

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 31, 1901.

Number 178.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

The private citizen tires; but the trust never quits nor sulks.

One Methodist bishop, if the San Francisco Star is correctly informed, takes a sensible and human view of last year's disturbances in China. In a letter foreshadowing his report, says the Star of Bishop David H. Moore, of Frankfort, Ind., "a representative of the Methodist church specially commissioned to visit China to investigate the causes of the Boxer outbreaks," the bishop writes:

Great wrongs the Chinese have committed, but with a tenth part of the provocation we would have done a thousand times more and greater.

Earlier in the summer, the American newspapers told "the man out of a job" that the farmers of the north-west needed him, and needed him at high wages; and that, therefore, there was no excuse whatever for his poverty. Some of the workless appear to have been deceived by this cry of "plenty of profitable work off yonder!" for here is some of the aftermath, a news dispatch of the 23d from Winnipeg:

Winnipeg is in a state of turmoil, due to the presence of several thousand harvesters who claim they were brought here from every part of eastern Canada under the promise of big wages and employment for several months. About 600 who came here from Minnesota and Dakota say if they are not given work or free transportation to the states they will make an appeal to the American consul.

There was a significant echo of last year's presidential campaign in an incident before the Chicago tax commission last week. It needs no

comment. We quote literally from the report of the Chicago News of the 23d:

Both reviewers and assessors laughed to-day over an interview with S. J. Klein, representing Joseph Beifield & Co., who tried to get a reduction of the firm's assessment on the ground it was losing money everyday. The two boards sat in joint session. When Mr. Klein sat in the witness chair to plead the cause of hard times for the manufacturing firm he represents, a smile spread over the face of Assessor Gray, who innocently asked: "How about those prosperity speeches made by Mr. Beifield in Central Music hall last fall during the campaign, in which he asserted that last year was the greatest year of prosperity he had ever had in his business?" Mr. Klein was taken off of his guard, for he had finished saying the firm had lost money all of last year and that it was losing more this year. The reference to his partner's public statements to the contrary staggered him. "Well," he stammered, "you mustn't take a man's political arguments too seriously."

One paper evidently understands the real import of the action of the steel trust in dismantling its works at McKeesport. This is the Kansas City Star. In its comment it says that "the workmen will go elsewhere, but the loss in real estate values and the destruction of business cannot be repaired." That is true as to the workmen. The dismantling of the steel works does not hurt them unless they have invested in McKeesport lots. But the Star is wrong in saying that the loss in real estate values and the destruction of business cannot be repaired. Business as well as the workmen will go elsewhere. And as to the real estate values, they will go where the workmen and the business do. They will not be destroyed. Real estate owners and business men elsewhere will get all the values that real estate owners and business men of McKeesport lose. The effect will be

only a change of owners, not a destruction of the values owned.

The city board of equalization of Cleveland has taken a most important step of general interest in deciding to tax the value of riparian rights along the water front of Lake Erie. This decision was reached on the 26th, against the determined opposition of the rich owners of these valuable but hitherto untaxed landed privileges. A queer objection was made by the Otis Steel company. Its manager wanted to know why the board doesn't tax "our right to use the air." Mr. Baker, the attorney for the board, replied with a joke. "The air over the steel plant wouldn't be worth much," he said; "you have put too much smoke into it." The point of that joke ought to be visible to every inhabitant of a "soft coal" city. But the steel company's manager was too indignant to appreciate a joke, and he retorted:

Well, I think you have as much right to tax that as you have to tax our riparian rights.

Mr. Baker's reply to this was no joke. It laid bare the whole fiscal question. It went even to the heart of the social question. And it went quick and true. Said he:

The difference is that all of us have air and light, but just a few of you people have Lake Erie.

This equalization board of Cleveland, it will interest our readers to know, has been proceeded against for contempt of court in disobeying an injunction. The complainant is the "Big Consolidated" street car company. It got an injunction in July (p. 243), prohibiting the board from raising its tax. The injunction was dissolved on the 30th of July (p. 257). The street car company appealed at once, and gave a bond; which, as it contends, hung the matter up, with

the injunction in force. But immediately upon the dissolution of the injunction, and before the perfection of the appeal, there being no stay of their action meantime, the board added \$7,291,609 to the company's tax. These are the facts on which the contempt proceedings are based.

The action of the democratic convention of Iowa gives an indication of the extent to which Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has forced the subject of equitable taxation upon public attention. In its platform this convention declares:

The Democratic party believes that the burden of taxation should be borne equally by all taxable property subject to the jurisdiction of the state. We pledge our members of the general assembly to formulate and urge the adoption of such a law as will compel the burden of taxation to rest on corporate and individual property alike, without favor and exemption of any interest.

Weak as this declaration is, for railroad interests got into the democratic as well as into the republican convention of Iowa, it is nevertheless directly in line with the work that Johnson is doing in Ohio. Even the preliminary statement that "taxation should be borne equally by all taxable property," is in harmony, as far as it goes, with Johnson's fiscal principle. Though a careless reading might make it appear like a declaration in favor of the absurdly inequitable general property tax, to which Johnson is opposed, a second reading will disclose that it leaves open the question of what ought to be taxable property. The essence of the declaration is that all property which you make taxable you should tax equally. That is honest doctrine. But when it comes to the point of trying to tax all kinds of property equally the public will discover the necessity of distinguishing property that can be and ought to be taxable, from property that cannot be taxed fairly and ought not to be taxed at all.

The tax question is really the only issue in Iowa this year, as it is in Ohio,

though the republican platform of Iowa is vague and the democratic platform affirms the national platform of the party. But that affirmation became necessary because the reactionary conspirators of the party exploited Ohio, Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania as having abandoned the national platform when they did not reaffirm it, and were ready to make the same exploitation with reference to Iowa. This view, which we elaborated last week, is confirmed by the Dubuque Telegraph, the most representative democratic paper in Iowa, and a democratic paper which is democratic. It says:

If the Ohio convention had said nothing about national questions and limited its platform exclusively to state issues; and if its action and the action of Pennsylvania, Virginia and Maryland had not been construed and paraded by plutocrats and the plutocratic press as a deliberate repudiation of the national Democratic platform and leader, the democrats of Iowa might have waived reaffirmation and contented themselves with a platform dealing with state issues alone. But when what had preceded gave certain assurance that if they did this their action would be interpreted and heralded as proof that they also were against what they had supported in 1900 they refused to assent to anything short of reaffirmation. In ordinary circumstances, this being a year when no congressmen are chosen and a governor and a legislature are, they would not have objected to a purely state platform. They were unwilling, however, to pass the Kansas City platform without mention when they knew that the moment they had done so it would be proclaimed from one end of the land to the other that they had such an imperfect conception of and such little devotion to fundamental democratic principles as to be against them in 1901, though they had been for them in 1900. It was the plutocratic press of the country that made reaffirmation an unavoidable issue in Iowa, and Iowa's answer is unmistakable and worthy of its patriotism and intelligence.

The brave anti-independent speech of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton, of Harvard, which was the principal speech at the annual alumni dinner of Sanderson academy, has attracted the critical attention of the Chicago

Chronicle. As the Chronicle is somewhat unsteady upon its political feet, a phenomenon which is due to dizziness in its political head, this criticism of Prof. Norton, both in its substance and in its spirit, is naturally enough somewhat incoherent. Prof. Norton had attributed to the Filipino patriots the same motives that controlled the American people in 1776. To that the Chronicle replies that the professor overlooks many important facts. It specifies two, describing them as of more than passing mention, which shows how important the others may be. The first is "the fact that there never was a time when the Filipino insurrection as against Spain, and probably this is true also as against the United States, could not have been bought with money." But precisely that accusation might have been made, and with greater force, against the American patriots. For Great Britain did buy one of our greatest generals, Benedict Arnold, a purchase that would have ended the revolution but for the accidental capture of Andre; whereas our efforts to buy the Filipinos utterly failed, and the so-called sale to Spain was not a sale. Spain granted the reforms demanded by the Filipinos, which was the main consideration, and the money that passed was quite as legitimate as the money we paid to Spain for the Philippine islands. Moreover, it was all used to support the second rebellion, waged against Spain because she refused the reforms she had promised to grant. The other fact to which the Chronicle calls attention is equally weak as a criticism of Prof. Norton. The Chronicle says: "So far as we are advised, the noblest inspiration of the insurgents when they were in greatest force in front of Manila, shortly before its capture by the Americans, was that that city should be given up to pillage and its inhabitants put to the sword." Then the Chronicle is badly advised. This slander was an imperialistic afterthought. Even if it had been true, would the Filipinos appear thereby to have been worse than our own

troops in their behavior toward other Filipino towns? Some were pillaged by our troops; and if the inhabitants were not put to the sword they were slaughtered, without the usual notice of bombardment, by American shot and shell.

Very courteously and with a perfectly candid presentation of our side of the case, the Boston Beacon replies to our article (p. 274) on excessive exports. We discover in this reply, however, only two or three points that call for a response. One of them is to this effect: Even if foreigners, having invested in this country, do derive large returns, and "our excess of exports goes largely to balance the account," it does not follow "that by this process the country is becoming impoverished." We think it does follow, to the degree of the excess. To the extent that our exports represent incomes to foreigners, they represent an outgo to us. We may be paying for an old import that once enriched us, but the return payment is a drain—that is, it in itself is evidence of depletion and not of enrichment. Yet protectionists, and even the Beacon itself, refer to this outgo as in itself evidence of prosperity. We advise them to reflect upon the suggestiveness of Puck's first page cartoon of August 28. So much for one point.

Before taking up the next, let us warn the Beacon against incautiously misleading its readers, and possibly itself, by assuming that the American excess of exports consists only of merchandise. It is not merely an excess of merchandise, but, taking merchandise, gold and silver altogether, still the export balance is enormous. We give the Beacon this reminder because it says that—
an enormous increase in exports of merchandise means an enormous expansion of industry to meet the demands of the markets of the world.

This would imply that the balance of exports consists of merchandise alone, leaving uninformed readers to infer that it is paid for with silver and gold. At this place also we should

like to interject a question: How can "an enormous expansion of industry to meet the demands of the markets of the world," when caused by "an enormous increase of exports of merchandise," for the value of which we get back only a small return in merchandise, silver and gold—how can that in itself enhance the prosperity of this country?

Now as to the next point. The Beacon unqualifiedly asserts that "the exporting countries are the rich and prosperous countries, and the importing countries are the countries that are impoverished." We make no concealment of our astonishment at that assertion. The reverse has long been accepted as true, and we should be sincerely obliged for a reference to the statistics upon which the Beacon bases its novel assertion. The statistics that are accessible to us show that India, for example, a very type of an impoverished country, is an exporting country. It appears from the Statesman's Year Book for 1901, page 151, to have been an exporting country for at least 40 years. The same reference book, at page 80, shows Great Britain—the conventional type of a prosperous country—to have had a steady excess of imports for ten years. In fact, Great Britain has been an importing country fully half a century.

Answering the Beacon's question, "Suppose, for instance, that the balance were the other way, and that our imports exceeded our exports, would the editor of the Public argue that the country was growing richer?" we say, By no means. Unlike those who boast of excessive exports, he would want to know more about what the figures meant. Excessive imports, as a fact by itself, does imply greater wealth; while excessive exports, as a fact by itself, implies a drain. This is only another way of saying that income in itself implies wealth and outgo in itself implies drain. Inasmuch, however, as excessive exporting may be for investment, and (as we showed

three months ago at page 51) thereby be the cause of excessive importing in the future, so excessive importing may be thriftless borrowing and thereby be the cause of excessive exporting in the future. In those circumstances excessive exporting would be in the direction of enhancing wealth, while excessive importing would be in the direction of diminishing it. But our criticism with reference to all this boasting about excessive exports, is not that excessive exporting is necessarily a drain, other considerations being taken into account, but that the boasters do not take other considerations into account. They put forth the fact that exports are excessive, and then, assuming that excessive exporting is in itself profitable, conclude that prosperity is thereby proved. And in this the Beacon also is an offender. In its very last number it quotes the latest statistics of enormously excessive exportation, with an implication that they in themselves mean prosperity. The burden is upon it, therefore, to show what are the conditions that turn our enormous and continuous excess of exports, which in itself would be evidence of a drain, into evidence of prosperity.

We note that J. Sterling Morton's Conservative has reached the conclusion that opportunities for success in life are better than ever. Mr. Morton means, of course, not that success is more easily achieved, but that the successes possible now are greater in magnitude than those which used to be possible. This is true. Business success, though harder to achieve, is more magnificent than ever. But that is not the point that should interest social students. The great masses are not concerned so much with glittering prizes which in the nature of things only a few can grasp. They are concerned with the living that all may make. That there is still room at the top we may grant. That the top is higher up and harder to reach Mr. Morton must concede. But how about the bottom? What peo-

ple need is more room at the bottom, not at the top. What they have a right to expect, in view of our enormous natural progress, is better room at the bottom and not more luxurious room at the top.

Mr. J. B. Johnston, a Chicago gentleman, has written to the Conservative a thoughtful essay on privileged classes. Mr. Morton publishes it with the editorial announcement that "it demonstrates thoroughly well the fact that there is a privileged class in this country." But he adds that "there always will be a privileged class, so long as some men have better intellectual ability by inheritance and better development thereof by schooling and discipline than other men." Inasmuch as Mr. Johnston "demonstrates," to use Mr. Morton's language, "that there is a privileged class," by showing that the law creates these privileges, through the establishment and maintenance of monopolies of national resources, Mr. Morton's comment leads to a queer conclusion. For if Mr. Johnston has demonstrated his proposition, as Mr. Morton admits, and it is true, as Mr. Morton explains, that the privileged get their privileges through superior intellectual ability, then their intellectual ability must be superior in the direction of securing legislation for selfish ends. In other words, it must be sly predatory ability that the privileged class inherits and develops? Now, pray, what is the moral difference between predatory ability of the intellectual order and predatory ability of the physical sort? If systematic robbery by law is commendable, why not sporadic robbery with a club?

The plutocratic press of the country made itself merry a few weeks ago, both in news and editorial columns, over a newspaper interview attributed to ex-Senator Charles A. Towne, in which Mr. Towne was credited with saying in substance that the bottom had fallen out of the silver issue, that Bryanism had collapsed, and that Hill,

of New York, would probably be the next democratic candidate for president. Mr. Towne has in a most public and emphatic manner denied the authenticity of this interview, denouncing it as a fabrication from beginning to end. We have consequently watched for corrections in the plutocratic papers that were presumably misled by the faked interview, but thus far we have watched in vain. The confiding readers of those papers are allowed still to suppose that Mr. Towne said what the interview attributed to him. If grocers were to deceive their customers in a similar manner about the genuineness of butter, the grocers would be accounted swindlers. But is it not a worse swindle to sell false news at full price than to sell oleomargarine for the price of butter?

AUSTRALASIAN TAXATION IN COLORADO.

A political campaign is now beginning in the state of Colorado which will last 14 months and culminate in a momentous decision—momentous not alone to the people of Colorado, but, only in lesser degree, to the people also of all the other states. It is a campaign to determine by popular vote whether Colorado shall introduce the Australasian system of taxation.

I.

Like every other American community, Colorado is cursed with great inequalities of taxation, imposed by burdensome methods and producing inadequate public incomes. After some experience with the usual variety of familiar "remedies" for curing this revenue disease without disturbing its cause, the state senate adopted a resolution on the 27th of March, 1899, providing for a senate committee to investigate the "state and local revenue laws, and, so far as possible, discover their defects and a just, wise and complete remedy therefor." The resolution particularly instructed the committee "to investigate the tax laws of New Zealand and the Australian colonies and the effect of such laws."

Credit for securing the adoption of

this resolution is due especially to James W. Bucklin, of Grand Junction, one of the most prominent lawyers of western Colorado. Some 15 or 18 years ago Mr. Bucklin was a republican member of the lower house of the Colorado legislature. About that time he came across Henry George's great work, "Progress and Poverty," which made him a thorough convert to its doctrines. His political sympathies thereby revolutionized, he withdrew from his party and for a long time afterwards had no party affiliations. But with unflinching enthusiasm, yet patiently and by common sense methods, Mr. Bucklin impregnated his community with the doctrines that meant so much to him; and when the wave of populism swept the state it carried him back to a seat in the lower house. That was in 1896. While in the house at this time Mr. Bucklin procured the passage of a measure for local option in taxation, but it was defeated in the senate. At the end of his term he was nominated for the senatorship jointly by the populist and the democratic parties, and elected in 1898 by an extraordinary vote. Though opposed by a regular republican and a silver republican, he carried every voting precinct of his own county, every voting precinct of the adjoining county, and 19 out of the 26 voting precincts of the third county of his senatorial district. Even the voting precincts where his adversaries lived gave him a majority. Upon coming into the senate Mr. Bucklin renewed his efforts to establish local option in taxation in Colorado, meantime securing the enactment of a very important franchise law which recognizes the fundamental distinction between property in personalty or improvements and property in mere legal privileges. The result of his efforts to advance the local option movement was the adoption of the resolution quoted from above.

Senator Bucklin was, of course, appointed chairman of the committee called for by that resolution, and with him upon the committee were named Senators William A. Hill, silver republican, and Thomas J. Ehrhart, democrat. As there was no appro-

priation for the expenses of the committee, it would have accomplished nothing but for the personal determination and pecuniary sacrifices of Senator Bucklin. The committee having been particularly instructed to investigate the tax laws of New Zealand and the Australian colonies, Mr. Bucklin determined to make the investigation thorough, though at his own time and expense. Accordingly he spent the winter of 1899 and 1900 in visiting the colonies of Australasia and examining into the character, operation and effects of their tax laws. Upon his return he presented a report which has been widely circulated and forms the basis for the campaign in Colorado which we mention above.*

In his preface to this report Senator Bucklin says:

One of the most persistent objections to a system of land value taxation has been the claim that such a system was a mere theory and not practical. The system of land value taxation now existing in the colonies of Australasia forever silences all such contentions. The practical working success of that system can no longer be questioned. All that I claim for this report is strict accuracy in detailing facts, and that the conclusions drawn therefrom are conservative. My hope is that the American states, and first of all my own state of Colorado, may likewise find relief from intolerable fiscal and economic conditions, by adopting the rational system of taxation which has been so successful in the progressive colonies of Australasia.

II.

To gather the materials for that report the now distinguished Colorado senator traveled more than 20,000 miles. He was everywhere received with great courtesy and kindness by the Australasian officials, who took all pains to facilitate his researches and enable him to make his investigation thorough.

That he did this is evident. But he makes no attempt either to describe all the different schemes of taxation in Australasia which he studied, nor to point out theoretical defects in any. Most of them are neither

novel nor valuable. He confines his report to that one of the Australasian tax systems which differs from any in America, and "which, owing to its extensive adoption, prospective extension and radical departure from other methods, may properly be called the Australasian land value tax."

This appears to be—

a law taxing land according to its value, excluding all personal property and improvements therefrom. It draws a sharp, clear line of distinction between the products of labor and capital as a source of public revenue, and the unearned increment or rental values of land. Such a tax, therefore, is not in any degree derived from wages, nor from the natural increase of capital, but comes wholly from ground or land rent, excluding all improvements. It is a tax on the privilege of owning social values, which are not produced by individuals, but which spring up, increase and decrease with the existence, condition and growth of society, and the character of its government. In short, the Australasian land value tax is simply a tax on the benefits or privileges which governments confer on land owners, in exact proportion to the benefits so received; in other words, the application of the betterment principle, that the owner of the property benefited by law should bear the burden of paying for the benefit so received. It is in no sense a class tax, but rests upon all in proportion to the benefits received from the existence and growth of society and government. It is not a tax on the area of land, but rests on city lots and on all land according to its value and irrespective of its size. The Australasian system does not interfere with nor tax any industry in any of its processes, nor anything which industry produces, but leaves them free from any fines or burdens of government, thus giving to each and every industry equal and impartial encouragement and protection. It is not a general property tax nor a real estate tax, as both personal property and improvements are exempt under its provisions. In fact, there is no direct taxation of personal property in any of the Australasian colonies, nor any constitutional or other restrictions on the power of the legislatures to establish or enlarge the land value tax.

Yet the Australasian land value tax is not identical with the system known as "the single tax," which is associated with the name of Henry George. "The single tax is not in operation in any of the Australasian

colonies," says the Bucklin report, which continues:

The single tax is a philosophy, and covers the question of political economy, while the Australasian land tax is simply a small land value tax in practical operation. The single tax would abolish all other forms of taxation and raise all public revenue from one source; while the Australasian land tax is only one of many kinds of taxes. None of the colonies derive their entire revenue from this tax, but, on the contrary, the greater portion of their revenues are raised by other tax laws. The Australasian land tax does not abolish private property in land, and only converts into the public treasury a small proportion of the rent of land. In short, it contains only a small part of the single tax ideas. The great majority of the advocates and supporters of the Australasian law have made but little if any investigation of the single tax, and some of them violently denounce it. Having been formulated and placed on the statute books of New Zealand before "Progress and Poverty," or any of the principal works of Henry George were issued, this law does not owe its origin nor its original establishment to the books of George. In fact, it owes its origin to the failure of all other systems of taxation, to the work of Sir George Grey and other New Zealand statesmen, many of whom were students of political economy, and to such books as those of John Stuart Mill and Judge Thomas M. Cooley. Its subsequent establishment and progress has been greatly aided by Henry George and his disciples, and it is significant that since "Progress and Poverty" has been known to the world no land value tax law has been repealed. The Australasian land value tax is not a law of the "Commonwealth of Australia," but is a law of the several states or colonies, and can be fully adopted by any of the several American states; while the single tax could not be put into full operation here without an amendment to the federal laws and constitution. While each is a tax on land values exclusively, still to identify the Australasian land tax with the single tax is to do great injustice both to the philosophy of George and to the existing law.

Besides the differences which the Colorado report enumerates between the single tax and the Australasian land value tax as proposed in Colorado, another difference is to be noted. The single tax is a fiscal system, whereas the Colorado measure goes no further than to give constitutional permission for the adoption of a fiscal system. Even if this measure were adopted, it would still remain

* Report of the Revenue Commission of Colorado. Appointed by authority of the senate. Senator James W. Bucklin, Senator Thomas J. Ehrhart, Senator William A. Hill, commissioners. Second edition. Copies to be had of the Australasian Tax League, 312 Jackson block, Denver, upon remission of five cents for postage.

with the people to determine whether or not to adopt the system it permits.

The Australasian land value tax, according to the Bucklin report, is used for both local and state purposes, and in some form and degree is in operation in four out of the seven colonies or states.

III.

New Zealand, South Australia and New South Wales raise part of their general taxes by the land value tax.

It was first established for general purposes in 1878 by New Zealand. Before its effects could be observed it was repealed and the general property tax substituted for it. But the general property tax worked so disastrously and consequently became so unpopular that in 1890 a parliament pledged to reenact the land value tax was elected. In 1891, therefore, the land value tax was reenacted. It has ever since remained in force, and could not be repealed. Says the premier, R. G. Seddon, in a letter embodied in the Bucklin report:

Those who in former years opposed this policy have gone the length of saying that they would not disturb it, and there was not a single candidate [at the recent parliamentary election], so far as I know, who advocated its repeal.

On this point Mr. Bucklin himself reports:

After having thoroughly tested the general property tax, and compared it with the Australasian land value tax, the former system was deliberately abolished and the Australasian system finally established; thus, after a thorough trial, rendering a complete judgment on the relative merits of the two methods of taxation. So completely are the people of New Zealand convinced of the superiority of their system that no political party advocates a return to the general property tax, but, on the contrary, practically a unanimous sentiment exists in favor of retaining their system.

Between the first and the second adoption of this system by New Zealand it was adopted by South Australia to secure additional revenues. That was in 1884. In 1894 New South Wales adopted it to reduce tariff taxes. In both countries it has proved satisfactory. The Daily Telegraph, one of the two or three papers of largest circulation and influence in New South Wales, predict-

ed in its issue of January 8, 1900, that Senator Bucklin could have "nothing but good to report of the working of land value taxation" in that state; and the premier of South Australia, F. W. Holder, writes:

There is no prospect of its repeal, and no general desire that it should be repealed. The trend has all been the other way. It was first one-half penny in every pound value. In 1893 it was altered to one-half penny in the pound up to \$25,000 owned by any one taxpayer, and one penny in the pound for all excess over \$25,000 value so held. The probabilities are all in the direction of another half penny being added when any one holding exceeds in value, say, \$100,000.

Of the operation of this system of taxation in the three Australasian states mentioned above, the Bucklin report has this to say:

Under the Australasian system there is no difficulty in assessing property at its "full cash value," and but little if any complaint of unjust or unequal valuations. These valuations are used as a basis of taxation, and for various other public and private purposes. In marked contrast to the conditions in Colorado and other American states, there is a general acquiescence in the fairness and accuracy of the assessments. The reason for this is clearly evident. The Australasian system does not attempt to assess property which can be removed or hidden from sight. Nor is it inquisitorial nor complicated. Nor does it attempt the impossible task of arriving at the value of property of infinite form and variety, each class of which would require a thorough expert to determine, even approximately, its fair value. On the contrary, the Australasian system only taxes that kind of property which cannot be hidden or removed out of the country, the existence of which is known to everybody, and the value of which is the most widely known, the most easily and accurately ascertained of any form of property values. For these reasons, the valuations being simple and easy, the difficulties inherent in assessing and collecting the general property tax are largely avoided, and the operations of the Australasian land value tax are full, fair and complete.

The Australasian tax cannot be avoided by perjury or any other fraudulent or evasive acts of the taxpayer. Whatever inequalities exist thereunder result from a wrong formulation of the laws or from incompetent assessors, and are not inherent in the system itself. This conclusion is illustrated by the fact that the only colony in which any serious

trouble has arisen over the operation of the land tax is New South Wales, where considerable complaint and litigation arose over the operation of the law for the first year or two of its existence. This trouble arose through the crude and incompetent formulation of the law, ignorance by both friends and enemies of the principle involved, inexperienced valuers, the unusually bitter opposition of large land owners, and the lack of any previous experience in direct taxation. These evils have now been overcome, and the law is working smoothly and satisfactorily.

A very significant piece of testimony to the success of the system is that of the Bucklin report where it avers:

The operation of the Australasian land value tax has always been satisfactory after its effects were once known, as is shown by the following facts: There has been no effort to repeal it, but, on the contrary, it has been extended and improved; as soon as it has come into operation in any degree in any colony or locality, all opposition to it ceases, and it is then accepted even by the conservative parties as a permanent institution; the people of the colonies never vote against it nor against those who are identified with the principle established; it has extended from colony to colony, and from state to municipal affairs, after the trial of numerous other revenue schemes. If these facts applied only to one isolated colony, or to the taxation of values of a special or local character, they would not be so convincing. But when the principle of taxing those values which exist wherever civilization extends has been tried for more than 16 years, under different laws and conditions, by different countries and peoples, with one uniform successful result, the question of the practicability and wisdom of the law as a fiscal measure is placed beyond the region of successful controversy. My conclusions are, after careful observations and the most minute and painstaking examination of all data which I could procure, that the Australasian land value tax is the best fiscal measure, and the greatest fiscal success, ever adopted by any country or community.

IV.

That unqualified indorsement and recommendation refers not alone to the system in its general applications for state purposes, but also to its special applications for local purposes in Queensland and New Zealand.

A local option law, authorizing

land value taxation for local purposes, was first proposed in 1887, in South Australia, and adopted there in 1893. But it was not in operation at the time of Bucklin's visit, because its enemies had managed to get obstructive conditions into the law which made it a dead letter. In one municipality, for example, these conditions prevented the adoption of the land value tax for local purposes, though the proposition received a majority of nearly 11 to 1 of those who voted. The sick, dead and absent all counted against it. Since Senator Bucklin's return to this country the South Australian law has been corrected.

In Queensland the system is in full operation. It is not optional there, but compulsory. Every local division is compelled to raise practically all its local revenue by taxes on land values only.

The law went into operation in 1891, and after an experience of a decade, the town clerk of Brisbane, Queensland's capital city, writes of its success in these words:

The object of the legislation of 1890 was primarily to fix the incidence of taxation more equitably, and that object has in the main been secured. The system of taxing improvements is undoubtedly defective, in that it tends to retard true progress. Prior to the adoption of the valuation and rating act of 1890, the owner of land who erected extensive improvements thereon was, in a sense, penalized for his temerity, while the owners of vacant lands, and lands whose improvements were not in keeping with their surroundings and the situation generally, benefited more or less at his expense. I am of the opinion that the effect of the act has been to induce greater activity in building operations, and that it is a distinct advance upon the previous system, though still open to improvement. . . . I believe that the workings of the act give very general satisfaction, and there is no intention to have it repealed. So far no amendments have been made, though several have been suggested, but these are of a very minor character and do not affect the general principles of the statute.

The New Zealand local tax law differs substantially from that of Queensland in only one particular. Whereas the Queensland law makes local land value taxation compulsory,

the New Zealand law makes it optional. Each municipality decides for itself by popular vote whether or not it will derive local revenues exclusively from land values.

This law went into operation in New Zealand in 1896, after having been four times passed by the lower house and thrown out by the legislative council. Up to February 19, 1900, 25 local bodies had voted under this law, on the question of adopting land value taxation for local purposes. Over 82 per cent. of all the votes cast were in the affirmative, and in only two instances did the negative poll a majority of the votes cast.

But prior to 1899 the details of the law were so far defective that in only 14 out of the 25 local bodies referred to was the proposition carried. Since then the law has been improved, and now the question is determined by a majority vote. Had that been so from the start, 23 local bodies out of 25 voting on the question would have adopted the land value tax at the time of Bucklin's visit.

Palmerston North, a borough on the north island of New Zealand, was the first body to adopt the new tax by popular vote. This was in March, 1897. The vote stood 402 for the land value tax and 12 in opposition.

And so satisfactory did it prove to be when in actual operation that three years later the road district bounding the borough of Palmerston North on three sides—and this road district is a farming community—followed the example of the borough by adopting the land value tax by a vote of 105 to 10.

"I found no opposition to the law whatever," Senator Bucklin reports; "but found that it gave general satisfaction." He adds that the satisfactory experience of the borough of Palmerston North "is the general experience throughout the colony, no local body having repealed the operation of the law after once having adopted it." Mr. Bucklin's judgment is confirmed by subsequent events. Down to the 1st of last April the land value tax had been adopted in New Zealand by a total of 60 local bodies—46 more than had elected to adopt it at the time of his visit. Its

popularity is further attested by the large majorities it received. At three elections last March it was adopted by 350 to 193, by 140 to 69 and by 140 to 8. The places so adopting it were all country districts in a farming region, which goes to show that in New Zealand the farmers have "caught on." Later still, Fielding borough, the center of the butter-making district, and the next station on the railway from Palmerston North, adopted this land value tax by 268 to 56, after a year's campaign, in which the subject was fully discussed.

V.

In consequence of Senator Bucklin's observations in Australasia a majority of the tax committee of which he was chairman recommended that "the legislature permit the people of Colorado to amend their state constitution so as to allow the gradual adoption of the Australasian land value tax system, or any part thereof." Even the minority report recommended substantially the same thing. It proposed "to allow the gradual adoption of the Australasian land value tax system, or any part thereof, or to reject it, as the people by their votes shall determine for themselves."

In harmony with the majority report Senator Bucklin drew and introduced a constitutional amendment authorizing the exemption by the legislature of personal property and improvements, when providing for taxes for state purposes, and empowering any county to exempt by popular vote all personalty and improvements in the raising of revenues for local purposes.

Some provisions of that bill were objected to by enough senators to prevent its commanding a two-thirds vote. To meet those objections Senator Bucklin substituted another amendment. It is as follows:

Section 1. There shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the state of Colorado at the next general election for members of the general assembly, for their approval or rejection, the following amendments to the constitution of the state of Colorado, which when ratified by a majority of those voting thereon, shall be valid as a part of the constitution.

Sec. 2. Section 9 of article X of the constitution of the state of Colorado shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 9. Once in four years, but not oftener, the voters of any county in the state may, by vote at any general election, exempt or refuse to exempt from all taxation for county, city, town, school, road and other local purposes, any or all personal property and improvements on land, but neither the whole nor any part of the full cash value of any rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, exclusive of improvements thereon, shall be so exempted; provided, however, that such question be submitted to the voters by virtue of a petition therefor, signed and sworn to by not less than one hundred resident taxpayers of such county, and filed with the county clerk and recorder, not less than thirty nor more than ninety days before the election.

Sec. 3. Section 11 of article X of the constitution of the state of Colorado shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 11. The rate of taxation on property for state purposes shall never exceed four mills on each dollar of valuation; but the provisions of this section shall not apply to rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, the full cash value of which may be taxed at such additional rate, not exceeding two mills on each dollar of assessed valuation, as shall be provided by law, after exempting all personal property and improvements thereon from such additional rate of taxation.

Sec. 4. Each elector voting at said election and desirous of voting for or against all the said amendments as a whole, shall prepare and deposit his ballot whereon shall be printed the words "For Australasian Tax System" and "Against Australasian Tax System," and shall indicate his choice by placing a cross opposite one or the other of said group of words. Any elector not voting as aforesaid, may express his approval or rejection of any one or more of said amendments by similarly designating any amendment so approved or rejected by number in the order in which it appears in this act. The official ballot shall be so prepared as to afford the electors the opportunity to express their choice as herein provided.

Sec 5. The votes cast for the adoption or rejection of said amendments, or either or any of them, shall be canvassed, and the result determined in the manner provided by the laws of the state for the canvass of votes for representatives in congress.

Summarized, that amendment would allow—

1. The people of any county to vote once in four years, if petitioned by 100 resident taxpayers, upon the question of exempting from all local

taxation any or all personal property or landed improvements, except franchises in public ways.

2. For state purposes the tax of four mills on the dollar may be increased to six mills, provided the extra two mills is levied upon rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, to the exemption to the extent of that additional rate of all personal property and landed improvements.

This constitutional amendment, now generally known in Colorado as "the Bucklin bill," received the necessary two-thirds vote in both houses. In the senate the vote stood 26 to 6, and in the house 50 to 11. The question is now before the people of the state. They are to vote upon its adoption at the general election in the autumn of 1902. A majority of the votes then polled on this question will, if affirmative, make it part of the state constitution.

The agitation for the popular adoption of this measure is the political campaign referred to at the beginning of this editorial.

VI.

That campaign is not merely a local one. Nor is it one that interests tax reformers alone. So important in the direction of freeing all industry from tax burdens is the step proposed, that it demands the attention of the public-spirited men of every state. Whatever may be the opinions one may hold on the subject of taxation, this amendment and those who are promoting its adoption deserve the support of everybody who believes in direct legislation or local self-government. Next to the constitutional provision in South Dakota, it is the largest measure of direct legislation yet proposed in this country with possibilities of adoption. In this Colorado campaign the advocates of direct legislation, and advocates of local self-government, as well as advocates of tax reform wherever they may live, have an unusual opportunity to further the civic principles they cherish. By helping the Australasian tax reformers of Colorado in their campaign, with intelligent speakers, instructive literature and funds for the work during the next 15 months, they

will avail themselves of an opportunity to render a public service of greater magnitude and at less cost than often presents itself.

The way for doing this can be opened by corresponding with Jabez Norman, president of "Australasian Tax League of Colorado," 312 Jackson block, Denver, or sending funds to the treasurer, Dr. C. S. Elder, who is treasurer also of Arapahoe county, and lives in Denver.

Assistance of this kind ought to be proffered promptly. The plan of the opposition in Colorado to the Bucklin amendment is quite evidently to maintain absolute silence upon the subject until the election is near, and then to make a short and sharp campaign of misrepresentation. To break up this conspiracy of silence, not a year hence, but now, by immediately educating the people of the state upon the merits of the measure, is of the utmost importance.

It is not remarkable that single tax organizations—notably the Ohio Single Tax league, of which William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, is president, and J. B. Vining, of Cleveland, is secretary—are first in the field as supporters of the "Bucklin bill." For while its adoption would not be the adoption of the single tax, not even in the slightest degree, yet it would open the way for the single tax for local revenues in any Colorado county whose inhabitants desire it. The campaign in behalf of the bill, though not a campaign for the single tax, is a campaign for permission to vote for or against local trials of the single tax in modified form. But other tax reforms, together with the principle of home rule, are involved in the fate of the "Bucklin bill."

From any point of view its acceptance by the people is the one thing to be worked for at this time. Home rulers should work for it because it involves the question of home rule at the most vital point—taxation. Direct legislationists should work for it, because it permits direct legislation to an important extent and in the vital matter of taxation. All who oppose the absurdities of personal property taxation should work for it, because it would enable them to propose the local abolition of those absurdities.

ties. Single taxers should work for it, because it would enable them to bring their theory to the forum of popular opinion and probably to local tests; and they should work for it with good judgment, having in view primarily the adoption of this permissive measure, rather than loose agitation in behalf of the mere label which distinguishes their cause, or even of the profound principles that underlie it. That labor organizations should work for it, is sufficiently attested by the action at its recent convention of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, which has coupled it with the eight-hour amendment in a series of resolutions urging "all unions and labor organizations, and all members thereof, to support these amendments with their votes at the next state election, so that a unanimous vote may be cast by organized labor, assuring the enactment into law of these beneficent measures." Last, but by not means least, every person should support the "Bucklin bill" who is opposed to government by monopoly corporations. This is a negative reason, to be sure, but at a time when corporations are reaching out to "grab everything in sight," it is not a bad plan, if in doubt, to work against what these corporations want and in favor of what they oppose. The monopoly corporations fought the "Bucklin bill" in the legislature bitterly though hopelessly; and such opposition as it may meet before the people will come from them. That fact alone is a high tribute to the merits of the bill. What may endanger the monopoly corporations is pretty certain to benefit the people.

Since in all these respects, and in others that have escaped enumeration, the result of the vote on the Bucklin bill will be national in its effects and influence, the campaign should be national in the support it receives.

NEWS

The steel strike has furnished abundant material during the week for gossip newspaper articles, but no important change in the situation has yet been made public, except that a

vote upon peace propositions is being taken by mail through the lodges of the Amalgamated association. The propositions submitted are given out as follows:

1. That the New York offer of July 27, made by Messrs. Schwab and Morgan, be accepted. [This provided that the tin-plate mills resume under the scale signed for the year beginning July 1; that the hoop company sign for all mills signed for last year, and that the sheet steel company sign for all mills signed for last year, except Old Meadow and Saltsburg.]

2. That a provisional scale be arranged, but not signed, for Painter's, Lindsay & McCutcheon's and the Clark mill, leaving recognition of the union open.

3. That the United States Steel corporation formally declare its attitude toward organized labor, this declaration to take such form as will have a reassuring effect upon the men in mills.

It is understood that these propositions have been assented to by President Shaffer. If approved by the referendum vote, the American Civic Federation, which has interested itself in bringing the strike to an amicable settlement, purposes to endeavor to secure their adoption by the steel trust. In a speech at Pittsburg on the 27th, Mr. Shaffer seemed to allude to this phase of the situation when, as reported, he said:

We will settle the strike if the trust signs the scale for all mills signed for last year, agreeing not to discriminate against men who left the mills on strike and guaranteeing to pay union rates in those mills in which the men have proved they want to organize.

"Government by injunction" has been invoked in behalf of the Allis-Chalmers concern against the machinists, whose strike was last referred to in these columns at page 298. The injunction was granted ex parte, on the 23d, at Chicago, by Judge Kohlsaat, of the United States circuit court, the 28th being fixed by him for the first hearing. It forbids the strikers—

from in any manner hindering by violence or threats of violence, or interfering with any of the business of the—

Allis-Chalmers plant; also from—compelling or inducing or attempting to compel or induce, by use of threats or intimidation of any sort, or violence, any person to leave the employment of said company or not

to enter its employ if desirous of so doing.

Also from—

congregating at or near the premises of the company with the purpose or in such manner as to intimidate any of the employes or said company or persons seeking employment from it, in going to, remaining at or coming from the premises of said company.

Also from—

picketing, besetting or controlling the streets, alleys, or approaches to the premises of said company, with the purpose to intimidate, threaten, surround or coerce any of the employes.

Since the granting of this injunction the striking machinists are reported to have been "picketing" the Allis-Chalmers plant by taking photographic snap-shots of nonunion workmen as they go into or come out of the place. The hearing upon the injunction, originally set for the 28th, has been postponed until September 16.

On the 24th another strike injunction was reported. This was issued at Goshen, Ind., by Judge Baker, of the United States circuit court, in connection with a local strike of long duration, which is still in operation against the W. B. Conkey Co., a printing concern at Hammond, Ind. It restrains the strikers and all their abettors—

from in any manner interfering with, hindering, obstructing, or stopping any of the business—

of the Conkey company. Also—

from entering upon the grounds, factory or premises of said W. B. Conkey company for the purpose of interfering with the business of the said company.

Also—

from compelling or inducing, or attempting to compel or induce, by threats, intimidation, persuasion, force or violence, any of the employes of said W. B. Conkey company to refuse or fail to do their work, or discharge their duties as such employes; and also from compelling or inducing, or attempting to compel or induce, by threats, intimidation force, or violence any of the employes of the said W. B. Conkey company to leave the service of said company; and also from attempting or attempting to prevent any person or persons by threats, intimidation, force or violence from freely entering into the service and employment, or continuing in the service and em-

ployment of the W. B. Conkey company.

The injunction restrains the men also from compelling the company, by threats, intimidation, force or violence, to employ or discharge any person whatsoever against its will; and forbids them—

from congregating or being upon or about the sidewalks, streets, alleys, approaches, places adjoining or places adjacent to said factory, and the premises of said complainant in the city of Hammond for the purpose of interfering with the business of the said firm.

The order further restrains the pressmen from gathering, singly or in small bodies, about the approaches to the factory "for the purpose of picketing or patrolling or guarding the streets, avenues, gates and approaches to the property of the W. B. Conkey company with the intention of intimidating or hindering persons from seeking employment at the factory or of interfering with the employes in the shop;" and in closing it reads:

And that said defendant and each and all of them be, and they are, and each of them is hereby enjoined and restrained from going either singly or collectively, to the homes of employes of said W. B. Conkey company, or any or either of them, for the purpose of intimidating or coercing any and all of said employes to leave the employment or service of said W. B. Conkey company or from entering into the employment or service of said W. B. Conkey company, and, as well, from intimidating or threatening in any manner the wives and families of said employes at their homes or elsewhere.

It was suggested by some papers that the restraint upon efforts at "persuasion," embodied in this injunction, had slipped into the order by accident; but in an interview published in the Chicago Tribune of the 25th the Conkey company's lawyer killed this suggestion by saying—

That "persuasion" means just what it says. I put it in for that purpose and Judge Baker copied my words. It means just this—that if anyone of those strikers should go to the house of any employe or stop him on the street or any other place and endeavor to talk him or her into joining the strike that person or persons is in contempt of court.

A different method from the process of injunction has been adopted in Florida for fighting strikes. It is used against the cigar makers' strike

at Tampa. We referred to this strike two weeks ago at page 298. All the strike leaders had then been kidnapped and secreted. This was done under the direction of a local business men's vigilance committee—"Citizens' Committee," as it is called. But the place of the missing leaders was supplied by the substitution of Alejandro Rodriguez for the kidnapped J. C. Padilla, as secretary of the union, and the appointment of Amelio Valdez to the vacant editorial chair of La Federacion, the union organ. These men were promptly notified, however, by the vigilance committee, to leave the city within 24 hours. They neglected to obey, and an officer of the vigilance committee arrested the secretary while he was at dinner in a restaurant. Later in the day the editor also was arrested. "Both men," says the news dispatch, "have been secreted in the woods, and it is not known what will be done with them." Of the 13 leaders previously kidnapped only one has yet been heard from.

In American politics the only facts to record for the week are that the "middle-of-the-road" populists of Iowa have nominated ex-Congressman L. H. Weller for governor; that the chairman of the state committee of the populist party of Pennsylvania announces that the party will not nominate a state ticket this year, but will ask its members to vote against the republican machine; and that the republican convention of Nebraska, meeting at Lincoln on the 28th, has named S. H. Sedgwick for supreme court judge, which office is the head of the Nebraska ticket this year.

War news from South America is contradictory, each party having representatives in this country who furnish their own kind of news. The Liberal agent for Colombia, located at New York, gives out a dispatch from the Liberal agent at Quito, Ecuador, saying that a battle was fought on the 17th near Pasto, just north of the Ecuador line, between the forces of the Colombian government and those of the Colombian Liberals, which resulted in a great victory for the latter. On the other hand, the Colombian minister at Washington gives out an official dispatch from the Colombian minister at Quito, which reports a defeat of the Liberals near Tomaco. A later

dispatch, a special news dispatch of the 24th, tells of an announcement of that day at Caracas, capital of Venezuela, that the Colombian government forces had been completely defeated by the revolutionist forces in the department of Cauca. Still another news dispatch, dated the 22d, and coming from Curacao, off Venezuela, states that Venezuela has sent war vessels with troops upon an expedition in aid of the Colombian revolutionists. But this is doubted by the Colombian minister at Washington, war not having been declared; and expectations of continued peace between Colombia and Venezuela are held out. The reports noted last week, that Ecuador was about to join with Venezuela in a war upon Colombia are also discredited. On the 26th the United States gunboat "Machias" arrived at Colon, on the northern coast of the Isthmus of Panama, for the protection of traffic across the Isthmus.

While this war cloud at the south of us looms up, the stubborn resistance of the Boers in South Africa to British occupation not only continues, but strengthens, and evidence accumulates that the British government is worse baffled than ever. Enlistments for South African service fall far below the mark, notwithstanding the high pay offered for "rough riders" to chase the Boers; and of the recruits that arrive in South Africa, Lord Kitchener complains that large numbers are physically incompetent for army life and work. Yet the Boers have carried the war far down into Cape Colony. One dispatch tells of a British proclamation of martial law, closing all the country stores in the Queenstown district, and "requiring that all goods likely to be useful to the enemy shall be taken to certain specified towns, and forbidding country residents to have in their possession more than a week's provisions." The significance of this is obvious when it is explained that Queenstown is a district of Cape Colony far south of the Orange Free State boundary. It is about midway between that boundary and the coast. Other dispatches give still further indications that the British colonies themselves are aflame with revolt. One tells of a Boer force having almost reached the coast at a point about midway between Cape Town and Port Elizabeth. Another reports an attack upon a British convoy on the way from Kimberley to Griqua-

town, about 100 miles west. The attack was repulsed, but at a loss to the British of 9 killed and 23 wounded. Still other dispatches tell of the cutting of telegraph lines in Cape Colony and Natal. One of the most significant facts, however, besides the proclamation with reference to the Queenstown district already noted, is the military arrest of Mr. Merriman, the Liberal leader of Cape Colony, whose offense consists in urging leniency for the Boers. It was he who came to England on that mission and was refused a hearing before parliament. Mr. Merriman had written a letter to a friend, dated August 6, describing martial law in Cape Colony, which was published on the 27th. In it he said:

Public meetings are forbidden by military force. Quite recently a member of parliament, living 50 miles from Cape Town, who had a few men to see him, was hauled before a military tribunal. At another place a man was deported because he refused to join the town guard. To crown all, our parliament, where the voice of the people should be heard in a legitimate, responsible fashion, is suspended, contrary to law. The administration of the whole country is carried on by means of the illegitimate issue of public money. You gag a man and because he does not make his voice heard you declare he is contented with his position.

The foregoing indicates that the British proclamation of the 7th. (see p. 298), demanding that the Boers surrender by September 15th, or be perpetually banished from their country when captured, has quite failed of its purpose. But beyond these indications there is positive evidence. President Kruger, interviewed on the 27th, said that peace is only possible on the basis of the independence of the two republics and free pardon for the colonial Afrikaners who have taken part in the war. In this interview, also, to the question: "Have you any objections to the proclamation, based on international law?" Mr. Kruger replied:

Great Britain recognized the Boers as belligerents. Now the proclamation says they will be shot as belligerents where possible, and when captured will be punished as rebels. Moreover they are to be continually weighed down by the thought that in offering legitimate resistance they are bringing ruin upon their wives and children. If that is international law then international lawlessness

would be better, for under it everybody could defend himself.

President Kruger's assertion that Boer resistance will continue is borne out not only by the circumstances we have already described, but also by proclamations of the Boer leaders in the field, which are reported by Lord Kitchener. In a dispatch of the 25th, Lord Kitchener said:

De Larey has issued a counter proclamation warning all Boers against my latest proclamation and declaring that they will continue the struggle. Steyn, De Wet and Botha are reported by Kitchener as having replied to the same effect. Lord Kitchener claims that, nevertheless, surrenders have increased; but he reports only 118, inclusive of captures, since the 9th. He also reports, August 26th, that—

three officers and 65 men who were sent north of Ladybrand (Orange River Colony), on the right of Elliot's columns, were surrounded on unfavorable ground and captured by a superior force August 22. One man was killed and four were wounded. The prisoners were released.

Military men in London are said to account for this easy Boer victory—only one killed and four wounded, but the whole force of 69 captured—with the explanation that it is difficult to keep jaded men to their work when they know that surrender to a superior force is followed by speedy release after deprivation of arms, powder and shot.

It is not at all likely that Turkey and France will come to blows (the post-mortem interests in Turkey of all the other European powers standing in the way); but all political communication between these two countries has been severed. The questions at issue are purely financial. The "Constantinople Dock and Quay Company," a French concern, claimed Constantinople dock concessions, which the sultan ignored. That is the basis of one question. Another rested upon a confiscation by Turkey of land in Albania from a French subject. Two others concerned money due to French subjects for advances made to Turkey for railroad construction. Until the 27th it was supposed that the whole dispute had been diplomatically adjusted. An agreement had in fact been made. But France, charging Turkey with breaking this agreement, ordered her ambassador, M. Constans, to withdraw from Tur-

key, leaving only a charge d'affaires at Constantinople, and announced that the Turkish ambassador to France would be given his passports. This international rupture was completed by the departure of the two ambassadors from France and Turkey respectively on the 27th.

The semi-official explanation of France is as follows:

On August 17 an arrangement concerning the various disputes between France and Turkey was effected with the Porte. The terms were drafted by the Ottoman minister of foreign affairs, Tewfik Pasha, with the approval of the sultan, who promised M. Constans, the French ambassador to Constantinople, that the full text would be handed to him on August 18. M. Constans telegraphed on August 19 that none of the porte's promises had been fulfilled. On August 21 M. Delcasse, the minister of foreign affairs, telegraphed M. Constans that in view of the complete disregard of its undertakings by Turkey, France was unable to continue the negotiations. M. Delcasse requested M. Constans to inform the porte that he had received orders to leave Constantinople. M. Constans communicated this to the porte on August 23 and announced that he would depart on August 26. As none of the porte's promises had been kept, on that date M. Constans left Constantinople.

Following is a dispatch from Constantinople, giving unofficially the Turkish version of the controversy:

The porte was showing a disposition to regard the French demands as settled by the irades referred to in yesterday's dispatches providing for the payment of 700,000 francs (\$140,000) to the French Quays company as compensation for the company's loss of rights for two years, and also the payment of £27,000 Turkish (\$121,500) as compensation to a French subject whose land in Albania had been arbitrarily taken. The French embassy, in order to prevent a misunderstanding, sent a letter to Tewfik Pasha, the Turkish minister of foreign affairs, pointing out that France also expected a settlement of the two claims in behalf of French subjects, which M. Constans in his note of August 11 had included, and stating that unless these were conceded M. Constans would leave Constantinople and Munir Bey, the Turkish ambassador to France, would receive his passports. No irade dealing with these two claims appeared and the porte yesterday endeavored to obtain 24 hours' delay before complying with

the French demands. M. Constans refused this request and prepared to depart.

NEWS NOTES.

—The British parliament was prorogued on the 17th.

—A convention of weather bureau officials has been in session this week in Milwaukee.

—A triennial conclave of the Knights Templar of the United States was held at Louisville this week.

—The eleventh biennial conclave of the Colored Knights of Pythias of the World met at Chicago on the 26th.

—The Press-Post of Columbus has suspended temporarily, because its compositors refused to set up copy furnished by nonunion journalists.

—The grand jury of Elmore county, Ala., called in special session by Judge Enson, has found indictments against white lynchers for hanging a Negro accused of murder.

—The first copies of the American Standard revision of the Bible were issued on the 26th. It is the result of disagreements between the English and the American revisers who modernized the King James version.

—On the 26th, the common council of Milwaukee granted a perpetual franchise for an electric elevated road, with freight-carrying privileges and without compensation except to damaged property holders. The grantee is the Milwaukee, Burlington & Lake Geneva railroad.

—Sheriff North, of Ashville, Ala., with a squad of deputies, drove back a mob of 400 white men on the 22d, who were bent on lynching a Negro who, convicted of assaulting a white woman, had been sentenced to death by hanging on September 20, and was then in Sheriff North's custody.

—On the 25th a Negro, Henry Noles, accused of murdering a white woman, was burned at the stake near Winchester, Tenn. He had been taken from the sheriff by a mob, after a sharp fight, and was burned in the presence of 6,000 persons, hundreds of whom helped on the murder by throwing oil and fence rails upon the fire.

"He's quite a prominent politician here, is he not?" inquired the visiting baron.

"Oh, no, he's a statesman," replied the native.

"Well, what's the difference?"

"A statesman, my dear sir, is one who is in politics because he has money. A politician is one who has money because he is in politics."—Philadelphia Press.

MISCELLANY

FROM THE HEBREW OF RABBI JEHUDA HA LEVI.

Timeservers are the fearful slaves of slaves,

Alone on earth who serves the Truth is free;

Man's spirit wins not higher than he craves,

Seek God, my soul—God shall thy portion be!

—Solomon Solis-Cohen, in The Conservator.

DR. ANDREWS HAD AUTHORITY.

A letter published in the Chicago Chronicle of August 18.

Lockport, Ill., Aug. 15.—In your editorial "Charity and Wealth" of August 14 you say: "Dr. Andrews' fling at the rich is unworthy of him and of the presence in which it was uttered." How is this for a fling at the rich? "Verily I say unto you that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." . . .

STEPHEN DOWSE.

MR. DOOLEY ON DISQUALIFYING THE ENEMY.

"Well, sir," said Mr. Dooley, "th' English ar-re goin' to end th' Boer war. They've taken the final steps. It's as good as finished. . . .

"'Twas fin'ly decided afther a long an' arjoos debate, that th' war mus' be declared irregular. Yes, sir, fr'm now on 'tis a nonunion war, 'tis again th' rules. Annywan engaged in it will be set back be th' stewards iv Henley.

"Lord Kitchener wrote th' notice. He's a good writer. 'Ladies an' Gintlemen,' he says, 'this war as a war is now over. Ye may not know it, but it's so. Ye've broke th' rules an' we give th' fight to oursilves on a foul.' . . .

"Our Anglo-Saxon cousins acrost t' sea ar-re gr-reat people. . . . Whin it comes to war, they have th' r-rest iv creation sittin' far back in th' rear iv th' hall. We have to lick our inimy. They disqualify him."—F. P. Dunne, in Chicago American.

FOR FAIR TAXATION.

Since Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, forced the issue of uniform taxation into prominence in the Ohio campaign this year that issue has grown in importance until it is bound to attract very general notice from now on until the fall elections. The work of the Chicago board in assessing railway property is no small item in the growing movement to compel all persons and corporations to pay taxes in

fair proportion to their wealth. Now come the Iowa democrats with this plank in their state platform:

The democratic party believes that the burden of taxation should be borne equally by all taxable property subject to the jurisdiction of the state. We pledge our members of the general assembly to formulate and urge the adoption of such a law as will compel the burden of taxation to rest on corporate and individual property alike, without favor and exemption of any interest.

Clearly Ohio's Tom Johnson is just now a more potent influence than Mr. Bryan in setting the pace for the democrats. Can he keep it up?—Chicago Daily News of August 23.

THE TROUBLE WITH THE NEGRO.

The principal trouble with the negro is that he is ignorant and poor. But there are whites in the south and in the north, too, who are ignorant and poor. There are a great many men who vote in Cleveland every year who do not exercise the suffrage with any degree of intelligence. But is that any reason why we shall limit the suffrage? It has been the theory for a century that the way to make men more intelligent is to give them responsibility and hold them to their rights. It is certainly a fact that the race problem in the south is a difficult one to solve and that the movement for bettering the conditions of the poor there is a slow one principally because the white people do not desire to have negroes know any more than they do at present. It is thought to be dangerous to have them advance in the scale. On the contrary it is the only salvation of the south to have them rise.—Editorial in the Cleveland Recorder.

THE BANDIT AND THE BONDS.

A Bandit, being elected to office, won fresh notoriety as a bold and successful Railroad Robber. His fame as a Thief was spread throughout the Land. By virtue of His Office the Bandit advertised that he had bonds for sale—not his own bonds, but those of the unhappy people over whom he ruled.

Nobody would buy the offered bonds.

"Why is this?" demanded the Astonished Thief. "My subjects are perfectly solvent and Good for the Money."

"The Explanation is," replied a Timid Investor, "that while your People are Good for any Amount, nobody of my Careful Temperament is anxious to deal with them through a Notorious Criminal."

"This," shouted the Indignant Bandit, "is not a Personal Matter. It

is a hideous and unwarranted attack on the Credit of the City."

Moral: Municipalities that want to borrow money should be careful to select decent agents. — Philadelphia North American.

PUTTING THE GOLDEN RULE INTO PRACTICE.

A portion of the remarks made by Rev. Harris R. Cooley, director of public charities, at the funeral services of Plummer Jones, held in Cleveland, O., August 18. Plummer Jones lost his life while trying to rescue the men imprisoned in the tunnel by the first of the two recent disasters at the "cribs" in Lake Erie opposite the city of Cleveland.

We are too prone to look into the past for our heroes. Damon and Pythias, with their infinite love for each other, always stand before us as the symbol for an earthly love between mortals which approximates the divine. We have been taught to go to the distant battlefields for our examples of valor and of courage, but if we look about we can find in the less sanguinary scenes of daily life instances which should at least equally arouse our admiration and reverence. There are the great deeds of charity and benevolence, the devotion of lives to the welfare of brother men which have within them the same sentiment, the same lofty adherence to the ideal that prompted the heroes of history to battle for principle.

In all our city and in all our country, I know of no nobler deed than that which brings us here for our sad duty to-day. Some among you knew this young man when he stood ready to offer his life if necessary for his country. I know but of his death, which was glorious, though sad. I have talked with the men who were with him before he went down into the bowels of the earth, below the rolling waves, into a place of whose dangers he well knew, and from one of them I learn that before he entered the tunnel he said to one of his comrades: "I believe that if I was down there I would like to have some one come after me. I can't see the poor fellows die." Here was the exemplification of the religion taught nineteen centuries ago, and which is true to-day. It was putting into practice, under the most trying strain, the golden rule.

In the death of this young man we have at once the highest apprehension of religion and the best refutation of that remark so often made that we are growing materialistic.

On all sides we hear the remark that life now is to the selfish and that success is only measured by dollars. We hear that brotherly love is a doctrine without sense or without any firm foundation in reason. Materialism, the expression of the religion of selfishness, is spreading its claims. But here is a young man, with health, with hopes for many years of pleasure, who, when he sees a fellow man in danger, does not hesitate. He never wavered to say that this is the age of materialism, but by his act declared to the world that all men are brothers, that there is kindred in humanity, and that the golden rule is still the grandest doctrine and expression of divine law which has been given to man in all the ages. . . .

God grant us grace to live as Plummer Jones died.

JAMES E. MILLS.

Away off in the Mexican mesas, so far off that it was some days before news of the event reached civilization, there died a man to whom the world owes a large debt of gratitude.

James Ellison Mills, whose death on the 26th ult., at San Fernando, Mexico, where he was engaged in managing extensive mining properties, was announced in a telegram from his wife, has a two-fold claim to fame. He was a pathfinder in the realm of physical science and a torch-bearer in the higher field of social progress. He was born in Bangor, Me., February 13, 1834, springing from old New England stock, his father being Dr. P. B. Mills, a noted physician of the time. As a boy he lived part of the time in the logging camps of Maine, where he was brought into touch with nature and with independent manhood. When 18 years of age he went to Boston, with hardly a larger equipment than that possessed by Ben Franklin when the latter made his advent in Philadelphia. Here he entered the Lawrence scientific school, over which the famous Louis Agassiz presided. Six years later he took the degree of bachelor of science and became an assistant of Agassiz in his laboratory. It was there he first met the late Prof. Le Conte, who just preceded him in the scientific school. The acquaintance thus formed, in later years ripened into friendship which continued uninterrupted to the last.

It was through a suggestion of Agassiz that Mr. Mills first gained fame as a geologist. The great scientist one day remarked that the old

water courses of the Sierras cross each other at strange angles, indicating that there would be found the most interesting geological formation on the face of the earth, and that Mr. Mills was the one man to investigate it and solve the problem. This suggestion led Alexander Agassiz, son of the famous scientist, and Quincy Shaw to supply funds for instituting that work, which afterwards and for many years was continued at Mr. Mills' own expense, he establishing a geological survey while engaged in his work as a mining geologist, for the most part in Plumas county. The results of his labors are maps showing in detail and accurately the formation of the Sierras, the changes of the water courses and the causes therefor, and the "most interesting geological formation on the face of the earth" is therefore known to scientists through his individual efforts, unaided by the government.

It was while thus isolated from his kind, far from the remotest outposts of civilization, that Mr. Mills entered a new field of research. Early in the '80's he was one of the passengers on a snowbound train, away up in the heart of the mountains.

This misfortune, if such it may be termed in the light of after events, was the untoward cause of awakening in him an interest in the vast and then untrodden field of political economy. On this snowbound train was a copy of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." He read it again and again and resolved then and there henceforth to exert all his powers to the noble task of the world's awakening. Mr. Mills wrote several able pamphlets, dealing with the single tax doctrine in its ethical and spiritual bearings. One of these was published in 1893, under the title, "Privilege or Service?" Two others appeared as supplements to the San Francisco Star—one in 1895 and one in 1898—under the respective titles of "Christian Economics, the First Principles of Political Economy," and "The Two Great Commandments in Economics." He was a friend of Henry George himself and the two men gained much from each other.—Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat, of August 22.

ROBERT BROWNING'S EVANGEL.

"Yes, often when I wake in the morning I do be just so glad that I be alive," said the woman to me once—a woman who made beds, and swept, and waited on table, and washed linen, for 14 or 16 hours a day, and who al-

ways had a little song on her lips when she was alone.

The joy of the world was great with her—just the joy of living and of doing things. She rejoiced in the blue sky above with the sunshine streaming down, in the sweet air blowing through the rooms, bringing aromas from the spicy trees outside where the birds twittered as they built their little houses in the new spring weather; and with all her heart she fell in with the scheme of the world as she understood it, bringing order, and harmony, and cleanliness, and comfort, into her little corner of service.

Now just this joy and vitality of the world seems to me to be Robert Browning's evangel.

He finds life intensely interesting; the world is gloriously beautiful; there is no end to the absorbing things to be done with brain and hands; and then, too, man has his own soul to explore. There are deserts, and wild beasts, and poisonous plants in the world and in the soul, as well as the God-given glory; but Browning is too much entertained with his explorations to shrink away from gruesome discoveries, and too robust to fear them. Then after having gone over the ground, he is no pietist, labeling certain paths as naughty and dangerous. Rather, he says: "Perhaps you won't find God down there. You are likely to come to a great blank wall or a pool of exceeding bitter waters." But other paths he knows which lead to watered meadows, or grassy hills, or the city of vision.

It is God's world, and Browning seeks God in it. Nor is he satisfied to find Him as a vague life principle. He yearns after a divine human God. He makes David in exaltation cry:

'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for!
for! my flesh that I seek
In the Godhead! I seek and find it. O
Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee;
a Man like to me,
Thou shalt love and be loved by, forever:
A Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee!
See the Christ stand!

The "New Churchman" spontaneously heightens the picture by mentally referring this last word, "stand," which would be weak in its ordinary English meaning, back to "existere," as if Browning were looking for a translation of Swedenborg's vivid Latin term.

In the poem called "An Epistle," purporting to be a letter from an Arab physician who had been inves-

tigating the experiences of that Lazarus who was raised from the dead, the physician, in spite of a scientific dogmatism identical with the attitude in which spiritual phenomena are received by most scientific men to-day, cries out—as it were, wholly against his will—

The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too—
So, through the thunder comes a human voice

Saying: "O heart I made, a heart beats here!

Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself!

Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine!

But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
And thou must love me who have died for thee!"

Of no conception of a glorified regenerate man could it be said:

But love I gave thee, with myself to love.

It is said of the Lord God himself, of whom Swedenborg says:

For the Lord gives to him who is loved the faculty of loving.

Trusting, doubting nothing, with rhythmic stride and wide open eyes, this poet leads us through the world of living, struggling men and women, torn by passions, exalted by faith and great joys, and doing things and loving God and man, in a strength not their own. And in the cool of the day we hear the voice of the Lord God as he walks in the garden.—Alice Thacher Post, in *New Church Messenger* of August 14.

PRESIDENT SCHWAB'S TESTIMONY.

Mr. Byron W. Holt, the tariff expert, who confronted President Charles M. Schwab, of the United States Steel company, before the senate industrial commission at Washington, has arranged citations from Mr. Schwab's statements to the commission, with comments, for the summer number of the *Single Tax Review*. We quote some interesting points in Mr. Schwab's testimony.

"There is a known quantity of ores in the United States, and as far as the best geologists can determine this ore region is not likely to be extended. Now, I think it is perfectly fair for the United States Steel corporation, in view of this fact and knowing that they own a given tonnage of ore which can be very closely estimated, to fix a liberal price upon that ore, because in years to come it is going to be very valuable, exceedingly valuable."

"Would you vary the price of ore with the demand for your finished products?"

"No, we would not. We might charge it in for the purpose of reducing our profits. We ought to fix the price that we think ore is worth. That is the basis of it all. If we fix a price for

ores it ought to be maintained under all conditions, and then, whether we take our profit on the ore and lose it on the steel, it would not make any difference. But the value of these plants has been much underestimated by people who cannot appreciate the limited quantity of raw material that is available in the United States, or in the world for that matter, for the manufacture of steel. For example, England thought many years ago that she had an unlimited supply of raw material, and her manufacturers went ahead using it. To-day the manufacture of steel in England is largely a question of producing raw material. They did not place nearly a high enough estimate on the value of materials which they had in England, and now they are going to Spain and Sweden and even taking some ores from America. That ought to show the value of the ore deposit which we have in America; and I am constantly talking to our people about putting a sufficiently high valuation upon them, because at the rate they are now being used they will not last many years."

Again, when discussing the question of capitalization and whether or not the stocks of the great trust were not all water—the tangible assets being entirely covered by the \$304,000,000 of bonds, Mr. Schwab replied:

"That is entirely a question as to the valuation you put upon your raw material resources. If I were putting the raw materials into this capitalization it would not be big enough. I claim that our ore and coking coals, limestone, etc., are of much more value than people as a rule, have ever given to them. For example, this company have over 500,000,000 tons of ore in sight in the northwest. Now, it does not take many dollars per ton on that ore alone to equalize the capitalization of these concerns. We own something like 60,000 acres of Connellsville coal. You could not buy it for \$60,000 an acre, for there is no more Connellsville coal. If the consumption of steel increases in the future as it has in the past, I believe the Connellsville coal will be exhausted in 30 years. If the consumption of iron ore in the northwest goes on as it has in the past it will not last very long, perhaps 60 years. Of course there are other coals, but it is a well-known fact that the Connellsville coking coal is an ideal coal for manufacturing purposes. Now, this coal field is very clearly defined, and every acre of it is highly prized, and it is owned by these constituent companies in toto. There may

be developments of coal in other directions, but nothing like this coal; therefore I say the matter of capitalization depends very largely on the value you put on the raw material."

He said that "these companies" * * * have created values by coming together, and the owning of these stocks by one corporation will enhance the value of them all." He said that while iron and coal mines were usually put in at the outset at cost, and were carried on their books, at low valuations, yet "if they appreciated in value by reason of the fact that a limit could be placed upon the possible sources of supply they certainly would possess a higher value if considered at only subsequent periods."

TOM L. JOHNSON AS A BUSINESS MAN.

The Philadelphia Press, under caption of "The Ways of a Demagogue," a few days ago told in an editorial how

A rotund man known as Tom Johnson appeared in Cleveland and bought up a bankrupt street railroad for a song, * * * boomed it, watered the stock enormously and then dumped it on a confiding public at an immense profit to himself.

The Press continues:

Now Mr. Johnson has appeared in Cleveland again, this time as its mayor, and with the intention of booming not his pocketbook, but his political fortunes. And in order to play to the galleries he has instructed his board of equalization to raise the assessment of the street railroad he boomed so as to include the water he pumped into the stock and sold at a big figure to deluded purchasers. The road has hardly been able to pay a moderate dividend on its Tom Johnson watered stock, and with its Tom Johnson assessment it will be able to pay little or none.

Evidently "playing to the galleries" is the way the Press chooses to say that Mayor Johnson is in his assessment campaigning performing an official duty that meets with popular approbation. But this aside, what is the truth of the matter which bias of some kind prevents the Press from stating?

It is a fact that, with his now deceased brother, Albert L. Johnson, "a rotund man known as Tom Johnson appeared in Cleveland and bought up a bankrupt street railroad for a song." It was an insignificant affair in the suburbs. Only the eye of genius and the daring of early manhood could see what might be done with such poor material. The Johnsons bought four old cars in Chicago, which they repainted and shipped to Cleveland. They imported a carload of 20 mules from Kentucky. One died in transit, so that with 19 mules and four second-hand cars they started their career in

a city dominated by the skill, the wealth and the masterful nature of Marcus A. Hanna. The Johnsons improved and pushed out. They quietly extended toward the Superior street viaduct, proposing by that route to strike for the heart of the city. It was a long, bitter war, with sensational incidents. The Johnsons had all the other railroads against them. But they had the people with them, because they paid better wages to their men than any of the other roads. They never had a strike, and they offered an increasing ride without increasing the five-cent fare. Suddenly they made a master stroke. They asked the city authorities for a franchise from the center to the opposite side of the city from which they had entered.

They offered in return not only to carry passengers from one end to the other of their system for a single fare, and thereby provide for five cents what before their advent the public had had to pay 25 cents, but in addition they bound themselves to do what few if any railroad companies had up to that time dreamed of doing—to pave the streets through which their tracks should run. The low fare and the street-paving condition were too popular for the combined railroad opposition. The Johnsons received the franchise. Nor did their popularity stop there. They were first to apply electricity in Cleveland transit facilities; so that in low fares and free transfers, in high wages to their men, in speed and convenience of their transit service and in contributions toward the public treasury the Johnsons led.

Now in the middle eighties was formed a combination of Cleveland street railroads known popularly as the "Little Consolidated." Mark Hanna headed this. About the same time was organized a larger combination commonly called "The Big Consolidated." The Johnson roads appeared in this combination and the Johnsons went on the board of directors, and though neither ever became president of the company, their spirit and methods largely prevailed in the management.

Whatever watering of stock was done occurred at the time of consolidation. I cannot tell the extent of the water, or indeed, if there was any at all; I assume, however, that the economies attending the combination would, in the opinion of the combiners and the public, insure larger dividends, and that the managers must have proceeded as other railroad managers do in like cases,

on the principle that rather than pay ten per cent. dividends on a given valuation they would pay five per cent. on twice such valuation; in other words, pay out the same sum of money, but on a doubled principal. Whatever was done in the matter the Johnsons received their proportion of stocks and bonds as based on the ratio of value contributed by their roads to the combination.

But they did not then proceed to "dump" these stocks and bonds "on a confiding public." On the contrary, they proceeded to use all the influence they could command in the management to improve and build up the system, and it was not for a number of years after the consolidation that the Johnsons withdrew from the Big Consolidated.

Perhaps the Press would have made no objection to Tom L. Johnson if, after this, he had not chosen to devote himself to the public weal and, on being elected to the office of mayor of Cleveland, he had not inaugurated a policy against street railroads, likewise against all public service companies—that is, all corporations having public franchises, which policy should, through taxation, lower fares or other methods, transfer to the public a larger share of their benefits so long as such privileges should remain in private hands, and which looked ultimately to the public ownership and operation of all such public functions. But, unfortunately for the Press, Tom L. Johnson perceived the iniquity of making private property of the arteries of the social organism.

In the middle eighties, and before the Big Consolidation was effected, he had publicly uttered clear views on this subject, and during his congressional campaigns, while still a director of the Big Consolidated, and still holding his stock and bonds in that company intact, he condemned private ownership of public franchises and announced his fixed purpose to work with his fortune and all his powers to awaken the people to the truth, that these privileges should not

The Public

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

ON TRIAL

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

SIX WEEKS FOR TEN CENTS.

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

be granted to him or to any other individual, but should publicly be held and shared by all alike. On this same principle he offered a tariff amendment in congress to place steel rails on the free list, although he was a manufacturer of steel rails, which were highly protected. Likewise he advocated the abolition of the patent laws, although he had been and was then a patent beneficiary. Similarly he voted for a measure intended to raise all federal revenue from land values alone, and this in face of the ownership, by him personally or his relatives, of considerable valuable land.

If it be demagogic to avow certain principles of public justice early in one's career and then publicly to proclaim and work for such principles consistently and persistently, and to declare that the money being made from a form of public privilege was to be used to educate the people to their rights; and, lastly, on taking public office to act as one has sworn to act, to work in the public weal—then Tom L. Johnson is a demagogue, and such a demagogue as the world seldom sees.

But even if he had no such principles about public ownership of public franchises, should he forswear himself? The law of Ohio is plain. It says that such corporations as the Big Consolidated company shall pay taxes on their "true value in money." The Ohio courts have long settled that this true value is to be determined by the market value of the stocks and bonds. What the mayor of Cleveland had done was to appoint to the local assessment board men who would not act upon the state law and its judicial interpretation.

In accordance with general usage in Ohio to assess at 60 per cent. of the full value, the board raised the assessment of Senator Hanna's Little Consolidated system from something over \$500,000 to more than \$6,000,000, and that of the Cleveland Electric company, or Big Consolidated, from less than \$1,000,000 to above \$8,000,000. Perhaps this is "playing to the galleries," but the masses of the people of Cleveland seem strongly to indorse it, and a judge opposed in politics to the party to which Mayor Johnson belongs refused to enjoin or in any way discourage the mayor or his assessing board from proceeding with their work.—Henry George, Jr., in Philadelphia North American.

That is to say, the constitution chaperones the flag, merely.—Puck.

JUSTITIA OMNIBUS.

For The Public.

Those critics overbalanced, that do find
Their happiness, and all that makes worth
while

Their lives, to live in advertising guile—
To all that does extenuate are blind.
Each day they know does seem to be their
grind,

The stories of wrong-doing to compile;
But with those stories, not a note they
file

That mitigates a deed, or makes more
kind.

Thus our great president they criticise,
Even because to Kruger he did send
No message of condolence; and their cries
Of naked condemnation illy blend

With song of men more fair, who, "'twas
not," sing,

"Our William's fault that Kruger was no
king."

G. T. EVANS.

"Mr. Wanamaker," said the old
journalist, "certainly did a very enterprising piece of work when he arranged to have Funston and Aguinaldo write stories of the great capture for his magazine."

"Especially," remarked Scoops, "if the arrangement was made before the capture."

G. T. E.

The Gripman—You have to keep a sharp lookout for people who want ter git on.

The Novitiate—Yes?

The Gripman—Yes; if you don't, why, the first you know they're on!—Puck.

Frotherham—Poor Mixer's health was broken down by overwork and he had to leave Manila.

Straight—What was he doing over there?

Frotherham—Running a saloon.

G. T. E.

First Millionaire—I've been frightfully busy this week!

Second Millionaire—Is that so?

First Millionaire—I haven't even had time to give away any money.—Puck.

"Histy is very particular in his choice of language."

"What has he said?"

"In speaking of the country as it was previous to the Revolution, he referred to the period as our 'first' Colonial times."

G. T. E.

MAGAZINES.

—Prof. Ely contributes to the August Cosmopolitan a most valuable paper on the subject of trusts. Considering the limitations the writer puts upon himself, it may be safely accounted the best of the magazine articles on this subject that have so far appeared. It proposes no policy with reference to the trusts, but is confined to an analysis of their power, and leads to the conclusion that it has its origin in monopoly.

The Public

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,
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

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

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES A. BUTLER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Suite 420, Ashland Block, CHICAGO.
Long Distance Telephone, Central 3361.

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

WALTER A. LANTZ, T. G. McELLIGOTT
Telephone Central 2254.

LANTZ & McELLIGOTT,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

BINDERS FOR THE PUBLIC:

Emerson Binding Covers in which
THE PUBLIC may be filed away week by
week, making at the end of the year a
reasonably well-bound volume, may be
ordered through this office. Price, 80
cents, postpaid. tf

THE BEST PORTRAITS
FOR FRAMING

THOMAS JEFFERSON,
etched by Rosenthal, 1897..... \$6.00
ANDREW JACKSON,
stipple by Welch, 1852..... 10.00
ALEXANDER HAMILTON,
etched by Rosenthal, 1896..... 6.00
GEORGE WASHINGTON,
stipple by Welch, 1852..... 5.00
CHIEF JUSTICE MARSHALL,
etched by Rosenthal, 1893..... 6.00
(And Others.)

Delivered free of charge in any part of the
United States, subject to return if not liked and
money refunded.

WILLIAM J. CAMPBELL,
1218 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.