grand jury in Chicago on the 2d. The indictments charged conspiracy in connection with recent assaults on nonunion men and perjury in attempting to prove false alibis for the same.

—Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews, superintendent of Chicago schools, severed his connection with the Chicago school board on the 30th. He sailed for Europe on the 2d for a few months' vacation previous to assuming his new duties of chancellor of the University of Nebraska.

—The second anniversary of the battle of Manila was celebrated in Chicago on May 1st. Admiral Dewey was the guest of honor and attended the grand ball at the Auditorium on the 30th in his honor, and on Tuesday reviewed the military and naval parade, in which more than 5,000 men participated.

—Ottawa, Ont., and the neighboring towns of Hull and Chandiere Flats were visited on the 26th by the most destructive fire in the history of Canada. Several lives were lost and property to the extent of \$15,000,000 was destroyed. The town of Hull was completely wiped out and 15,000 people are homeless.

—The sessions of the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal church began in the Auditorium at Chicago, on the 2d. Seventeen bishops and more than 500 delegates were present. The conference adopted an amendment to the book of discipline providing for equal representation of the laity in the present and future conferences of the church.

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.

April 24-30, 1900.

Senate.

On the 24th the amendments of the house to the senate joint resolution regarding the administration of civil affairs in Puerto Rico (passed in the senate on the 19th and printed at page 4700) were laid before the senate, which voted to nonconcur, and appointed conferees. The house amendments are printed on page 4952. On this day also the resolution relative to the seating of M. S. Quay as senator from Pennsylvania came up for final action. After an extended debate the senate decided by the close vote of 33 to 32, 22 not voting, that Quay was not entitled to his seat. The agricultural appropriation bill was passed on the 25th and the conference report on the Hawaiian bill was agreed to. The resolution relative to the election of Nathan B. Scott as senator from West Virginia, which was reported favorably from the committee on privileges and elections, was discussed, and the consideration of the Alaska civil government bill was resumed. Senator Mason introduced a joint resolution on the 26th providing that the United States shall turn over to the people of Cuba the civil government of that island on July 4, 1900. This resolution, which was referred to the committee on relations with Cuba, is printed on page 5063. The documents from the secretary of war in reply to the inquiry of the senate, made on the 21st and printed at page 4851, as to the pay of certain army officers in Cuba and Puerto Rico were reported on this date and are printed on pages 5061-2. Also on this date Pettus spoke in opposition to the resolution regarding the election of Scott, of West Virginia. On the 27th the senate began the consideration of a bill relative to southern claims under the title of abandoned property in insurrectionary districts, and the consideration of the Alaska bill was resumed, after which the resolution in regard to the election of Nathan B. Scott as senator from West Virginia came up for final action and the senate decided by a vote of 52 to 3 that Scott had been duly elected. Pettigrew's resolution, introduced on the 27th and printed on page 5144, asking for important information in regard to the war in the Philippine Islands, was agreed to on the 28th, and senate conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill were appointed. A motion to refer Pettigrew's resolution of sympathy with the South African republic, printed on page 5187, was carried, 31 to 11, but the vote disclosed the fact that no quorum was present and so the senate adjourned over Sunday. The conference report on the joint resolution in regard to the civil administration in Puerto Rico was agreed to on the 30th and the consideration of the Alaska bill was resumed. Thereafter Pettigrew called up his resolution of sympathy with the South African republic and moved for its immediate consideration. The motion failed to carry—20 to 29.

House.

On the 24th two amendments to the senate joint resolution relative to the administration of civil affairs in Puerto

Rico were agreed to, and the resolution passed after a long debate. The amendments are printed on page 4982. Consideration of the post office appropriation bill was resumed. William H. King, of Utah, was sworn in as the successor of Brigham H. Roberts on the 25th, and consideration of the post office bill was resumed and continued on the 26th when it was passed. The conference report on the Hawaiian bill was adopted on the 27th. Nothing of importance was done on the 28th, and on the 30th a bill empowering the president to appoint a commission to study and report on the commercial and industrial conditions of China and Japan was under consideration.

MISCELLANY

TO JOHN D. LONG.

There never yet were wanting men of speech,

Persuasive and mellifluous, to give aid
To tyrants when, abandoned and betrayed,
Freedom for pity did the world beseech.

Then smooth and affluent phrases over-
reach

A feeble faith and conscience, and pervade
The press, the pulpits, and the marts of
trade,

As the insidious tide pervades the beach.

But when the music and the glamour
cease

Returning reason dissipates the spell,
And captive senses find a quick release.

Silenced the siren song of "All is well!"

The fancied picture of a reign of peace,
Fading reveals the warring strife of hell.

—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, in Rockland
(Mass.) Independent.

March 25, 1900.

IN THE PHILADELPHIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

A new way of putting in the closing sessions of the school term has been contrived by the board of education. Dr. Brooks at to-day's meeting of teachers announced that recitations may be held in Fairmount park on occasional afternoons. The innovation gives promise of many hours of pleasure in study instead of the wretchedness that comes of hot hours passed in close schoolrooms. All teachers need do is request the privilege for a day through the principals of their schools and the superintendent will grant it.—Telegram to Chicago Chronicle, under date of Apr. 27.

ANTI-VEGETARIAN ARGUMENT.

Someone in London feels so strongly on the anti-vegetarian diet that a periodical is to be issued monthly as an organ for the antis. The second number comes out with nine challenges or problems which it would be pleased to have the vegetarians answer. Perhaps the most important one is a defiance to produce the names of 50 consistent vegetarians, living or dead, conspicuous

for their vitality. The list may begin with Pythagoras and comprise anyone in the more than 25 centuries since his decease. Then there is the defiance to produce the names of 20 vegetarians besides G. Bernard Shaw famous for their beauty. No limit as to time or place is imposed in this proposition. Then it is demanded, "What would Nansen have done with only a vegetarian diet permissible in his equipment for his polar expeditions?" And how would vegetarians have provisioned Columbus' vessel?

Flanking all these defiances and inquiries are letters from any number of actresses famous for good looks as well as ability testifying that they are firm believers in the joys and sustenance to be found in a mixed diet, with small birds not too scarce. The most interesting thing about all this is that vegetarianism has reached such proportions that those who, for reasons best known to themselves, oppose it think it advisable to mobilize.—Boston Evening Transcript.

HAMILTON ON LAND VALUES.

For The Public.

Here is an item for the admirers of Alexander Hamilton. In the Federalist, No. 12, on "The Utility of the Union in Respect to Revenue," advocating the adoption of the constitution because union would encourage commerce between the states which would otherwise interpose tariff barriers between one another, Hamilton says that the interests of agriculture and commerce "are intimately blended and interwoven," and adds:

It has been found in various countries that in proportion as commerce has flourished land has risen in value. And how could it have happened otherwise? Could that which procures a freer vent for the products of the earth, which furnishes new incitements to the cultivation of land, which is the most powerful instrument in increasing the quantity of money in a state—could that, in fine, which is the faithful handmaid of labor and industry in every shape, fail to augment the value of that article which is the prolific parent of far the greater part of the objects upon which they are exerted? It is astonishing that so simple a truth should ever have had an adversary, and it is one among a multitude of proofs, how apt a spirit of ill-informed jealousy, or of too great abstraction and refinement is to lead men astray from the plainest paths of reason and conviction.

And again: Personal property is too precarious and invisible a fund to be laid hold of in any other way than by the imperceptible agency of taxes on consumption.

"Two truths are told as prologues to the swelling act of the imperial theme," says Macbeth.

Strange that a man who could so clearly express two kindred truths should then proceed to advocate a revenue system which would restrict commerce and retard the increment of land values. Strange that even in that age he should fail to consider municipal as well as agricultural land values. And unfortunate that he should not have exerted his great influence to secure the total exemption of personal property from all taxation and the establishment of a revenue system which by freeing industry from all restrictions and raising public funds from a tax on land values would have tended constantly to increase at the same time the earnings of the individual and the earnings of society. Freedom of production increases land values and wages. Increased land values means more abundant social revenues. Increased wages means more abundant individual revenues. One hand washes the other.

WILLIAM S. RANN.

SPAIN TREATED PUERTO RICO BETTER THAN WE TREAT HER.

Extract from speech of Hon. William Sulzer, of New York, at the banquet of the Mohawk club in Detroit, Mich., Wednesday evening, May 2.

Since the ratification of the treaty of peace between Spain and the United States the island of Puerto Rico has been and is now a part of the territory of this country, and the constitution applies to it, and should apply to it, just as much as it applies to the District of Columbia or the territory of Arizona. To contend otherwise is preposterous.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States, and entitled to the same privileges, the same rights and the same immunities under the constitution that the people of any other territory are entitled to in the federal union. The law compelling the citizens of Puerto Rico to pay a tariff tax on their goods, wares and merchandise to and from this country is unwarranted, unjustifiable, unprecedented, un-American, and, in my judgment, unconstitutional. In all our past history no political party ever dared to attempt to pass such a law—a law as inhuman as it is unfair.

The constitution regarding this matter is clear and plain. Section 8 of article 1 says in language that cannot be misunderstood:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; * * * but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The republican party has deprived

the Puerto Ricans of self-government and given them a military government. They have no representation in congress. Under Spanish rule they were represented by 12 representatives and four senators in the Spanish cortes. They had their own local legislature and absolute home rule. Why, under the circumstances, I ask, in the name of all that is fair and just and decent, should we now tax them and rob them?

Have we liberated them from monarchical tyranny only to enslave them in industrial oppression? The poor people of Puerto Rico will speak, and the great heart of the republic will answer and respond in the coming campaign. The American people will never repeat in the dying year of the nineteenth century the crimes and the blunders of George the Third in the closing years of the eighteenth century. In the sisterhood of states there must be no stepdaughters. The flag we all love must not be used as a cloak to rob and oppress our fellow citizens at the dictation of the trusts and to bolster up the falling republican protective tariff fallacy.

GOLDWIN SMITH ON THE BOERS.

Mr. Goldwin Smith, who gave up a place in British politics of considerable importance, and also a place as instructor in Oxford university, to live in Canada, has just returned from a visit of a few months in Italy. He expressed himself quite freely on the war in South Africa, and the place among the nations of the Boers, at the Fifth Avenue hotel this morning. Among other things he said:

"None of my English friends and correspondents," began Mr. Smith, "has ever doubted what would be the issue of a war in which the entire forces of the British empire were opposed to those of a population not half as large as the population of Liverpool. The Boers have put into the field decrepitude and childhood. They have no reserves. We shall win; and, having won, we shall, too, probably, reap in the judgment of posterity a measure of the same glory which we reaped in the burning of Joan of Arc. We shall be fortunate if we escape the guilt of opening an era of unscrupulous rapacity and violence which might throw back for a century the progress of moral civilization.

"A civilian can have nothing to say about this dispute as to the conduct of our generals. The generals were distinguished men. The British sol-

dier has shown his wonted valor. Canadian and Australian have fought gallantly at his side. Our military administration seems also to have really done well and put into the field with striking rapidity an unexpected amount of force. But besides the difficulties of the country, we have encountered in our enemy a moral force on which we did not reckon, and which escaped the discernment of Mr. Cecil Rhodes. We have encountered in its greatest intensity that enthusiastic patriotism which turns the slug-gard's blood to flame. Can history show a more memorable fight for independence than that which is being made by the Boer? Does it yield to that made by Switzerland against Austria and Burgundy, or to that made by the Tyrolese under Hofer? The Boer gets no pay, no comforts and luxuries are provided for him by fashionable societies; he can look forward to no medals or pensions; he voluntarily endures the utmost hardships of war; his discipline, though unforced, seems never to fail. Boys of 16—a correspondent at the Cape tells me, even of 14—take the rifle from the hand of the mother, who remains to pray for them in her lonely home, and stand beside their grand-sires to face the murderous artillery of modern war. A newspaper correspondent the other day saw a boy of 16 lying mangled on the field, and saying: 'It does not hurt much; only I am so thirsty.' Rude, narrow-minded, fanatical in their religion, these men may be; so were the old Scotch Calvinists; so have been some of the noblest wildstocks of humanity; but surely they are not unworthy to guard a nation.

"Ax on shoulder the Boers twice went out to make for themselves a home in the wilderness where they might live their own life. Who had a right to take it from them? Her Britannic majesty did not create Africa. There is too much truth in the saying that this is the second Jameson raid. It makes me sad to think into what hands my country has fallen. Had Lord Salisbury kept the matter in his own hands, as he ought, for it was really a foreign, not a colonial question, there would have been no war."—New York Evening Sun of April 23.

THE IMPERIALIST RELIGION. THE CREED.

1. I believe in the old war taxes to prevent trade with Europe and the new war taxes to force trade with Asia.

2. I believe in excluding uneducated Europeans who wish to enter our territory, and in including uneducated Asiatics who wish to keep out.

3. I believe in home rule for Ireland, but in alien rule for the Spanish islands.

4. I believe that whites and blacks have a right to govern themselves, but not browns.

5. I believe in a Monroe doctrine which forbids Europe to interfere with self-government in America, but permits America to interfere with self-government in Asia.

6. I believe that governments get their just powers from the consent of the governed in America, but from contempt for the governed in Asia.

7. I believe that taxation without representation is tyranny when applied to us, but philanthropy when applied by us.

8. I believe that forcible annexation is criminal aggression, but that payment to non-owners makes it benevolent assimilation.

9. I believe that militarism and foreign broils strengthen despotism abroad but republicanism at home.

10. I believe that American policies have made a little America, but that European policies will make a greater America.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me and only gold above me.

2. Thou shalt not worship any graven image except on bank notes.*

3. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, but shalt use it profitably to sanctify thy greed.

4. Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. On the seventh day thou shalt do no labor, but thy man servant and thy maid servant, thy freight trains, thy blast furnaces and thy sweat shops must be kept going.

5. Honor thy father and thy mother but disregard the fathers of thy country.

6. Thou shalt not kill except to extend trade.

7. Thou shalt not commit adultery, but may enter into entangling alliances.

8. Thou shalt not steal, but shall annex.

9. Thou shalt not bear false witness, but censor the dispatches.

10. Thou shalt not covet, but grab.

THE PRAYER.

O Thou, who dost exalt the mighty and put down those of low degree, crush, we beseech thee, the struggles of the Filipinos for independence. Force them to recognize that, although

they are willing to die for freedom, they are not fit to live in freedom. May they and all men forget the declaration of independence, or if they remember it may they also remember that it was not intended to apply to Malays. Strengthen in us the pride of race and the exalting conviction that we are not as other men are. Help us to scorn the Filipinos as children unworthy of the rights which our ancestors had from the days of barbarism. May we subject them to alien military rule, knowing that this is the school in which self-government and manhood are developed. May our people forget that the Filipinos had established a government in which life and property were secure before we commanded them to lay down their arms, and enable the voters to rejoice when they read of villages destroyed for the preservation of property and men killed for the preservation of life. Forbid, O Lord, that we should treat the Filipinos as we have treated the countries of Spanish America in the past, protecting them against foreign aggression and permitting them the government of their choice. Aid us in our war of subjugation to the end that we may use the Filipinos to extend our trade—and thy glory—in the orient. All this we ask in the name of Him who said: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."—Charles B. Spahr.

"THE CHRISTIAN."

The following is an extract from an address delivered Sunday evening, April 22, at the Vine Street Congregational church in Cincinnati by the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow.

There has been a revival of interest in Mr. Caine's book, "The Christian," owing to the drama based upon the novel, which has been presented to the Cincinnati public during the week just passed.

What Glory was to Father Storm, the theater is to the church—a gay child surrounded by many temptations. For the church to taboo the theater because its influence may be bad would be as irrational as it was for Father Storm to shut himself up in a "salvation zoo" and leave Glory alone in the world. The surest way to make a thing bad is to call it bad names. The function of the theater is to reach the mind through the eye, to convey truth by example. Let us recognize that function as natural and legitimate. Let us insist upon its noble possibilities. Let us frown upon the bad by expecting and encouraging the good. Mr. Caine's play

is a successful attempt to make the stage in its way just as ennobling as the church. I have read the book with care, and have seen the play, and I have failed to find anything in either to justify the criticism which has been made that the book is immoral in its influence. And as for the critics seeing any suggestion of carnality in the love of Storm and Glory, it seems to me that such a critic must live on the same moral plane with Lord Robert Ure, who, because of the impurity of his own heart, sneers even at the virtue of Glory.

The professed aim of the novel is to reflect "the religious purpose and social effort" of our own time. In other words, the theme of the novel is the social mission of the church, and as such claims our attention.

It is evidence of a far-reaching and vital reformation of thought that religion is being moved both from the monastery and the fashionable church to the social settlements and the club rooms of the parish house, where there is at least an honest and unselfish effort being made to do something for others. The author's ideal of a Christian, as represented in the character of John Storm, is a man who is too outspoken to be tolerated in the conventional church, who is too human and real to waste his life fighting shadows in a monastery, but whose master passion is to save the weak and the oppressed, and who is willing to try any plan or adopt any legitimate means to that end.

Unquestionably John Storm exfigures the spirit of Christ in the slums of a modern city more consistently than any other type of religious worker. But, in the changed conditions of modern life, a literal repetition of the work of Christ may not be the most effective way of saving men. What we need to-day is not necessarily an exact reproduction of the life of Christ, but men who are as earnest about saving their fellows as John Storm was, but who, instead of finding any special merit in imitating literally the life of Christ, will work in the wisest way and do the thing which in our modern life will tell most for the salvation of men.

"Go down into the slums. Live with the poor. Suffer with them. Encourage them. Help them to resist temptation." Is that the final word? Is that the last revelation of God's will to man? I think not. As the author says, religious progress is indicated by the fact that religion is moving from

the monastery and the fashionable church and is going down into the homes of the poor. But religion will not stop there. It is making another move. It is moving into the legislatures. That is the most significant move of all. The poor owe their wretchedness to bad laws more than to any other single cause. The most effective way to help them is to repeal these laws. This is a religious duty. As long as men regarded pestilences as the visitation of providence they continued to have them. They did not get rid of them until they learned that they were the natural penalty of the violation of the laws of sanitation. As long as we think God sends poverty to some and riches to others the poor will remain with us. Poverty will be abolished just as soon as we learn that it is not the gift of God, but comes as the natural result of the violation of social laws by ignorant or corrupt legislatures. I would not close the doors of a single institutional church, nor do away with a single social settlement. I would have these John Storms multiplied a thousand fold. Useless as it may seem, I would have them go down into the slums and die on their cross. I know what is going to come of it all. These men are going to see that their methods are not radical. With the same open-mindedness which took them to the slums they are going to discover that the real enemy of the poor is the injustice which ramifies our whole social system, and that nothing but radical and vital reforms can have much effect. And when they see that, with the same devotion and singleness of purpose which took them to the slums, they will go to the legislatures there to demand that the age-long burdens that have been crushing the poor shall be raised, that the yokes shall be broken, that the oppressed shall be set free. "On to the legislatures!" That is the last word religion has spoken.

One of the great forces of wickedness with which John Storm struggled was the worldliness of the established church of England. Storm's uncle, who was prime minister of England, watched with the keenest interest and sympathy the losing battle the boy was fighting. But he saw that the selfishness of the clergy was only a symptom of the disease, and that its real germ lay in the great temptations to selfishness which grew out of the fact that the church was a political institution and received its support by taxation. In the last analysis, the murder of his nephew seemed to him to be a political crime, having its origin in bad legislation and which therefore could

be dealt with effectively only by the legislative power of the state.

The other great evil which Storm felt called to combat was the social evil. But the social question is after all a wage question, with which the legislature has more to do than the church. Of these women Storm says:

Yet what was their condition? Think of it—their dependence on man, their temptations, their rewards, their punishments! Three half-pence an hour was the average wage of a working woman in England! and that in the midst of riches, in the heart of luxury, and with one easy and seductive means of escape from poverty always open.

Noble though it was, yet how hopeless his attempt to rescue these women so long as the poverty and the luxury remained, the one to lure them by false ideals of life, the other to goad them from the paths of virtue. It was not that Polly Love was so much weaker than other women. It was not that Lord Robert was a fiend incarnate. Just as the materialism of the clergy had grown from the soil of the marriage of church and state, so these immoralities were the weeds that grew from the soil of economic injustice which made it possible for Lord Robert to live a life of idleness and indulgence and compelled Polly Love to work for three half-pence an hour or sell her virtue. If John Storm was right in trying to lessen the temptations of slum life, and if, as he said, the chief temptations were luxury and poverty, how much more effective it would be to abolish the poverty and the luxury. But, you say, this is impossible. It would be with John Storm's methods. But give England a parliamentary majority of men with the heart of John Storm and the political wisdom of Henry George and they would do more to solve the social evil than has been done in a thousand years of noble effort.

Two hundred thousand persons own all the land of the United Kingdom. The other 39,000,000 pay tribute to them for the privilege of living under the union jack. The best argument I know for the existence of God is the fact that no state can tolerate such a wrong and not have the slums of luxury and the slums of poverty with all their trains of evil. To try to save men and women from these social vices without touching the great economic wrongs that breed the slum girl on the one hand and the idle lord on the other would be like trying to save a disabled ship by putting life preservers on its passengers. Give the drowning man a life preserver, give him that last hope if you have time. But he cannot cross the ocean

with that. The only permanent safety is in a sound ship. Religion has confined itself too long to the task of dragging drowning men out of the water. It is a more important duty to keep them from falling into the water. The greatest obstacles our John Storms have to meet are the effects in the lives of the people of hoary-headed injustice shielded by law and blessed by religion. This generation is suffering more from the lack of an aroused social conscience and a sound political economy than for the lack of agencies to give comfort and aid to the victims of social wrong. Sense and conscience are wanted in the legislatures. The most important factor in the salvation of the race is freedom.

AN APPEAL FROM THE PRESENT.

Extracts from the speech of Hon. George F. Hoar in the senate, April 17. Of the delivery of this speech the Springfield Republican said, editorially:

"There was one passage in Mr. Hoar's speech which acquired its dramatic force chiefly from the delivery. Referring to the Johnson impeachment, he said it had once been his fortune to witness the impressive spectacle in that chamber of senators responding to the call of the roll in a great state trial and giving in a sentence the reason for the vote. Would, he said, that the roll of the great men of the republic might thus be called on the pending question of imperialism. Thereupon the senator proceeded to call a number of names, such as Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Webster, Seward, Lincoln and Sumner, quoting against each some expression pertinent to the subject. They all voted no, all save Aaron Burr, whose yea vote was based on the ground that his buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi was at last to be vindicated. Then came the call, in shrill tones: 'William McKinley?' There was no answer. Then, stepping into the central aisle of the senate chamber, in still louder tones, the orator called again: 'William McKinley?' The effect given was of hesitation and reluctance to answer on the part of the one summoned to vote and give the reason. Finally came the response . . .

"Eye-witnesses describe the effect as very dramatic. A most impressive stillness came over the chamber as the name of the president was called, and the large audience awaited the response breathlessly. It is further stated that when Mr. Hoar reached that passage in his peroration: 'I appeal from the millionaire and the boss and the wire-puller and the manager to the statesman of the older time in whose eyes a guinea never glistened,' etc., he looked squarely at Senator Hanna. The latter's face flushed, and for once, says the Washington correspondent of the Chicago Inter Ocean, his smile of indifference or contempt forsook him. He was visibly angry."

Until within two years the American people have been wont to appeal to the declaration of independence as the foremost paper in history. As the years go round the Fourth of July has been

celebrated wherever Americans could gather together, at home or abroad. To have signed it, to an American, was better than a title of nobility. It was no passionate utterance of a hasty enthusiasm. There was nothing of the radical in it; nothing of Rousseau; nothing of the French revolution. It was the sober utterance of the soberest men of the soberest generation that ever lived. It was the declaration of a religious people at the most religious period of their history. It was a declaration not merely of rights but of duties. It was an act not of revolution but of construction. It was the corner stone, the foundation of a great national edifice wherein the American people were to dwell for evermore. The language was the language of Thomas Jefferson. But the thought was the thought of everyone of his associates. The men of the continental congress meant to plant their new nation on eternal verities which no man possessed by the spirit of liberty could ever thereafter undertake to challenge. As the Christian religion was rested by its author on two sublime commandments on which hang all the laws and the prophets, so these men rested republican liberty on two sublime verities on which it must stand, if it can stand at all; in which it must live or bear no life. One was the equality of the individual man with every other in political right. The other is that you are now seeking to overthrow—the right of every people to institute their own government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness, and so as to assume among the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature's God entitles them. Equality of individual manhood and equality of individual states. This is the doctrine which the republican party is now urged to deny. . . .

Certainly the flag should never be lowered from any moral field over which it has once waved. To follow the flag is to follow the principles of freedom and humanity for which it stands. To claim that we must follow it when it stands for injustice or oppression is like claiming that we must take the nostrums of the quack doctor who stamps it on his wares, or follow every scheme of wickedness or fraud, if only the flag be put at the head of the prospectus. The American flag is in more danger from the imperialists than there would be if the whole of Christendom were to combine its power against it. Foreign violence at worst

could only rend it. But these men are trying to stain it. . . .

Mr. President, it was my good fortune to witness an impressive spectacle in this chamber, when the senators answered to their names in rendering solemn judgment in a great state trial. By a special provision each senator was permitted, when he cast his vote, to state his reason in a single sentence. I have sometimes fancied that the question before us now might be decided not alone by the votes of those who sit here to-day, but of the great men who have been our predecessors in this chamber and in the continental congress from the beginning of the republic.

Would that that roll might be called. The solemn assembly sits silent while the chair puts the question whose answer is so fraught with the hopes and liberty and destiny of the republic.

The roll is called. George Washington: "No. Why should we quit our own to stand on foreign ground?"

Alexander Hamilton: "No. The declaration of independence is the fundamental constitution of every state."

Thomas Jefferson: "No. Governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Every people ought to have that separate and equal station among the nations of the world to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them."

John Adams: "No. I stood by the side of Jefferson when he brought in the declaration; I was its champion on the floor of congress. After our long estrangement, I come back to his side again."

James Madison: "No. The object of the federal constitution is to secure the union of the 13 primitive states, which we know to be practicable, and to add to them such other states as may arise in their own bosoms or in their neighborhood, which we cannot doubt will be practicable."

Thomas Corwin: "No. I said in the days of the Mexican war: 'If I were a Mexican, as I am an American, I would welcome you with bloody hands to hospitable graves;' and Ohio to-day honors and loves me for that utterance beyond all her other sons."

Daniel Webster: "No. Under our constitution there can be no dependencies. Wherever there is in the Christian and civilized world a nationality of character, then a national government is the necessary and proper result. There is not a civilized and intelligent man on earth that enjoys satisfaction with his condition if he does

not live under the government of his own nation, his own country. A nation cannot be happy but under a government of its own choice. When I depart from these sentiments I depart from myself."

William H. Seward: "No. The framers of the constitution never contemplated colonies or provinces at all. They contemplated states only; nothing less than states—perfect states, equal states, sovereign states. There is reason, there is sound political wisdom, in this provision of the constitution—excluding colonies, which are always subject to oppression, and excluding provinces, which always tend to corrupt and enfeeble and ultimately to break down the parent state."

John Marshall: "No. The power to declare war was not conferred upon congress for the purpose of aggression or aggrandizement. A war declared by congress can never be presumed to be waged for the purpose of conquest or the acquisition of territory, nor does the law declaring the war imply an authority to the president to enlarge the limits of the United States by subjugating the enemy's country."

John Quincy Adams: "No. The territories I helped bring into the nation were to be dwelt in by free men and made into free states."

Aaron Burr: "Yes. You are repeating my buccaneering expedition down the Mississippi. I am to be vindicated at last!"

Abraham Lincoln: "No. I said in Independence hall at Philadelphia, just before I entered upon my great race, that I rested upon the truth Thomas Jefferson had just uttered, and that I was ready to be assassinated, if need be, in order to maintain it. And I was assassinated in order to maintain it."

Charles Sumner: "No. I proclaimed it when I brought in Alaska. I sealed my devotion with my blood, also. It was my support and solace through those many long and weary hours when the red-hot iron pressed upon my spine, the very source and origin of agony, and I did not flinch. He knows our country little, little also of that great liberty of ours, who supposes that we could receive such a transfer. On each side there is impossibility. Territory may be conveyed, but not a people."

William McKinley; William McKinley: "There has been a cloud before my vision for a moment, but I see clearly now; I go back to what I said two years ago: 'Forcible annexa-

tion is criminal aggression; governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, not of some of them, but of all of them.' I will stand with the fathers of the republic. I will stand with the founders of the republican party. No."

Mr. President, I know how imperfectly I have stated this argument. I know how feeble is a single voice amid this din and tempest, this delirium of empire. It may be that the battle for this day is lost. But I have an assured faith in the future. I have an assured faith in justice and the love of liberty of the American people. The stars in their courses fight for freedom. The ruler of the heavens is on that side. If the battle to-day goes against it, I appeal to another day, not distant and sure to come. I appeal from the clapping of hands and the stamping of feet and the brawling and the shouting to the quiet chamber where the fathers gathered in Philadelphia. I appeal from the spirit of trade to the spirit of liberty. I appeal from the empire to the republic. I appeal from the millionaire, and the boss, and the wire-puller, and the manager to the statesman of the elder time, in whose eyes a guinea never glistened, who lived and died poor, and who left to his children and to his countrymen a good name far better than riches. I appeal from the present, bloated with material prosperity, drunk with the lust of empire, to another and a better age. I appeal from the present to the future and to the past.

In New Haven, Conn., a hot-food company began operations a few days ago. It undertakes to provide hot meals for families, course dinners for entertainments, and suppers and luncheons for parties and after-theater occasions. Canvassers call from house to house and solicit business. When the offer is accepted, an attendant of the company calls daily for the bills of fare of the various meals. The food is cooked in the company's kitchens, which are located in different parts of the city, and delivered in hot ovens.—Woman's Journal of April 14.

Just before the late local elections in Chicago the Municipal Voters' League gave this delightful description of one of the candidates for aldermen:

J—Y—, democrat, clothing dealer; colorless, except as a reflection of corporate appetite.

Much may the administration regret the pro-Boer programme of Hon. Webster Davis; but it must con-

gratulate itself because of the fact that the unadministration idiosyncrasy of Mr. Davis did not move him to pay a visit to Aguinaldo instead of to Mr. Kruger.

G. T. E.

A visitor at a Columbia (Mo.) school the other day asked one of the lower grade classes this question: "What is the axis of the earth?"

"An imaginary line passing from one pole to the other, on which the earth revolves," proudly answered a pupil.

"Yes," said the examiner, well pleased, "and could you hang a bonnet on it?"

"Yes, sir."

"Indeed! And what kind of a bonnet?"

"An imaginary bonnet, sir."

The visitor asked no more questions that day.—Woman's Journal.

BOOK NOTICES.

"Bimetallism," by A. J. Utley (Los Angeles: Fish & Hornbeck), a book of 250 pages, is a discussion of the money question from the bimetallic standpoint. Though intended rather as a treatise than a reference book, it contains a great quantity of historical and statistical information bearing on financial questions. To a condensed history of the precious metals is added an exposition of the cost of producing them, together with chapters on the ratio between them, on their consumption in the arts, on the parity of exchange between gold-using and silver-using countries, and on other subjects of equal importance in their relation to the "battle of the standards." Mr. Utley adopts the quantitative theory of money with all it implies—prosperity and a contented people with an expanding volume, and depression, poverty, misery, crime, with a contracting volume.

"The City for the People" (C. L. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia), by Prof. Frank Parsons, is an example of excellent work upon the subjects with which the author has made himself familiar by conscientious labor. It is also an example of the puerile work such a man can do in unfamiliar lines. Prof. Parsons's brief discussion of land monopoly mars the book. It is only an echo of the school men. By no possibility can it be an expression of his own independent thought. What he says of compensation, for instance, exposes his unfamiliarity even with what Henry George had to say upon that point, and is altogether a woeful display of superficial and confused thinking. But in his own field Prof. Parsons is admirable. He makes, to begin with, a simple but important and necessary distinction between government ownership and public ownership of public utilities. "Russia has government ownership of railroads," he says, for illustration, "but there is no public ownership of railroads in Russia, because the people do not own the government." This consideration leads to an inquiry, after a full presentation of the subject of public ownership of monopolies, into the related subjects of direct legislation, proportional representation and home rule for cities. In all respects the work in these

particulars is thorough and satisfactory. So is the reply, on page 236, to the objection to municipal ownership that it would be socialistic or in the direction of socialism. "The common ownership," writes Prof. Parsons, "of water, gas and electric works, street railways, telephones and other monopolies is no more socialism than Chestnut street is Philadelphia," nor any more socialistic than a journey from New York to Chicago, by a person who intended going no further, would be "San Franciscolistic."

"Vineland," by Perry Marshall (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co.), puts the story of the Norse discovery of America into hexameters.

"The Rights and Wrongs of Ireland" (Charles H. Kerr, Chicago) is one of Clarence S. Darrow's eloquent addresses. It was delivered as an oration on the anniversary of the execution at Manchester, England, of Allen, Larkin and O'Brien, and for that reason is especially interesting to Irishmen; but its democratic sympathies are so broad and wholesome that it appeals exclusively to no nationality or race, but to all.

Public Libraries and Reading Rooms which receive THE PUBLIC weekly:

Mobile, Ala., Ettel's Restaurant, 72 Dauphin St.
Mobile, Ala., Reading Room, Y. M. C. A. Bldg.
New Westminster, B. C., Public Library.
Berkeley, Cal., Public Library.
Pasadena, Cal., Public Library.
Colorado Springs, Col., Free Reading Room.
Como, Col., Reading Rooms.
Denver, Col., Public Library.
Wilmington, Del., Institute Free Library, 8th and Market Sts.
Wilmington, Del., Young Men's Single Tax Club, 4th and Shipley Sts.
Orlando, Fla., Direct-Legislation Reading Rooms.
Chicago, Ill., Reading Room Atlantic Hotel, cor. Van Buren and Sherman Sts.
Chicago, Ill., Six Branch Reading Rooms of Public Library.
Chicago, Ill., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, Hyde Park.
Elgin, Ill., Gail Borden Public Library.
Elgin, Ill., Y. M. C. A. Library.
Geneva, Ill., Public Library.
Maywood, Ill., Public Library.
Normal, Ill., Public Reading Room.
Peoria, Ill., Public Library.
Muncie, Ind., Trades' Council Library.
Terre Haute, Ind., Reading Room of Central Labor Union.
Cedar Rapids, Ia., Public Library.
Des Moines, Ia., Public Library.
Sioux City, Ia., Public Library.
Atchison, Kan., Public Library.
New Orleans, La., Fisk Free Library.
Boston, Mass., Public Library.
New Bedford, Mass., Free Public Library.
Stoneham, Mass., Public Library.
Stoughton, Mass., Public Library.
Wakefield, Mass., Public Reading Room.
Worcester, Mass., Free Public Library.
Kalamazoo, Mich., Library of Kalamazoo College.
Minneapolis, Minn., Public Library.
Meridian, Miss., Reading Room, R. R. Y. M. C. A.
St. Louis, Mo., Free Reading Room of St. Stephen's House, 520 Rutger St.
St. Louis, Mo., Public Library.
St. Louis, Mo., Reading Room of Aschenbroedel Club, 604 Market St.
Helena, Mont., Public Library.
Newark, N. J., Free Public Library.
Albuquerque, N. M., Public Library.
Brooklyn, N. Y., Brooklyn Library, Montague St.
Buffalo, N. Y., Public Library.
New York, N. Y., Manhattan Single Tax Club, 119 E 23d St.
New York, N. Y., Social Reform Club, 45 University Pl.
Riverhead, N. Y., Free Reading Room.

Syracuse, N. Y., Central Library.
Wyoming, N. Y., Free Library.
Fargo, N. D., Equal Suffrage Library.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Public Library.
Cleveland, Ohio, Case Library.
Newark, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Troy, Ohio, Public Library.
Youngstown, Ohio, Haselton Public Library.
Youngstown, Ohio, Hotel Radcliffe.
Youngstown, Ohio, Public Library.
Youngstown, Ohio, Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Portland, Ore., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Allegheny, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Braddock, Pa., Carnegie Library.
Conemaugh, Pa., P. R. Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Du Bois, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.
Homestead, Pa., Carnegie Library.
McKees Rocks, Pa., R. R. Reading Room Y. W. C. A.
Philadelphia, Pa., Economic Library, 1315 Filbert St.
Philadelphia, Pa., Free Reading Room of Henry George Club, 27 No. Juniper St.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Carnegie Library—Lawrenceville Branch, West End Branch and Wylie Ave. Branch.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Central Library.
Pittsburgh, Pa., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, East Liberty Branch; Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, 43d and Butler Sts.; and Y. M. C. A. Reading Room, Penn Ave. and 7th St.
Reading, Pa., Library, 5th and Franklin Sts.
Wilmerding, Pa., Public Library.
Peacedale, R. I., Narragansett Library.
Providence, R. I., Public Library.
El Paso, Tex., Public Library, City Hall.
Seattle, Wash., Public Library.
Milwaukee, Wis., South Side Branch of Public Library.
Seattle, Wash., Y. M. C. A. Reading Room.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 618, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Telephone, Main 2711.

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

JOHNSON, McGRATH & WAAGE,

ALFRED T. JOHNSON.
JOHAN WAAGE. JAMES E. McGRATH.

LAWYERS,

SUITE 906 TACOMA BLDG. Telephone Main 3644.

Houston.

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

Don't smoke with your eyes.

EXERCISE JUDGMENT

There are many cigars as good looking, but few as good tasting as ours.

J. & B. MOOS,

95 Randolph Street, 58-64 Dearborn Street, CHICAGO, ILL.

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.

Volume 2 of the Public

Complete Volumes, including Index,
Unbound, sent postpaid at Regular
Subscription price, \$1.00.

Bound Volumes. Price, \$2.00.
Express charges to be paid by consignee.

Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

Credit is often established by the fact of having a life insurance policy. It says a good deal for its holder,—indorses for him. Investigate may what be done. Consult

HENRY C. LIPPINCOTT,
Life Insurance Expert,
821 Chestnut Street,
Philadelphia.

OLD BOOKS! Any obtainable BOOK, PAMPHLET, or PERIODICAL, supplied.
Libraries, or small lots of Books bought

Catalog free upon application.

H. H. TIMBY, (Book Hunter)
P. O. Box 927. 731st Conneaut, Ohio

CHICAGO SINGLE TAX CLUB

MEETS EVERY FRIDAY EVENING

HANDEL HALL,

40 East Randolph Street, Second Floor.

Program for Friday, May 4th,

HON. C. W. C. JONES,

Editor Chicago Law Journal.

"Expansion—Disintegration—Extinction."