

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 30, 1902.

Number 230.

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 page.

It is a good thing for the President to tour the country with a view to making his policy understood by the people, and to do so as a partisan. Americans want no glass case presidents. Mr. Roosevelt incurs just criticism, therefore, not because he is making partisan stump speeches, but because he makes them during a political campaign while pretending that they are nonpartisan.

Thus far Mr. Roosevelt has dwelt upon two leading political issues—trusts and colonialism. On the question of trusts, his speeches have been what would be described down South as “powerful weak.” The only strong thing about them is the strong government they advocate. If Mr. Roosevelt’s policy in this respect were carried out, the Hamiltonian doctrine of centralization would be enormously advanced, and little more would be needed to establish a regime of state socialism radiating from the national capital through all the channels of business activity. On the question of colonialism, his speeches would be more valuable if they were less indifferent to the facts. When he spoke at Hartford, he implied that anarchy prevailed in the Philippines until the American army put it down; whereas the incontestable fact is that the American army produced the only anarchy there was. Long before the American flag had advanced beyond Manila, a native republic stood successfully between anarchy and order, and made the country safe until the late President McKinley broke the peace. By his declaration of war against the re-

public and his invasion of the country, he turned the Philippines into a veritable hell on earth.

In the peroration to his Hartford speech, however, Mr. Roosevelt simply disclosed the whole animus of the colonial policy. Though he prefaced this part of his speech with the excusatory remark that “we have acted in the interest of the islanders,” he proceeded with the naive explanation that “we have also helped our own people,” for—

our interests in the Pacific are as great as in the Atlantic. The welfare of California, Oregon and Washington is as vital to the nation as the welfare of New England, New York and the south Atlantic states. The awakening of the Orient means much to all the nations of Christendom, commercially no less than politically; and it would be shortsighted statesmanship on our part to refuse to take the necessary steps for securing a proper share for our people of this commercial future. The possession of the Philippines has helped us, as the securing of the open door in China has helped us.

In one of President Roosevelt’s campaign speeches, the one at Boston on the 25th, he repeated his familiar inference that the millions upon millions of Americans who are hewers of wood and drawers of water for the privileged few, owe their condition to their incapacity. To quote him:

The state cannot carry any one. The state cannot do as much for you as you can do for it. Under no circumstances will it be possible by law to shape conditions so that each man shall succeed. If the man has not in him the stuff out of which he can work success the state cannot supply it. If he fails, I am sorry for him. I will help him as far as possible. I will lift him up if he stumbles, but I won’t try to carry him, for that is neither helping him nor helping me.

Unfortunately for Mr. Roosevelt’s philosophy, the state not only can, but does, carry many a one. It is because it carries so many in unearned wealth and luxury that it compels so many

more to stumble into undeserved poverty and misery. The state carries the coal trust, by securing its monopoly of the rich coal deposits. On this subject Mr. Roosevelt is silent. It carries the railroad trust by securing them the monopoly of highway privileges. This subject also he avoids. It carries Mr. Roosevelt himself, by giving him an unearned share in the growth of the greatest city on the continent, while denying all share to hundreds of thousands whose toil makes that city great. Mr. Roosevelt may save his sorrow for those who do not succeed in getting rich. Let him devote himself more to promoting tendencies that will distribute future wealth with reference to individual earnings instead of legal privilege, and he may withhold his crocodile tears for those who fail because they haven’t “the stuff” in them. Stop apologizing for the legally privileged monopolists, Mr. Roosevelt, and you won’t have to excuse yourself for not carrying the unprivileged worker who “stumbles.”

Chicago boasts that her builders are getting structural steel imported from Scotland and Germany. The importers say they are delivering it more quickly than the American steel trust; and in addition, that they quote lower prices. Here is a suggestion for Mr. Roosevelt. He is strenuously opposed to reducing the tariff on imports competing with trust products. Could he not argue that the steel trust, already staggering under foreign competition in its own protected market, would collapse if the duties on its produce were repealed? It might be embarrassing, to be sure, to express himself so bluntly. But couldn’t he take the idea and work it up into acceptable shape? Wouldn’t it aptly illustrate some of the vague generalities he now offers in defense of trusts?

Doubtless Mr. Knox would help him in return for the good character he generously gives to that expert attorney general.

That accusation which bolting Democrats of 1896 and 1900 periodically revive against Bryan, by way of excusing themselves, that he bolted in 1892 by voting for the Populist or Weaver electors in Nebraska, is playing the boomerang with great beauty and sweep of movement. We might explain once more that while Bryan did support the Weaver electors in his state in 1892 he did so because the national Democratic committee had asked him to. Their object was to take the electoral vote away from the Republicans, since they had no hope of getting it for their own candidate. It was wise party policy, too; and there was no bolting about it. They advised the same policy in Colorado (p. 258), and doubtless in all the other Republican states where the Populists were strong. It now appears that they adopted it in Oregon. Let the reader turn to the election statistics for 1892, and he will find that Harrison got only 3 of the 4 electoral votes of Oregon, Weaver getting the other. Weaver would have got the whole 4 if the national Democratic committee had been obeyed. So we are informed by L. H. McMahan, a lawyer of Salem, Oregon. He avers that orders came during the campaign from Democratic national headquarters to withdraw the Democratic electors of Oregon; and that one of them, R. A. Miller, of Jackson county, obeyed. In consequence, 1 Populist elector was elected. But as the other 3 Democratic electors refused to withdraw, the anti-Harrison vote was divided and the Harrison electors won. Now for the extra-beautiful nub of this Oregon story. Mr. McMahan observes that the three Democratic electors who refused to obey the order to withdraw, got no political rewards after the election; whereas, Mr. Miller, who did obey, was rewarded with an appointment by President Cleveland to the registership of the Oregon City

land office! Mr. Cleveland himself seems to have been involved in the political arrangement, perfectly justifiable, for assenting to which Bryan is called a "bolter" by Cleveland's naive admirers.

Inspector Shea, of the Chicago police department, defends the "sweat box" with the same audacity that characterized Mayor Harrison's defense of it. He tries to convince the public that the "sweat box" harms no innocent man and leads to the conviction of guilty men. But not one word has he to say of the law which guarantees immunity to innocent and guilty alike from "sweat box" persecution. The question is not whether the laws for the protection of the rights of persons charged with crime are good laws. Good or bad, they exist. The question, therefore, is whether policemen shall obey them or may defy them. If the "sweat box" is a desirable adjunct to the police function, let it be established by law. But until it has been so established, let us not allow ourselves to become apologists for crime by getting befogged in the sophistries of law-breaking policemen.

When the hard-working farmers of Colorado are urged to vote against the Australasian amendment, or "Bucklin bill" they had better, before allowing themselves to be buncoed, think of the experience of Nancy B. Irving, with her Angora goat ranch in the western part of their state. Mrs. Irving is one of the victims of the big land grabbing interests of Colorado, which stand in the way of the farming interests. In her case their marauding agents have killed hundreds of her goats. In other cases they have wired in thousands of acres, thereby wiring out thousands of industrious farmers. These people are the enemies of the Colorado farmer, and if the Australasian tax system were in vogue the farmer could get rid of them. They know it if he does not; and it is their influence, coupled with that of the land grant railroads and the owners of valuable mining and

city land, that causes the subsidized newspapers of Colorado to appeal to the farmer to defeat this beneficent amendment. The Colorado farmer will be wise in his generation if he recalls the old stories of "Hungry Joe," the bunco man of New York. "Hungry Joe" loved farmers. So do ranch grabbers, land grant railroads, and real estate speculators. They all love farmers—as foxes love chickens. It is a fool chicken that doesn't know the shadow of the hawk. Let Colorado farmers be at least as knowing as hawk-hunted chickens.

The city of Cleveland may boast one of the most extraordinary trade papers in the world. Its name is Finance, and no pun is intended when we suggest that what it seems most to need is sense. In an editorial recently, this journalistic flunkey in the household of Plutocracy essayed the impossible task of proving that "in a multitude of instances capital exists independently of and entirely apart from any operation of labor." This is astounding. But it seems from its concrete examples that what the astute Finance means by capital of that kind is not capital at all, but land; for the only objects it names by way of illustration are such as "surface deposits of gold," and "veins of valuable ore breaking out on the surface." Those things belong in the category of land. There either is a difference between capital and land or there is not. If there is not, then the paper that mixes up capital with land needs a little elementary education in straight thinking.

Edwin Burritt Smith truly described the Root-Roosevelt-Lodge policy regarding the Philippine question when he characterized it as "government on the sly."

TWO SIDES OF THE SAME SHEET.

On one page of a Sunday paper, of August 24, there are huge pictures of President Roosevelt, represented as speaking to the crowds from his car platform. He is telling the people, among other things, of the great

prosperity of the American working men to-day.

On the other side of the same sheet there is the following extract from a report of Mr. J. G. Schonfarber, of the Maryland board of statistics, who has been investigating wages and cost of living in the city of Baltimore:

Only two of twenty typical Baltimore workingmen's families own their own homes, and only two of them are able to save anything from their earnings. Eight of the 20 have a total income of less than \$300. The average number in each family is nearly eight persons. The average earnings per family, in many instances being the total from three to five persons, is but a trifle more than \$600 per annum. When distributed among this average family of eight, the amount upon which a person is compelled to subsist and meet all expenditures of life is less than \$80 per capita per year, or about \$1.50 each week. Ten of these 20 families consumed all their income, but did not run in debt. Eight of them, however, were in debt at the end of the year at amounts ranging from \$30 to \$200. Some of this deficit was due to the misfortunes of illness, but more of it was due to the necessarily idle time and the small amount of wages paid when at work.

Is it not an interesting illustration of our "complex modern life" that this very clipping, if turned over, would be telling of the prosperous condition of workingmen's families?

Up in Hartford, where the workingmen gave the President a flower horseshoe, typical conditions must be better than in Baltimore; else only about two in twenty could have afforded to subscribe.

J. H. DILLARD.

THE RIGHT DIVINE.

According to recent news dispatches, President Baer, of the Reading railroad, one of the great anthracite mining and carrying lines, has said in a letter to Mr. W. F. Clark, of Wilkesbarre:

I have your letter of the 16th instant. I do not know who you are. I see that you are a religious man; but you are evidently biased in favor of the right of the workingman to control a business in which he has no other interest than to secure fair wages for the work he does.

I beg of you not to be discouraged. The rights and interests of the laboring man will be protected and cared for—not by the labor agitators, but by the Christian men to

whom God in His infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country, and upon the successful management of which so much depends.

Do not be discouraged. Pray earnestly that right may triumph, always remembering that the Lord God omnipotent still reigns, and that His reign is one of law and order, and not of violence and crime.

This letter suggests so many lines of thought, and can be dealt with from so many standpoints, that I shall content myself with a single one, the "divine right" arrogated to themselves by certain people.

It was reported this spring that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., at some religious meeting or other, in commenting upon the saying of the Man of Nazareth that, "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath," said, in effect, that it was difficult to understand why the goods (material possessions) of the poor should be taken from them and given to the rich, except upon the theory that the rich could use them to so much better advantage; but that there was the language, and the rich must accept the trust!

President Baer roundly asserts that God, in His infinite wisdom, has given the control of the property interests of the country to certain Christian(?) men. I query that word, because Henry Ward Beecher once said that God showed His opinion of money by the kind of men whom He permitted to accumulate it; and on questions of what is and what is not Christian, I prefer Beecher as a guide to all the Baers in existence.

This letter of President Baer gives added point to the article in the Independent of April 3, last, entitled "The Next Step: A Benevolent Feudalism." The old feudalism was founded on the might of the sword, and was glossed over with the idea of "divine right." In the last analysis, the old feudalism was based upon this: "Do as I say, or I will slay you." The new, upon: "Do as I say, or I will starve you into submission or to death."

There is a book, simple in its language, and dealing with the effect upon plain people of the carrying out of

the ideas of the old feudalism as modified by Napoleon. Joseph Bertha was a lame boy in Phalsbourg, Alsace, who was learning the trade of clock-maker from the old republican, Goulden, and who loved his cousin Katherine, who lived in Saverne. Joseph was "drawn" in the conscription of 1813, after Napoleon's disastrous Moscow campaign, and the "Conscrit de 1813" gives his simple account of his marches, fights, sufferings and well-nigh fatal illness, the horrors he witnessed in battle, siege and invasion. In one place it uses language which has clung in my memory for these 20 years past:

If those who say that Providence (le bon Dieu) has put them on earth to make our welfare for us, could only conceive of the misery, sufferings and degradation they cause in carrying out the self-imposed task, they would leave Providence to manage its own affairs.

That book, used at the naval academy in teaching us French, taught me other lessons than the French language.

Young Mr. Rockefeller and President Baer make it plain that the ideas underlying the new feudalism do not differ in kind or much even in degree from those underlying the old. As the French say, "the more it changes the more it is the same thing"—the "right divine."

New York City. R. W. BARKLEY.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Cleveland, Aug. 25.—The first authentic copy of the proposed code for the government of the cities and villages of Ohio has reached here. It was submitted by Gov. Nash to the special session of the legislature which convened at Columbus to-day. Senator Hanna, of Cleveland, and "Boss" Cox, of Cincinnati, are believed to have dictated its more important provisions.

This code would so divide the responsibility of municipal officers that no city government could be held in check by popular opinion if an astute political manipulator, like Mr. Cox, of Cincinnati, were on hand to regulate affairs.

The legislative power of cities is vested in a council, elected partly at large and partly from wards, and having a term of office of three years. The executive power is distributed beyond all reasonable chance of fixing respon-

sibility upon anyone. It is vested variously in the mayor, the president of council, the auditor, the treasurer, the solicitor, a board of public safety, and a board of public service.

The mayor, elected for three years, would have but little authority. He could employ no one without the consent of council nor remove any employe, even in his office, without reporting the cause to the council; and his law officer, the solicitor, though he appoints him, could be removed only upon charges and after a hearing.

The board of public safety would be composed of four directors, only two of the same political party, to hold office for four years, two of them going out every two years, and all to be appointed by the mayor. Police and fire protection would be under their jurisdiction.

But the real power under this charter would be lodged in the "board of public service," composed of three directors elected for three years. This board would be, in the language of the proposed code, "the chief administrative authority of the city." It is one of the "little jokers" in this Hanna-Nash-Cox code. Within the jurisdiction of that board of public service would come all such subjects as usually pertain to street departments, public works departments, charities and correction departments, park departments, health departments, and so on. Although the mayor would be completely tied up with reference to his employes, this board could fix its pay roll to suit itself, employing without restriction and making salaries in its discretion, and by a majority vote could discharge employes at will and without stating any cause to anybody. It could easily be made the center of corrupt power, and is evidently designed, like the old department of public works of New York, which Tweed controlled, to be the leverage for the operating "boss."

On the subject of public service corporations this interesting code allows the council to grant street franchises for not longer than 25 years, and to revise charges "by agreement with the companies," every ten years. "Extensions of existing street railway routes" may be made much more easily than new grants.

The only important power except the veto reserved to the mayor is that of the removal of any officer, whether elected or appointed, "for misfeasance, malfeasance or non feaisance in office." This can be done only upon charges and after a full hearing. Any officer

so removed may appeal to the council, which, by a two-thirds vote, may reverse the mayor's action. Vacancies caused by such discharges would be filled by the mayor.

This code, loaded down with detail, is utterly planless except as it has been planned in the interests of political "bosses" and public service corporations. No principle of government can be detected in it. It is simply a hotch potch of empiric legislation. There is a general belief, moreover, that the worst features of it are withheld for the present to be rushed in as amendments when the code is being "jammed" through, toward the end of the special session.

At present the affairs of the city of Cleveland are conducted under an unconstitutional charter and a court injunction. The council was in session to-night. Since the injunction does not prohibit the mayor and his cabinet from participating in debates, as the old charter allowed them to, they continue to do so—not de jure but de facto. Consequently Mayor Johnson was able to make mincemeat to-night of the protest of a Republican councilman against the appropriation of a special fund temporarily to the purpose of general expenses.

The sum so appropriated was \$109,000. In objecting, this councilman charged the administration with having wasted the general funds. Pinned down, however, he was unable to mention any other waste than \$12,000 for the Peter Witt tax bureau.

When Mayor Johnson replied he told the council that all the expenses of police, fire department, street cleaning, etc., were less than those of Cincinnati or Buffalo; and that the \$12,000 for the tax bureau had so excited the public service corporations with fear that they had voluntarily increased their taxes this year by \$60,000. As they had never paid so much before, and would not have done so this time but for the work of the tax bureau, this \$12,000 of "waste" had paid for itself five times over, which he thought a good investment.

Then the mayor, very briefly and incisively, explained why the city needs to borrow from a special fund to meet general expenses. It was not because \$12,000 had been "wasted" by swapping it for \$60,000. It was not because there had been extravagance in any department. There had been none, and nobody, however anxious to do so, had been able to point to an instance. The reason was that \$20,000,000 of street car values put upon the list of

taxable property to bring those corporations up to the valuations made upon homes, had been taken off. Had this sum been left on the list, the city revenues would have been \$248,000 more than they are. But the governor, the state auditor and the attorney general had taken it off and so relieved those corporations of that just obligation. "These officials gave no reasons for obliging those corporations," said the mayor; "they have never given any. They probably did it because Mark Hanna wanted them to; and they couldn't give that reason because it wouldn't be a legal one."

The mayor's speech was followed by that of a Republican councilman who differed from the protesting member of his own party. This Republican confirmed the mayor's statement that there has been no waste, and after declaring that the tax bureau was the last institution that ought to be attacked, voted for the mayor's measure. It was carried by 11 to 7, the minority being all Republicans, and the majority all Democrats but this one.

Mayor Johnson and his supporters of the democratic Democracy, are preparing for the Democratic state convention, which is to be held at Sandusky on the 2d, and of which he is to be temporary chairman. Immediately after the convention he will make a tour of the state on the issue of "home rule and just taxation."

L. F. P.

NEWS

President Roosevelt began a campaign speaking tour on the 22d, which has already taken him into Maine, where the state election is to be held on the 8th. He will doubtless go into Vermont, also, which holds its state election on the 2d; and it is expected that he will tour the West in time to influence the November elections. His first stop after leaving his country home at Oyster Bay was at New Haven, on the 22d, and his second at Meriden later in the same day. But his first set speech was not delivered until evening. He made it at Hartford. His principal subject there was the colonial policy. Leaving Hartford on the 23d, he made off-hand talks on the route to Providence, where he spoke on the subject of trusts. He spent the night and Sunday at Newport. On the 25th he spoke on the trust question

at Boston; and on the 26th, after speaking briefly at Haverhill, Lawrence, Lowell, Old Orchard, Portland, Lewiston, and other places on his route, he arrived at Augusta, where he was the guest over night of Gov. Hill. He went to Bangor on the 27th to speak at the state fair, stopping on his way at Waterville to address the employes of the paper mills there, and closing the day with an after-dinner speech at Ellsworth.

The Republican convention of California met at Sacramento on the 26th. It adopted a platform in which President Roosevelt's administration is endorsed; and after a deadlock until the 27th nominated George C. Pardee for governor. Gov. Gage was unable to secure thenomination for reelection, though he held a plurality vote; so he threw his support to Pardee, who received 515 votes, the next highest candidate having 240½ and 416 being necessary to nominate.

John T. Morrison was nominated for governor on the 21st by the Republican convention of Idaho. The platform endorses the national administration, denounces trusts, and favors a revision of the tariff to the extent of placing products controlled by them upon the free list.

The only other political events of the week were the nomination on the 22d by the Prohibitionists of Iowa of a state ticket with W. W. Howard at the head of it for secretary of state; the nomination on the 25th by the Democrats of Alabama of Gov. William D. Jelks for governor, with a full state ticket; and the nomination on the 26th by the People's party of Illinois of a state ticket with W. W. Scott for clerk of the Supreme Court at its head.

A special session of the legislature of Ohio, called to remedy an awkward condition of public affairs caused by improvident legislation, met at Columbus on the 25th. In his message Gov. Nash specified two things needing remedial legislation. One is the accidental deprivation of the Supreme Court, by an act passed last May, of a large proportion of its appellate jurisdiction. The governor recommends the repeal of this law and the restoration to litigants of their rights to appeal as they existed before the blundering law was

passed. The other subject to which the governor has called the attention of the legislature is the necessity of enacting a uniform code for the cities and villages of the state. As he explains in his message, "during the last days of June, the Supreme Court of the state handed down several decisions which practically deprive our municipal corporations of all government." The decisions so alluded to are those described at page 212, which held that all the charters of Ohio cities and villages are special legislation and therefore unconstitutional. Gov. Nash submitted with his message the draft of a complete municipal code, made under his direction, the adoption of which he recommends. In supporting this recommendation he says:

The question now is not what we think would be a "model" municipal government, but what we can get, considering the constitutional limitations, and all the circumstances surrounding us. The task must be approached with a spirit of "give and take," and with a determination to accomplish something which will bring order out of chaos. It is time enough to have our favorite ideas in regard to municipalities incorporated into law after order has been restored and when the general assembly has ample time at its regular session, to discuss and consider them.

He expressly opposes the home rule code proposed by the State Board of Commerce (p. 305), saying:

In doing our work we should be careful to stand rigidly by the principles of the constitution. A departure from this course would make our work a nullity and continue indefinitely the confusion which now exists. It has been suggested by very respectable people that you can authorize the citizens of municipalities to do something that you cannot do yourselves; that you may empower the people of the 800 cities and villages in Ohio to assemble in constitutional conventions, and each for itself adopt a charter for its government. The result would be as many schemes for the government of cities and villages as there are municipalities in the state.

The governor's proposed code was read in both houses of the legislature on the 26th. The lower house at once provided for the appointment by the speaker of a committee of 17 to consider this bill and all others that may be introduced; and upon the report of that committee it will take up the measure, section by section, in committee of the whole. The senate also listened on the 26th to the read-

ing of the proposed code, but adjourned over the day without action.

British politics gives renewed indications that the Conservatives are losing ground and the Liberals are forging ahead. At the by-election for North Leeds in July (p. 267), the Conservative majority of 2,517 returned in 1900 was wiped out and a Liberal majority of 758 secured. A few weeks later a Conservative constituency in Ireland (p. 313) returned an anti-landlord member, changing the majority from 2,600 one way to 826 the other. And now the junior lord of the treasury in Balfour's cabinet, H. W. Forster, is barely returned from Seven Oaks, which he carried in 1900 by 4,812 majority. At that election he received 6,604 to 1,792 for his Liberal adversary; he now gets only 5,333, while his Liberal adversary gets 4,442.

In Cape Town, where the parliament of Cape Colony reassembled on the 20th (p. 312), for the first time since its abrupt suspension during the Boer war, the Progressive party has dropped the premier, Sir J. Gordon Sprigg, from its leadership, and elected Dr. J. W. Smart. This is the anti-Afrikander party, and Dr. Smart represents the sentiment which recently endeavored (p. 217) to secure from the British ministry the suspension of the constitution guaranteeing representative government. He was commissioner of public works in the Sprigg cabinet until last May, when he resigned because Sprigg opposed suspension.

Upon the opening of the parliament the governor of the colony, Sir Walter F. Hely-Hutchinson, announced that martial law will be removed immediately upon the passage of a bill indemnifying the governor and all persons concerned for acts committed under martial law. Such a bill was introduced, and on the 22d had passed its second reading.

A strong force of British troops left Johannesburg on the 26th for the western border of the Transvaal. It is reported that the real purpose of this move is to suppress native uprisings which the Boers have predicted. The natives are said to have been armed by the British during the war, and to have retained their arms after the Boers had been required to surrender theirs. Gen. Botha himself

was credited on the 23d, by an Austrian paper, with saying:

The civilization of South Africa is threatened by the Kaffirs. England armed these savage, brave, but untrustworthy tribes to fight for her; now the war is ended the Kaffirs have not returned their arms, but have retreated with them to inaccessible places in the mountains, where they are reported to be engaged in shooting exercises and preparations for war. Unless the English authorities display the greatest energy the Kaffirs are likely to cause great trouble.

The western frontier of the Transvaal is formed by Bechuanaland, which is inhabited chiefly by the Kaffir race of the Bechuanas.

The Haytian revolution (p. 310) shows no signs of subsiding. The revolutionary victory at Limbe, 80 miles north of Port au Prince, which was won on the 9th (p. 296), was reversed on the 26th by troops of the provisional government, who recaptured the town after a sanguinary fight. But on the 27th Limbe was retaken by the revolutionists. Another battle took place on the 26th, at Marmelade, but no details are yet reported.

NEWS NOTES.

—Gen. Taft arrived at Manila from Rome (p. 249) on the 22d.

—The National Association of Referees in Bankruptcy met at Milwaukee on the 27th.

—The twenty-fifth annual meeting of the American Bar association began at Saratoga on the 27th.

—The Universal Peace union, in session at Mystic, Conn., on the 21st, was addressed by Thomas E. Whipple, Walter S. Logan and Ernest Howard Crosby.

—George Hoadley, ex-governor of Ohio, died at Watkins, N. J., on the 26th, aged 76. For several years prior to his death he had been a prominent practitioner at the New York bar.

—From the motor races at Beauville, France, on the 26th, the highest speed yet attained is reported. It was at the rate of 78 miles an hour for a distance of more than three-fifths of a mile.

—The annual report of the labor department of the British board of trade, issued on the 26th, shows that the wages of men employed in industrial pursuits in 1901 were \$9,000,000 less than in 1900.

—Gen. Franz Sigel, a military leader in the German uprising of 1848, and famous as a general in the American civil war, on the Union side, died

at Mott Haven, N. Y., on the 21st, at the age of 78.

—Gen. Miles having applied for authority to inspect that portion of the United States army serving in the Philippines, his application was granted on the 26th by order of the President, and he is to sail about September 15.

—At the sixth annual convention of the League of American Municipalities, which opened at Grand Rapids on the 27th, 200 delegates were in attendance. The address by Mayor Ashley, of New Bedford, Mass, president of the league, advocated home rule for cities and the right of municipal ownership and control of public utilities.

—Horace G. Burt, president of the Union Pacific railroad, was arrested at Omaha on the 26th charged with false imprisonment. The complainants are machinists. They allege that they were engaged at Indianapolis to work in the railroad shops at Omaha, upon assurances that they were not to take the places of strikers. When they refused to take strikers places they were locked in the cars and guarded by armed men.

PRESS OPINIONS.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S TOUR.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Aug. 26.—We would not expect from President Roosevelt or from any man, perhaps, a full solution of the trust problem, but we might expect from a president of the United States an attitude toward the evil of gigantic monopoly that did not turn again and again to detraction of those opposing the evil.

Cole County (Mo.) Daily Democrat (Dem.), Aug. 26.—"It is not true that the poor have grown poorer," says this wise man from the East. He might have also added, "It is not true that the dead have grown deader." . . . Mr. Roosevelt graciously admits that the rich have grown richer. Any blind man can see that, however, and any lunatic would know it without being told. But what the people want to know, and what they have the right to ask of any man who sets up in business for himself as a professional statesman, is this: Why have not the poor also grown richer?

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Aug. 25.—No hired attorney for the trusts could more feelingly portray the beneficence of co-partnership for the destruction of competition and for raising the market prices of commodities. . . . There is one simple remedy for the trust evils, in the removal of the protective tariff from trust-controlled articles, but the Republican party will not listen to that suggestion of relief, and the President dared not mention it. He can do nothing to help the people; he is not disposed to hurt the trusts in any way, or to offend those interests which he knows control the Republican nomination for the presidency in 1904.

Johnstown Daily Democrat (Dem.), Aug. 25.—Mr. Roosevelt laid down the economic principle that the "best way in which to serve one set of our citizens is to serve them all alike well." This elicited a round of applause. In the light of dispassionate reflection it awakens the question as to whether legislation favoring trusts, high tariffs and the interests of capitalistic combinations, cliques and privileged classes generally, is "serving all classes

alike well." Thus far the president himself has shown no especial strenuousness toward attacking that kind of legislation, which has been the most prominent product of Republican government during the Hanna-McKinley-Roosevelt regime.

OHIO CODE MACHINE.

Buffalo Enquirer (ind.), Aug. 26.—Ohio now has a great opportunity to form a measure that will be the perfection of municipal law.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), Aug. 3.—In effect, the governor's message, which is commendable chiefly for its brevity, summed up, means simply an imperative command to the general assembly to "do as you are told to do."

Chicago Daily News (neut.), Aug. 25.—An opportunity is afforded the legislators at Columbus to enact a general charter for Ohio cities that will do much to further municipal progress in that state. Practical students of city government questions will watch the outcome with interest.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (ind. Dem.), Aug. 22.—This opportunity for creating a municipal system that may serve as a model for other communities is almost without parallel in late years. There is widespread anxiety that the legislature should recognize the importance of the work before it and approach the difficult problem with a determined purpose to put aside all considerations other than the construction of a system of municipal government that will be for the best interests of all.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Aug. 25.—The spirit of the constitution is to be respected, and the principle of home rule is to be the corner stone of the new edifice. Cheap partisan advantage is sought by some, but they are an insignificant minority. Ohio appreciates the magnitude of her task and the splendor of her opportunity. She has suffered too long from "peanut politics" and vicious legislation not to have learned the need and value of a sound and stable foundation for her municipal activities.

MISCELLANY

THE CITY CHILDREN.

For The Public.

From scorching, dazzling pavement,
From sweltering garret room,
From close and crowded tenement,
Abodes of grime and gloom,
The city's prisoned children
For one brief fortnight go,
By grace of sweetest charity,
The country's joys to know.

Not these the hopeless poorest,
That courts and alleys rear,
Whose misery e'en charity
Must hide, from shame and fear.
The highest of the low are they,
In whom the world may view
The best that city toilers
For home and child can do.

Our hearts, from daily use grown dull
To quiet country joys,
Gladden anew, beholding how
These eager girls and boys
Drink in with wonder and delight
The beauties lavished round,
The heavenly charms of summertime
In sight and scent and sound—

The sweet and dewy freshness
The early morning yields,
The music of the thousand birds,
The verdure of the fields,
The fragrance of the gardens,
The softness of the lawns,

The radiance of the sunset hues,
The glory of the dawns.

Oh, palefaced city children,
With eager, hungry eyes
Beholding all the wonders round,
What thoughts within you rise?
Do all these teeming treasures
That crowd upon the view
But call more bitterly to mind
That nothing is for you?

And glowing skies and landscapes
And cool and fragrant air—
Seem these to mock your darkened lives
And deepen your despair?
Hark! Not in scene of beauty,
Or heavenly scent or sound,
Is Nature's deepest truth made known,
Her sweetest message found.

Her soul, in breathless whisper,
Speaks inly to your own,
Thrilling the deepest consciousness
With solemn, awesome tone,
Yet with such blest compelling
The heart must needs say, "Aye!"
Whatever lusts resist the truth,
Whatever tongues deny.

Thus soundlessly are answered
The questions of your thought:
For each and all you little ones
The mighty work was wrought.
Ye, too, are Nature's landlords,
For whom were all things made;
Behold your heritage! Stand up
Erect and unafraid!
ELIZABETH PHELPS ROUNSEVELL.
Cuba, N. Y.

FILIPINO WOMEN ABANDONED.

A copy of the Filipino Christian Advocate, published at Manila, by Rev. J. L. McLaughlin, of the Methodist Episcopal church, is at hand. It is the number for July 1, and there is in it such a depiction as has before come by way of the special correspondents in Manila, but is here told with an authority beyond dispute. We quote:

The Twenty-fourth regiment (colored) has completed its term of service in the Philippines and has been ordered home. Three companies have already gone, and the remainder are being mobilized in Manila preparatory to embarking. This regiment has been doing garrison duty for several months, and, as has been a too free custom with the American army, many of these soldiers have been consorting with the native women; many have bound these women by promises of marriage, others have already been legally married, while by far the greater number have been living in concubinage pure and simple. Now comes the order, and the men are being sent home. It is a sad sight to see these women, some with children in their arms, bewailing their abandonment. It is perfectly safe to say there are hundreds of such forsaken women here to-day, in disgrace among their own people, who at one time thought themselves honored wives. This thing is a lasting shame upon our service, and yet there are commanding officers who have openly favored it because, as they say, tending to better discipline in the army."

"In disgrace among their own people"—that tells the story! No wonder this missionary is moved to protest at such an exhibition of our superior

civilization as imposed in the Orient, so at odds with his professions to these people, and with ours as defense has been made for the nation's subjugation of an alien race.—Springfield Republican, of August 15.

HIGH-GRADE TIPPING.

"Am I," said the waiter, "the only man who takes tips? No, not at all. You, for instance, tell your tobaccoist that in a few days Smith, the millionaire, will be in to see him—that Smith was looking for a good dealer, and you recommended him to go there. Well, Smith goes there and leaves a heavy order. Hence you are not surprised when you receive a little later a box of fine cigars, with your tobaccoist's compliments, but if those cigars are not a tip, what are they?"

"Brown is a buyer for a big manufactory. The firm he patronizes is sending him every week or two boxes of toilet soaps, cases of perfumery, dozens of golf balls, and barrels of clams. Those are Brown's tips—the gratuities he gets for his patronage.

"Robinson sends a rich friend to his tailor with a note of introduction, and the rich friend buys four suits. Isn't Robinson being tipped when the tailor, the week following, makes him a present of a set of English flannels?"

The waiter made a disdainful gesture and ejaculated:

"Pish! Tipping, they say, is un-American, and a waiter of proper pride and independence would scorn to accept a quarter or a half in return for the serving of a meal. But I say that tipping runs clean through our social system, from top to bottom, and all of us, excepting only the elevator man, are taking tips of one sort or another all our lives."—Philadelphia Record.

A NON-PARTISAN QUESTION.

Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, at the Mayfield (O.) Pioneers' picnic, on August 13, as reported in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The existing struggle is not between capital and labor; it is between labor and monopoly, between capital and special privilege. It is monopoly and privilege which must be dealt with before any just solution can be reached.

Democrats as well as republicans have assisted to place iniquitous laws upon the statute books, by which special privileges are allowed and monopolies are protected. In national, state, county and city offices men have built

up by man-made laws these special privileges which you cannot enjoy, and for which you have to pay.

President Schwab, of the steel trust, estimates the value of the trust's property at \$1,500,000,000. Of this amount only \$500,000,000 covers all the tangible property, such as machinery and buildings. This leaves a billion to cover the value of the fields of ore and coal over which the trust exercises a monopoly, nature's storehouse which God has given to all.

This trust escapes each year the payment of \$19,000,000 of just taxes. Who is it that makes up this deficiency, who is it that pays for the special privileges enjoyed by the trust? It is the farmer and the small landholder who bear the burden. And in this I am not talking politics. It comes nearer to being religion, because I conceive it to be in accordance with the teachings of the Saviour to advocate the establishment of full justice between man and man. And I care not which party it is that advocates the establishment of such justice. I care not whether the man who advocates such measures has his name under the rooster or under the eagle. He is the man and his the party to vote for.

THE SWISS ELECTIONS. THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM IN OPERATION.

"We have here no grandeur," says M. Christian Schefer, in La Revue de Paris, "but simply a few thousand people with heads uncovered, grouped in a circle, motionless and silent. There is in their attitude a profound and sincere gravity, all apparently feel the importance of the object which has brought them together, and standing as they do in the same places where their fathers often stood before them there is mingled with the religious meditation a deep remembrance of the past which is enhanced by the exquisite serenity of nature. We are here in the presence of a regime which special authors call pure democracy.

"In the matter of laws the right of initiative belongs to every citizen, but the proposition must be addressed to the cantonal council not later than the 31st of December. The order of the day is generally arranged sufficiently long in advance to give the citizens time to study it, a small brochure being printed which contains a list of the officers whose terms of office expire, together with the report of the cantonal council on the questions of law. Each one

knows that he is to deliberate on each proposition emanating from popular initiative, and he gives to each careful thought.

"As each new motion or measure is taken up, the landamman allows a member of the cantonal council to speak, choosing them in the order of their entry on the roll of the council. After a short speech this orator is followed by an opposer, and then a third and fourth until there is no response to the landamman when he demands if anyone wishes to speak further. The landamman then gives his opinion and immediately thereafter the vote of the people is taken."—Public Opinion.

TRUE FREEDOM.

A portion of an address delivered at the Baccalaureate Day exercises at the State Normal University in Bloomington, Ill., June 1, by President David Felmley.

The pages of history are filled with the story of the struggle of freemen against the despot that would enslave. The classical examples of heroism owe their fame to the fact that they were champions of freedom. Although our own civil war was a struggle to preserve the union its stirring songs sounded the battle cry of freedom. "As Christ died to make men holy, let us die to make men free," was its hymn of consecration. The great war lyrics never celebrate the triumph of the invader. His war literature may praise the loyalty and bravery of the soldier, his fidelity to duty and to the flag, but it cannot reveal him as inspired by a righteous cause.

But the political freedom of patriot and poet is not the freedom of the new testament. True freedom is not in external condition; it is internal and personal. Freedom is the sense of harmony of the individual soul with the world in which it lives.

Liberty is no guaranty of freedom; it may breed licentiousness, dissipation and oppression. Freedom can come only from the knowledge of the truth. To know the truth is to see things in right relation, to see them in their origin and purpose. It is to feel that at the core of things is a power that makes for righteousness, law, order; to be assured that as we discover this divine order we may through it approach that perfect state that has been the dream of the philosopher and poet. That nature is essentially beneficent nobody questions. Man's deliverance from bondage to his physical environment has kept equal pace with the growth of his knowledge of her

truths. The story of these liberations has been told a thousand times. But their method is always the same. Know the truth and obey its law. Your will must fit her will. Work with her and she is your willing servant; oppose her and you dash yourself to pieces against her resistless might.

That law is equally resistless and inexorable, equally gentle and fruitful to him that obeys is not generally apprehended. We recognize that the method of the flower or chemical combination is inherent in the constitution of the plant or atom. Man may discover and announce these laws; he cannot create them. But in social affairs and things of man's fixing we are prone to think of him as the lawgiver. But institutions are the forces that human energy takes in moving toward some end. The nature of man and the special character of the end determine the law of the institution. Whatever legislatures may enact or rulers decree, the inner law must prevail. To know this inner law and to obey it is rational freedom.

THE DRONE'S SHARE.

Several columns are devoted by the New York Post to special pleading in behalf of the anthracite operators by a staff correspondent who is as incapable of seeing anything reasonable in the demands of workingmen as if he were the writer of Post editorials. The correspondent's purpose is to show "why the operators find it impossible to grant the demands of the miners." One of the chief reasons is thus stated:

Most of the mines are leased, and are not operated by their owners. There is a fixed rental, besides a royalty for every ton of coal taken out. Twenty years ago the royalties paid by operator to owner were from 20 to 25 cents per ton for sizes larger than chestnut; to-day royalties are from 40 to 50 cents per ton for all sizes above pea, and from 25 to 10 cents for sizes below pea. Thus, not only have the royalties increased a great deal, but, where they used to be paid only on large sizes, they now have to be paid on all sizes.

That statement of fact is an unconscious and unintentional admission of the truth of one of the gravest indictments brought against the existing economic system. It is a revelation of the operation of special privilege and shows how idleness extorts from industry a large share of the product of labor. The owners of most of the anthracite mines take no part whatever in the processes by which inert mineral matter, stored in the earth by the forces of nature, is converted into wealth. They contribute neither la-

bor nor capital to the enterprise; they are absolute drones; in them privilege is personified.

Labor goes into nature's storehouse, adds work to raw material and converts it into wealth and brings it forth for the use of man. At the door stands Capital awaiting its share of the product in return for having supplied Labor with tools. Privilege sits idly by. As Labor passes out, sweating under its burden, Capital not only takes its own share of the wealth, but filches another portion and places that in the pocket of Privilege, who is too lazy even to stretch forth a hand to take the tribute.

When Labor complains of the insufficiency of what is left and asks that Capital shall abate something of its greed in taking toll at the door, Capital points to Privilege and says: "But I have to take care of him, and he and I have agreed that he shall have more than you because he likes to wear better clothes, eat better and more food, live in a better house and amuse himself more expensively. He can't work and is absolutely useless in the world, but he insists on existing and I have great respect for him. I don't want to give up any of my share, and therefore you must support him. Besides, his family are our best people, and you wouldn't think of degrading them to your level and forcing them to work for a living."

That is the royalty argument translated into plain English.—Editorial in The Philadelphia North American of August 20.

MAYOR JOHNSON ON THE MUNICIPAL CODE.

Written by the Hon. Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, expressly for the Daily Press, of Columbus, O. Published in the Press, of August 13.

On the subject of the new municipal code I have said very little except that we ought to have all the home rule possible and as near a federal plan of government as we can get the politicians to accede to.

The public service corporations, headed by Senator Hanna, will do all they can to force a board system of government upon us. Failing in that, they will attempt to destroy the federal plan by having heads of departments elected and, in other words, aim to remove as far as possible the local government from the control of the people; confusing men's minds as to where the blame should be located; requiring many successive elections to repudiate guilty officeholders. To illustrate:

They are claiming that the federal plan is a failure in Columbus; that the board system is a great success in Cincinnati. I will agree with them if they mean that the board system offers Boss Cox a better means of removing the government from the eyes of the citizens and offers the greatest advantage to public service corporations to get what they want. But take the case of the attempt to grant a 25-year franchise to the street railway in Columbus under the federal plan which resulted in a political revolution which swept the guilty people from office and left the question in the courts for ultimate decision. While under the Cincinnati board system, a 50-year franchise has been granted and rests in their municipal law without a contest and the same men are undisturbed in office that perpetuated that wrong.

Isn't this a clear illustration of the advantage to the people of the federal plan of government over the board system?

The municipal corporations, headed by Senator Hanna, want to dictate the municipal code that they may secure protection from competition in their municipal monopolies; freedom from attack in the interest of lower charges for public service; continued opportunities to evade nine-tenths of their taxes and finally, to turn over the police forces of the cities to the governor that they may better protect their monopolies in times of labor disturbances, their aim being to use the government of the state to so mold the government of the cities that they will be free from strikes, competition, regulation and the payment of their just share of taxes.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN TWO ENGLISH WARS.

An editorial in the *New Age*, of London, for August 7.

In 1780 the population of Great Britain was estimated at 9,000,000. That of Ireland in 1754 was estimated at about 2,250,000. Let us call the whole population of these islands in 1780 11,000,000. That of the thirteen revolted North American colonies was 3,000,000. The war lasted eight years. During the last four we were also at war with France and Spain. During the last two, we were, in addition, at war with Holland. From the middle of 1778, the East India company was in most serious difficulties, which quickly resulted in the very critical war with Hyder Ali, assisted by France. The number of troops we had

at any one time in North America does not seem to have much exceeded 55,000 men. We had also about 20,000 armed loyalists, who, by the accounts of both sides, were most formidable and ruthless partisans. We also from first to last enlisted in our service some 12,000 Indians.

One hundred and twenty years later we engaged in a war with two states, whose united white population did not exceed—if it reached—half a million. Our own population is now by the census of 1901 forty-one and a half millions. We had no other war on our hands except the disturbance in China in 1900, in which we were unable to take any active part. We sent to South Africa, from first to last, nearly 300,000 troops, and for a considerable period we had 250,000 there at one time. We received substantial assistance from Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The war lasted two years and seven months—more than a quarter of the period of the American war. We were three times more in number than the Americans of 1780. We are more than 40 times more in number than our late adversaries. The whole population of the two Republics is together less than one-sixth part of that of the thirteen colonies in 1789. To beat this sixth part, we have required a force five times as great as we sent to North America. It is true that we tried in vain for eight years to beat the Americans, and that the Boers have submitted to us. But they could have held out longer—as is shown by the number of surrenders; and until we know the reasons which induced them to lay down their arms, we cannot estimate the amount of our success. What we do know is that, nation for nation, we are eighty times as many, and army for army were 300,000 to 60,000—if it be true that the Boer army ever reached 60,000. In most of the battles, the disparity was ridiculous. We took Cronje when we were eleven to one. Where is the glory? Where is even the assurance that we have more fighting power than in 1780? Finally, the American war of eight years cost £140,000,000; the Boer war of two and a half years cost us—it is admitted—£228,000,000. If we are to go on at this rate, our next war will require 600,000 troops to beat 12,000—ah, who will they be?

AT THE FRESH-AIR CAMP.

All about were tall, whiskered grasses. Mothers dropped their babies in their yielding expanse, and went to find them by the path they made at play. Near at hand shone the striped

awnings of the tents wherein were sheltered a hundred little waifs from the city streets. It seemed as if they were cast like driftwood upon this peaceful shore, soon to be regurgitated by the whirlpool of city life. Just below the tree line a thousand blue ripples dawned on the beaten sand to their own music.

Over every grassy tussock, under every awning, ran the little children. Above every sound rose the shrill music of their happy laughter. Back and forth they romped and pulled and shouted, as if they would force every moment to yield its full 60 seconds of joy in this week of country life that was all too short.

In the midst of the revelry an elderly woman came to me.

"I can't find Eddie anywhere," she said. "He must have run off. It is the first time in his life he has been away from our block—he's most five years old."

She had a younger child in her arms, so while she devoted herself to him I went for her in search of Eddie.

In and out the groups of children, through the tents, through the tangled elderberry bushes I went, calling "Eddie! Eddie!"

"At length I turned a sandy hillock. An oak tree had sent its roots deep through the ground. Jealously the lake had nibbled nearer and nearer, until the two roots were bared. Rough with sand as they were, their gyrated fibers formed a semblance to a cradle in which was huddled a forlorn little figure:

It was Eddie.

I knew him by his shapeless blue garment, by his red head and squirrel teeth.

"Why, what's the matter, son?" I asked.

We were such old friends having known each other intimately for almost two days, that the answer was not very slow in coming.

"Want to go home—"

"So soon, dear. But we can have such a nice time here in this nice fresh air. What do you want to go home for? Tell me—"

"I'm 'fraid," this doggedly.

"Afraid of what?"

"I'm 'fraid—just 'fraid. The lake's so big—and it makes such a noise! Ain't never had a noise like that on Pearl street! An' the wind sounds just like chewing som'pn. 'Tain't like that in Pearl street. An' ther ain't no sidewalks. Nor no banana man. Nor no ash boxes!" His voice broke into a wail.

Here was a real "heimweh." Suddenly an idea occurred to me. I communicated it to Eddie in whispers.

Two hours later a contented little fellow was making "red-hots" out of balm blossoms and selling them from an "all-nighter" of strawberry boxes.

And Eddie was happy, for he was at home once more.—Chicago Evening Post.

OUR SHAME AND OUR HOPE.

Portions of an address delivered at Ashfield, Mass., August 21, by Louis R. Ehrlich, of Colorado Springs, Col.

In due time everything rises or falls to its level. When George III. attempted to impose his will upon the American colonies, he had the nation at his back. His contemporaries extolled the domestic purity of his life, his unflagging industry, his simple bucolic tastes, and his whole-hearted devotion to the empire. One of them wrote: "Ages may probably elapse before we shall again behold on the throne a prince more qualified on the whole to dispense happiness, and more justly an object of universal affection, blended with esteem." Three-quarters of a century have barely passed since the king's death, and already the latest English historian has written: "The name of George III. cannot be penned without a pang, can hardly be penned without a curse, such mischief was he fated to do the country."

When, in a few decades, the story of our times shall be impartially set down, the historian, in the characterization of our late lamented president, will tell of his kindly, sunny disposition—of his capacity in winning and holding friends, of his sweetness and devotion in his domestic relations, of his having died like a hero; and then, unfortunately, he will be constrained to add that the foulest stain on the pages of our history was his signature of the "benevolent-assimilation" proclamation of December, 1898. That document deliberately proclaimed to the Filipinos: "We have bought you and we should impose our sovereignty upon you. If you resist, we will shoot you down." Thank God, they resisted! The dignity of human nature and the principles of liberty cryingly demanded vindication in the hour when this republic arbitrarily proposed to usurp the political rights of 8,000,000 people.

Let us not dwell on the horrors of the last three years. The saddest, most disheartening fact has been that while our national ideals were being desecrated, while from 50,000 to 100,000 lives were being sacrificed, and hun-

dreds of millions of treasure being worse than wasted, the pulpits of Christ applauded; and in all the countless meetings and conventions of our Daughters of the Revolution, Colonial Dames, Sons of the Colonial Wars, woman federations, and other bodies professing to represent the patriotic spirit of our past and the moral and social hope of our future, not an outcry was heard in protest. Could this generation give stronger proof of American decadence? If you point, as an equivalent, to our material prosperity and to our having developed into a world-power, I quote you Jeremy Taylor in reply, and say that "A prosperous iniquity is the most unprofitable condition in the world."

Our hope is in the American spirit of fair play. We know how often republics have been cruel and ruthless, but we will not believe that, in this blessed land, freedom shall breed tyrants and oppressors. Its prevention rests with the individual citizen. Every man and every woman who recognizes our national duty should boldly raise his or her voice, appealing again and again and again to the conscience and pride of our countrymen. If the fitting word could only be spoken—if the precepts of the revolutionary fathers could be winged and barbed into renewed influence—if the inspiration of those who, within the half century pleaded and bled for the enslaved and oppressed, could be reinspired—if some poet or prophet could weave into a golden message that yearning for human equality and human brotherhood, which however inarticulate and however stifled with selfish wrappings, dwells in the depths of every human soul—then the editor in his sanctum, the merchant in his store, the banker in his office, the lawyer at his desk, the professor in his library, the farmer at his plow, the wage-earner in the factory, the minister in his pulpit, the mother in her household, and all the members of our complex civilization, even to the very youth at their play, would feel restlessly tugging at their heart strings the resistless desire to make full reparation to the brown men of the Orient, and to rebaptize our nation in the living waters that flow from the shining fountains of civil liberty and of eternal justice.

COMMON HONESTY.

Willie—Good morning, Mr. Fatte-Grabb.

Fatte Grabb—Hello, old boy, come in and sit down. But what's the matter—why the "mister?"—you

used to call me "Grabblets," if I remember right.

W.—You're making more money now.

F.-G.—That ought not make any difference.

W.—I know that—but as a matter of fact, it does make a difference. Just between you and me, you know my personal opinion of you perfectly well. If I hadn't hammered at you until you learned to exhibit a little human intelligence when you saw me looming up through the doorway, you never would have known enough to—

F.-G.—Here, won't you have a smoke, Willie?

W.—That's the way to do it. Somebody must have put you next to a new brand. These are good ones. Got a match?

F.-G.—What are you after to-day—anything special?

W.—I wanted to get an interview on the tax question.

F.-G.—I see. I have just been reading that the tax question is one that ought not to enter into politics at all. I think that's dead right.

W.—Why?

F.-G.—Well, what on earth does the common ordinary voter know about taxes? For instance, take 100 average voters here in Milwaukee and you'll find only ten per cent. of them owning property.

W.—Oh, there's more than that.

F.-G.—Well, say there's 25 per cent. Now what right have they to dictate to the men who own millions of dollars' worth of property as to what taxes they shall pay?

W.—What do you suggest?

F.-G.—Why, a commission ought to have charge of the question—a commission of big, brainy men who would devote time and study to the question; who would know what they are talking about, and who would be perfectly fair to everybody, the big property holders and the little property holders.

W.—I see. Instead of letting the people—the small property owners—dictate to you, you prefer having two or three men do the job.

F.-G.—That's a different way of putting it.

W.—Ought these men be big property owners or small property owners?

F.-G.—Well, I don't see where we would come in if they were only small property owners.

W.—Then you think the people, as a whole, are not fair?

F.-G.—Fair. I should say not. The average man isn't inclined to be fair with a corporation, even when he knows enough.

W.—What makes you think so?

F.-G.—Why, anybody knows that. Look at the railroads—if the people had their way about it they'd pay \$1.50 for a ride to New York and back, or one-cent fares in the street cars.

W.—Oh no they wouldn't.

F.-G.—What do you know about it?

W.—Well, I forget who said it, but it has been said that the great mass of the people are honest.

F.-G.—That's nonsense, the average man is a thief at heart.

W.—That takes you in, doesn't it?

F.-G.—I guess I ain't any worse than the next man.

W.—All right. That brings up a new point. We'll suppose that two double-distilled thieves meet, and that neither knows the other is an arrant rascal. Now wouldn't the first impulse of both be to try to make the other believe he was an honest man?

F.-G.—Certainly.

W.—All right. Now put about 300 men in a hall—men who are not personal friends—take for instance the legislature of the state. Suppose that the legislature had the power to regulate the railroad fares in the state. And suppose that one of the members introduced a bill to bring fares down to one cent a mile. Don't you know that some man would jump up and say: "No, that isn't right. That isn't fair." In fact, don't you know that if the question were put to a vote of the people the majority of them would vote against it?

F.-G.—They might.

W.—There's no "might" about it. They would.

F.-G.—If they didn't the courts would knock the law out anyway.

W.—Why?

F.-G.—Because it would be rank injustice, and there isn't a law or a law court in the land that would uphold it.

W.—Who made the laws and the courts?

F.-G.—Why, the people of course.

W.—Certainly, and that proves from your own point of view that the great mass of the people, as I said, are honest.

F.-G.—Well, the individual isn't built that way, anyhow.

W.—That may be. You take two or three or half a dozen owners, and

they are individuals. But take 300,000 people in Milwaukee, or 1,000,000 throughout the state, and they are "the great mass of the people."

F.-G.—What about it?

W.—Why, just this—which is the more honest, two or three individuals, or the 300,000 voters of the state?

F.-G.—What do you think you're talking about, anyway?

W.—Common honesty.—Milwaukee Free Press.

UNCLE SAM VS. BROTHER JONATHAN.

THE CANADIAN VIEW.

For The Public.

The kindness with which American readers have received Mr. Goldwin Smith's recent book, "Commonwealth and Empire," shows that they appreciate friendly criticism from beyond their own borders, and may perhaps justify another outsider, who can claim a brotherly motive, though not the authority of a great name, in giving expression to his views upon the present momentous epoch in the history of the United States.

Though living under the flag of a monarchy, Canadians are, as a people, essentially democratic; and notwithstanding that we have of late witnessed an extraordinary revival of "loyalty to the empire," I doubt if more than a score of responsible men could be found from Halifax to Vancouver who would confess to any sympathy with the imperialist policy of the present United States administration. For the "empire" we enthuse over is one which, in our experience, is compatible with the doctrine of "consent of the governed," and is not imperial at all in the ancient Roman or modern McKinleyan sense of the word. Enjoying in peace, quietness and prosperity, the utmost blessings of self-government; and having this autonomy administered with economy and efficiency in the protection of life and liberty, Canadians justly account themselves one of the most highly-favored communities on earth; and, being pressed by no grim problems of their own, they have every opportunity for the contemplation of those of their neighbors.

The United States, it goes without saying, is to us a phenomenon of perpetual interest; and its affairs occupy us, next to our own domestic concerns, more than those of any other country, with the possible exception of Great Britain. If I might be permitted to express in a concrete figure what I believe to be the universal senti-

ment in Canada toward the United States, I would say that we honor, love and sympathize with Brother Jonathan; but disapprove of and distrust Uncle Sam. Under these separate personalities, as the representatives of the one nation, you will have no difficulty in recognizing the two distinct elements which compose the population of the United States—and which might be found—though perhaps not so conveniently named—in every other country.

Brother Jonathan symbolizes to us all that we connect with the grand and glorious traditions of the American commonwealth, numbering unreservedly amongst those traditions the gallant deeds of the revolution, in which tyranny—albeit by a British king—was repulsed and overthrown. In him we hail the author of the constitution, which is the substance, and the declaration, which is the spirit of American liberty; the foe of slavery, the champion of the oppressed, the brother and friend of humanity, the advocate of education, the upholder of free speech and a free press, in short, the noble scion of our own house, who, on a larger stage, has sought to act a part calculated to bring greater glory to the Anglo-Saxon name.

Uncle Sam, on the other hand, has small title to the reverence of mankind, and least of all to that of Canadians. He it was who, in 1812, wickedly and without just cause invaded our territory—a proceeding which did not fail at the time to evoke the strong protest of Jonathan. Nor do we forget that since that date he has on various occasions sought to overreach us in a rather mean fashion. But it is not from the standpoint of any new or old grievances of our own, but from the broader, and quite disinterested, outlook upon humanity in general, that we note with regret his more recent ascendancy in the councils of the republic. It is with a feeling akin to indignation that we see the symbols of Brother Jonathan being perverted to serve the purposes of a very different personality. We begin to suspect that Uncle Sam, under the influence of some mad and unholy ambition for fame as a "world-power," has deliberately set himself to wreck the republic and substitute an empire for it—and not an empire on the model of the British, but a downright military despotism. On the principle of the greater including the less, the tyrant presupposes the hypocrite, and hence we find this conspirator against human liberty, declaring war against Spain on grounds which would befit

the character of Brother Jonathan, namely, for the liberation of the Cubans from the cruelty and misgovernment of Spain. But the world knows that if Jonathan had made the declaration, he would have acted upon it. No man would have dreamt of questioning his good faith; and it would scarcely have been necessary for him to have given an assurance that when Cuban liberation had been accomplished he would not attempt to steal the island. Sam, however, in his assumed character of Jonathan, overacted the part, and proclaimed to mankind that he had no intentions toward Cuba but those of an honorable and chivalrous neighbor. When the war was over, however, he gradually dropped his Jonathanian pretenses. He was manifestly disposed to kick himself that he had been so respectful toward the opinion of the world as to have made the Cuban promises. In the face of them he could not quite annex the island; but neither was he capable of an honest fulfillment of his word. The upshot of it was that, in virtual violation of his pledge, he exacted certain conditions from the new republic as the price of the independence he had so chivalrously won for it—conditions which it is now believed must infallibly lead to the ultimate surrender of that independence. Having thus buncoed the Cubans, he retired with vociferous announcements of his own unparalleled generosity and nobility, and much waving of Old Glory.

Meanwhile, however, he had come into possession of the Philippines. This unanticipated fortune occurred, by a sinister coincidence, just about the time that Uncle Sam had discovered that the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence were mere abstract glittering generalities, and the whole document a "back number;" but especially that part of it which alleges that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. So that it was with no great shock of surprise that onlookers saw the rapid development of the present situation in the Philippines—the crooked transaction by which sovereignty over them was purchased, the cynical cruelty with which the Filipino alliance was repudiated, the scorn with which their hopes were mocked, and the barbarity and tyranny with which their liberties were beaten down and their existence is now burdened. The islands are to-day under a military despotism worse than any which elsewhere exists on earth, and which presents in its every feature the antithesis of the American system as rep-

resented in Brother Jonathan. Well may that friend and champion of humanity boil with righteous indignation in his anti-imperialist leagues, for unless he speedily secures the place of power and reverses the national policy, the hopes of humanity will be eclipsed, the noblest experiment in government the world has ever seen will be a shameful failure. May the God of nations forbid such a disaster!

J. W. BENGOUGH.

Toronto, Can.

THE CHARTERS OF CITIES.

An editorial in the New York Nation of August 14.

Within a few days the Legislature of Ohio, convened in extraordinary session by the Governor, will enter upon a most interesting and important task, that of preparing a code for the government of Ohio cities. The preparation of the code is made immediately necessary by a decision of the state Supreme Court, practically declaring invalid the city charters throughout the state. The court, in effect, decided that the classification under which the city governments are operating is contrary to the Constitution, which requires that "the Legislature shall pass general laws" for the government of cities. The classification in question was general in form, but so expressed that particular cities were indicated, and this the Supreme Court finally refuses longer to sanction.

The task which the Legislature has before it is, of course, of the utmost importance to Ohio, but it possesses also an extreme interest for students of the municipal problem elsewhere. The eyes of municipal reformers will turn toward Columbus with a good deal of eagerness, and perhaps with some anxiety, during the weeks which follow the assembling of the lawmakers. They well know that the attention which has been given to municipal problems during the last decade has not all been in vain. Principles of municipal administration have been evolved which are no longer mere theories; they are established. In framing the fundamental law for the cities of Ohio, will the Legislature take these principles into account, or will it disregard them? Will the Legislature so act that the municipal code which it produces may register the advance which has been made in the direction of good government for cities, or must "politics" play the chief part during the session, and the result be

some municipal hodge-podge through which the "control" of the cities will be kept by the party in power in the state, without reference to the wishes of local taxpayers and voters?

One of the principles which may be described as established is the principle of home rule. It is fair to describe it as established, though it is violated perhaps as often as it is observed, no party dares to oppose it as a principle, and all, in fact, proclaim their adherence to it. The Ohio Legislature has a chance to institute real home rule in the cities of that state. A charter ought to be to a city, somewhat at least, as a constitution is to a state or a nation. It ought to contain the fundamental law, and it ought not to be subject to constant change at the whim of some party or individual. This is the modern idea of a city charter, and it is the right one. The Legislature cannot, of course, of itself, prevent the amendment or repeal of its work by subsequent legislatures; but, if it succeeds in drawing up a municipal code based upon modern principles, the Legislature may with much force appeal to the people to prevent unwarranted changes without due process. The people of California are about to vote on a constitutional amendment providing that amendments to home-rule charters must be submitted to a popular vote in the localities affected, if such submission is petitioned for by 15 per cent. of the qualified voters of such localities.

Another principle of municipal administration which can be said to bear the sanction of common acceptance, is that of responsibility concentrated in the municipal head, the Mayor. The principle is pretty clearly outlined in the present charter of Cleveland, which for other reasons has been declared invalid. The Cleveland system is one of bureau heads appointed and removable by the Mayor, and constituting his "cabinet," as it is called. This feature, by the way, gave the Cleveland system the name of "Federal plan," by which it is commonly known. These bureau heads are directly responsible to the Mayor, and he is responsible for them to the people. In this particular the Cleveland charter has been regarded as particularly well drawn and modern, and it would be a source of great regret if a less enlightened system should now be adopted.

Prodded by Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, and some others,

the Ohio Legislature may be expected to give close heed to the rules incorporated in the municipal code relating to the granting of franchises. Here, too, a certain standard has been set which the legislators cannot avoid without confessing a disregard of the best and most enlightened thought on the subject. Formerly cities were empowered to give franchises as they chose. A charter which does not now place a restriction on the granting of franchises, requiring a fixed compensation and naming a term of years at the expiration of which the franchise must terminate, be renewed, or be readjusted, would be an anachronism. This is a matter about which the people have shown that they feel most strongly, and in many cities it has furnished the chief interest through which good citizens have been aroused to the performance of their civic duties. In Chicago, for instance, an attempt to renew expiring street railway and other franchises in 1897 by vote of the Legislature awakened the citizens to such an extent that, under the lead of the Municipal Voters' league, they have practically assured protection of the people's rights in public franchises, as a result of long and hard endeavor, culminating in the election of a reform city council at the last election. Even to this day, men who, as members of the Legislature, voted for the obnoxious franchise grabs of 1897, are practically excluded from public office in Illinois.

These are some of the standards which have been set, and which the Ohio Legislature will disregard at its peril. Probably the greatest of them is the principle of home rule, for this could hardly exist without bringing the others into active being. If the Legislature can produce a fundamental law for cities in keeping with modern standards, and then, by constitutional amendment or otherwise, provide a sure protection against "ripper" legislation in the future, it will be of the greatest benefit to the cause of municipal reform throughout the country.

PRESIDENT BAER'S BLASPHEMY.

Sermon delivered by Dr. J. L. Stern, rabbi of B'er Havim congregation, of Cumberland, Md., at the Sabbath Eve service, Friday, August 22, 1902.

People sometimes ask: "What is it that has made the Bible the power it has been in the molding of the thought of the world? What is it that makes this ancient collection of

books a power even to-day, to-day when so many pretend that they are no longer swayed by the sentiments of this Book of books?"

Only such, though, as do not know the Bible ask this question. The man who knows the book, the man who cherishes it, the man who keeps it as the rule and guide of his life, as the rule whereby to measure the breadth of life's vistas, as the plummet wherewith to gauge the depth of the ever flowing stream of events, the level wherewith to survey the numerous ups and downs of his own limited path and of mankind's long stretched journey—he to whom the book is all this, never asks this question. For he knows the answer, which some nineteen centuries since was so happily phrased by the great Hillel's pupil, the proselyte Ben Bag-Bag: "Turn it and turn it over again, for everything is in it, for thou canst have no better rule than this." He knows that human nature was by none better understood than by the writers of the Bible; he knows that every mood of life is there touched, every problem propounded, every solution given, every riddle asked, every maze unraveled.

I was most forcibly reminded of this fact when a day ago I read that astounding letter of the president of the Philadelphia & Reading railroad, in which, though he professes himself and admonishes others to remember "that the Lord God omnipotent still reigns, and that his reign is one of law and order, and not of violence and crime," he, nevertheless, has the arrogance to blasphemously call himself and his associates "men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of the country."

As I read this there flashed through my mind some verses of the Bible lesson (Deuter. 7:12; 11:25), which our ancient liturgy prescribes for this very week during which that impious remark was penned, for their appropriateness is remarkable.

For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of springs and lakes that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig copper. When thou hast eaten and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land he has given thee. Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God, in not keeping his commandments, and his judgments, and his statutes, which I command thee this day; lest when thou hast eaten and art full, and hast built goodly houses, and dwelled therein; and when thy herds and thy flocks

multiply, and thy silver and thy gold is multiplied, and all that thou hast is multiplied; then thine heart be lifted up, and thou forget the Lord thy God * * * * and thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God: for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth. * * * *

Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the Lord's thy God, the earth also, with all that therein is. (Deuter. 8:7-14a, 17, 18a; and 10:14.)

Of equal appositeness is the greater part of the prophetic lesson appointed for the day:

Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the just captive be delivered? But thus saith the Lord, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered; for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children. And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with new wine; and all flesh shall know that I the Lord am thy saviour and thy redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob. (Isa. 49:24-26.)

I wonder whether the president of the Philadelphia & Reading would regard it as ordained by Providence that it should so happen in the week when he wrote his letter that on this very Sabbath day as the sun circles the globe just these passages from the mouth of Moses, the greatest of prophets, from the lips of Isaiah, the greatest of preachers, should be read in thousands of synagogues, in the pulpits of the people that has been chosen to be the witness of God's truth throughout the ages?

As for myself, I know not whether it is an arrangement of Providence, for I am mindful of another word of Isaiah:

For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts higher than your thoughts. (Isa. 55:8, 9.)

The ways of Providence we know not, nor dare we presume to fathom the thoughts of God; and the manner in which they intertwine with the warp and woof of the web of passing events on the loom of time is to us a mystery.

Yet there are some things, some very simple things, that we do know concerning Providence, concerning the ways of God with man.

We know that God has made the universe. The Lord God Omnipotent has done this with none to help him. It is he who has made the hosts of heaven, the stars in their places, planets and comets in their courses, and the sun that sendeth its radiance of light and heat to all the ends of the earth, and the moon that bringeth comfort in the night, and this beautiful planet, the

circling earth, our cradle, our home, our grave, the grave of the loved ones that have gone from us, our children's playground and our own workshop. This earth with its springs and its brooks, with its rivers and lakes and mighty oceans; with its mountains full of treasures, with its plains full of meat, with its meadows full of fragrance, with its bushes full of song: God has made it all.

And this also we know: That in his infinite wisdom and mercy he has made man; man though ever so puny if compared with his maker, yet but a little less than the angels.

And concerning ourselves we know, concerning man: That with every hungry mouth there comes into this world two feet that may carry us to nature's table which God has spread before us, two arms that may stretch forth to get of the abundant gifts, two hands which with deft fingers can shape the crude offerings of nature into a thousand forms of beauty and utility to minister to our wants, two eyes to see and two ears to hear the secrets of Nature's whisperings, and above all a brain to observe, to remember, to reason, to plan and to devise how to obtain dominion over the universe which God has made for his children.

And another thing we know, as does that railroad president. We know that this is a world of law and order. And we know some of the laws and ordinances, too. Among these this is one of the simplest and foremost: Though God has given the earth with all its treasures to man, yet not the least mite of all the riches of this planet can be obtained by man save by work; and the only prayer for material things that God will hear and grant is the supplication, not of bended knees and folded hands, but the petition of hurrying feet and busy fingers. And it is, indeed, true, therefore, what Father Riley, of Shenandoah, said two weeks ago:

Every man has placed upon him by the God who sustains him, the responsibility of earning his bread by the sweat of his brow, and he must be permitted to do this without interference.

Aye, indeed, and that he should! It is wrong to stop a man who wants to do his God-given duty to work. The 150,000 strikers should, therefore, certainly not interfere with the few score of men that want to work in the mines under present conditions. But if that is expected of untutored miners, many of whom had to go to work before they could go to school long enough to learn how to spell, to say nothing of how to write letters about the provi-

dence of God, then it certainly may be asked of railroad presidents who can. Then let the score or so of railroad presidents and mine owners who have preempted thousands of acres of coal lands, in which they allow no one to work—neither "strikers" nor "scabs"—let them take off their hands, let them throw open these lands and permit thousands of willing and anxious hands to go and perform their God-given task to work for themselves and their families.

Ah! but we are told that God in his infinite wisdom has given control of these lands, nay, more, control of the property interests of the country into the hands of these magnates. Where is the grant they hold from God? Does this railroad president mean to say that because he has possession, his right is divine? So did the kings say, and some say it yet; but we laugh at their folly. So might Capt. Kidd have said: "I have this and that, and I mean to keep it. God in his infinite wisdom has given me control of this schooner." What a blasphemy! Or is he pointing to his paper titles? Let Herbert Spencer bear witness to their character:

It can never be pretended that the existing titles to such property [in land] are legitimate. Should any one think so, let him look in the chronicles. Violence, fraud, the prerogative of force, the claims of superior cunning—these are the sources to which these titles may be traced. The original deeds were written rather with the sword than with the pen; not lawyers but soldiers were the conveyancers; blows were the current coin given in payment; and for seals blood was used in preference to wax. * * * We have simply to inquire what is the verdict given by pure equity in the matter. And this verdict enjoins a protest against every existing pretension to the individual possession of the soil; and dictates the assertion, that the right of mankind at large to the earth's surface is still valid; all deeds, customs and laws notwithstanding.

This is the verdict of the greatest philosopher of our age concerning the pretension that there are "men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of the country." Will the verdict be executed? Not to-day nor to-morrow, but I firmly trust and hope that some day it will be executed. If not in our day, then in the day of our children. Inspiration for this hope is contained in the words of the text from Isaiah:

But thus saith the Lord, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered: for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children. (Isa. 49:25.)

Money is sought only as a means to an end which nobody has ever attained by this means.—Puck.

HE FLUBBED HIS PUTT.

For The Public.

"I cannot explain why I flubbed my putt on the home green."—Golfer Ormiston.

A gloom rests on the city.

We would be cheerful—but

Each day the very heavens weep,

For Ormiston flubbed his putt!

Prate hot of trifling evils,

The fire-damp's horrid glut,

Volcanoes, fires or smallpox,

Since Ormiston flubbed his putt!

We'll grieve no more for strikers

In labor's dreary rut,

Child-workers, deaths, divorces—

Poor Ormiston flubbed his putt!

The rich appear to flourish,

Wide swaths they seem to cut.

But none can tell; some awful day

They all may flub their putt.

The humble home holds gladness,

Although full hard life's rub;

The poor man rests securely,

He has no putt to flub.

C. F. HUNT.

BURIED IN THE CITY WILDERNESS.

One day one summer, while a resident of one of the New York city settlements, I conducted a party of mothers and their children on an "outing" to Montclair, N. J. During the day I noticed that one woman of the party acted strangely. When we crossed to Hoboken she sat inside the ferryboat, dazed and bewildered; on the train she gathered her three children close about her lest they might fall off; and in the grove, during the day, she came to me in terror half a dozen times and asked me to find her lost (!) boy. The boy would turn up each time not 100 feet away, playing harmlessly behind a tree, but for the moment out of sight. At last, in answer to inquiries, she explained that she had never been "took to the country before," and that everything was strange to her. Her life story was this:

She had been an only child, and all her years of childhood had been spent indoors in keeping house and waiting on an invalid mother. When she was 18 her mother had died, and one month later she herself was married to a man who, in his turn, had made a slave of her. The following 12 years she had been kept at home, cooking for him and slaving for her own three children. She told me she had "never seen the sky where it was round," and "never heard a live bird sing," and had "never seen green grass grow where you dared tramp on it." She had scarcely ever been out of her own street—Forty-seventh—had never been as far north as Harlem, once only as far south as Fourteenth street, and only once as far west as Central park. Twice in her life she had been on street cars, only once on a ferryboat,

and never on a railroad train. When I expressed surprise, she was still more surprised at me than I at her, and said: "Why, that ain't nothing. Lots of 'em hain't neither."—Rev. David M. Steele, in N. Y. Independent.

On one occasion in the early days Bishop Whipple had journeyed into the Indian country to preach a sermon to the assembled Chippewas in Chief Good Thunder's village. The bishop had with him the costly garments of his office, which he wore on such occasions, and it became necessary to leave them unguarded in the chief's tepee. It seems that the bishop had his doubts at that time as to the inherent honesty of the average Indian. Before leaving he asked, turning to Good Thunder:

"Chief, do you think it will be safe to leave them here?"

"Never fear, bishop," was the reply; "there isn't a white man within three miles of here."—Chicago Chronicle.

When an honest laboring man or woman, who is not looking for charity, but for fair wages, reads in the papers that the cost of living to-day is higher than it has been at the beginning of any fiscal year since 1865 what does he or she care if a trust magnate has endowed another library?—Appleton (Wis.) Press.

There are a great many ways of playing the game of chasing responsibility around a ten-acre lot, and one of the most ingenious ways is to make a straw man and label him "society," and play he is "it." Anybody can dodge him.—The Straight Edge.

We are terribly cramped for space in our new flat.

That so?

Yes; we even have to use the family skeleton as the family hat rack.—Stray Stories.

Jinks—Most things that are bought go to the buyer.

Jenks—Yes; all except coal, that goes to the cellar.—Princeton Tiger.

BOOK NOTICES.

MONSIEUR VINCENT.

Jean de Paul, a humble peasant, living in a little village not far from Bayonne, France, had six children. The fifth, Vincent, was born April 24, 1876. He lived the life of a country boy, tending sheep and doing homely chores. At the age of 12 he was put to school in the neighborhood, and in time became tutor to a lawyer's children. This lawyer persuaded him to enter the priesthood, and assisted the father in giving the young man further education. In the year 1890, at the age of 24, he was ordained priest, and began one of the most wonderful careers the world has ever

known. He died in 1860. In 1737 he was canonized, and has since been known the world over as Saint Vincent de Paul.

In a brief biography of 160 pages, bearing the title "Monsieur Vincent" (Longmans), Mr. James Adderley has given us a very interesting account of Vincent's work. What made this work great was that in an age of theological discussion and intellectual pride it was intensely humble and intensely practical. As Mr. Adderley says, St. Vincent de Paul may be considered the founder of modern forms of charity. He had, of course, no conception of the injustice of social conditions, such as the world is just beginning to have. Like most charitable workers, even to-day in modern cities, he accepted the horrid poverty about him as inevitable, and wrought as nobly and wisely as he could to alleviate it. The Order of Sisters of Charity, established in 1633, was one of the institutions which he founded.

His heart was ever with the poor of France, and they, blindly suffering in contests between king and nobles, loved him. "If there are any real virtues anywhere," he said, "you will find them among the poor people." He made no pretense to learning and theology. His preaching was as simple as it was genuine. To the priests of the Mission he said: "A person who preaches to get applause, praise, esteem, to get himself spoken of, what is his person doing? This preacher! What is he doing? He is committing sacrilege! Yes, sacrilege! What! to make use of the Word of God and holy things in order to get honor and reputation; yes, it is sacrilege. Oh, mon Dieu!"

During the famous and foolish wars of the "Fronde"—wars in which it could make no difference to the welfare of the masses which side should win—the suffering among the working people of France was more than usually horrible, even for those days. "Some starving in holes and caverns, women and children sleeping out of doors almost naked, sick people lying in their beds without food, too weak to come to the door to let anyone in to help them"—such were the reports brought to Vincent; and he, an old man of 75, was the vigorous organizer and director of relief. His work was marvelous, and not the least splendid part was his bold address to Anne, the queen regent, protesting against the interference of the military with the freedom of trade and industry, and at another time telling her to her face that she was causing "a million innocent persons to die of hunger in order to punish 20 or 30 guilty ones."

In many ways, whatever we may think of charity and of church, the life of St. Vincent de Paul is full of inspiration, and all "publicans and sinners," of whatever creed, may call him brother.

J. H. DILLARD.

"Pages of Socialist History" (New York: C. B. Cooper, 114 Fourth avenue. Price, 30 cents), by W. Tcherkesoff, is a brief but searching examination into some of the pretensions of the fatalistic or "scientific" school of socialism, of which Carl Marx is the prophet. The point of view is that of a revolutionist. Unfortunately, Mr. Tcherkesoff addresses only such readers as are already fairly familiar with the history, dogmas and principal literature of socialism. To these his collection of essays is not interesting. But only because there is too much to be understood which the essays do not explain. Keen in perception and powerful in argument, they cannot fail to excite the interest of students of socialism, whether friendly or hostile. More than that, they present views of the subject which no student can afford to ignore and which none who are intelligent will wish to overlook.

In "The Basis of Political Liberty and Human Rights" Dr. W. E. Macklin and Mr. Li Yu Shu, of Nanking, China, have made and published a free translation into Chinese of Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics." The Chinese symbols are interesting in con-

nection with the thought that they interpret Western ideals of liberty to the far Eastern mind; but for obvious reasons this little rice paper volume does not yield readily to a review in English.

PERIODICALS.

—The Bulletin of the Department of Labor for July is devoted chiefly to an exposition of labor conditions in Cuba.

—An excellent brief statement of the situation in Ohio over the municipal code question appears in the Outlook for August 23, over the signature of George C. Sikes, a well known Chicago newspaper man and expert on the subject of municipal government.

—Mr. Edward Lee Hicks, in the Manchester (England) Guardian, writes very entertainingly about the finding of a complete papyrus leaf containing a brief letter written about the year 305 A. D. by one Christian presbyter to another. It was discovered at Kysis in the Great Oasis of the Libyan Desert, and is simply a recommendation for the care of a Christian woman who had been banished thither. This lady must have been a "new woman" of her day, and one cannot but wonder what she had been up to that caused her to be "sent into the Oasis by the government". Dr. Deissmann, of the University of Heidelberg, who has published a monograph on this letter, thinks that there are early Christian monuments and inscriptions in the Oasis which are well worthy of investigation.—J. H. D.

—As was to be expected the resolution of the National Educational association with reference to the study of the bible in the

The Public Leaflets.

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

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

The following pamphlets have been issued:

1. **A Business Tendency** (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. **That Favorable Balance of Trade** (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898.)— Out of print.
3. **Nero-Then**, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. **Department Stores** (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
5. **The Remedy for the Evil of the Trust**, by the Rev. Robert C. Bryant (from THE PUBLIC of June 24, 1899).
6. **Monopoly and Competition** (from THE PUBLIC of August 19, 1899).
7. **Documentary Outline of the Philippine Case** (from THE PUBLIC of May 19, 1900). Out of print.
8. **Assassination and Anarchism** (from THE PUBLIC of September 14, 1901).
9. **Australasian Taxation in Colorado** (from THE PUBLIC of August 31, 1901).
10. **Landmarks of Liberty** (from THE PUBLIC of September 28, 1901).
11. **The Chinese Exclusion Act** (from THE PUBLIC of December 14, 1901).
12. **Brutal Degeneracy Disgracefully Defended**. By A. B. Choate. (From THE PUBLIC of July 26, 1902).



A DESPERATE BUT CANDID APPEAL.
(Scene, Colorado).

Monopolist and Land Speculator—My good man! don't on any account vote for that unspeakable amendment! Don't, for heaven's sake! If carried, it will enable counties to—to—er—er—to relieve you of your load, and put the weight of taxation on my back!

public schools is meeting with little favor. The Churchman, New York, thus voices the religious sentiment in regard to the proposition: "The Educational association proposes that we study the bible 'as literature,' carefully divested of its sacred associations, of its religious meaning. Those who consider the bible as wholly like in kind to other great literary monuments may welcome this. Those who do not, ought to realize fully that the inevitable result of such a study of the bible as the Educational association recommends will be its association, as like to like, with Shakespeare and Milton, possibly even with Pope. If they do not want that, they should not favor 'the bible as literature' in the public schools."—J. H. D.

—A writer in the New York Observer gives one of the best estimates of Robert Browning we have anywhere seen. He brings out very forcibly the old, old story, which the world never believes, namely, of its neglect of its prophets. Many are still living who can remember the time when Browning's wife was far more famous than he. Her poems were actually bringing in money to them while his were a drug on the market. Fortunately, like all real prophets, he accepted neglect with bravery:

'Our human speech is naught,
Our human testimony false, our fame
And human estimation words and wind.'
As the writer of the article says, "Browning taught that he who would serve his fellow-men must expect as his reward misunderstanding, ingratitude and

scorn, and that his sole support must be in the consciousness of his integrity and God's approval."—J. H. D.

"Eminent Respectability"

A new novel by W. R. Pedrick, is a book that SINGLE TAXERS will relish.

By mail—Cloth, \$1.00. Paper, 50 cts.

ALFRED M. SLOCUM CO.
718 ARCH STREET, PHILADELPHIA.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

Campaign Subscriptions to The Public

from bona fide new subscribers will be received from the present issue to and including that of November 8, 1902, for

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

ADDRESS,

THE PUBLIC

Box 687.

CHICAGO, ILL.

The Public

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

TERMS.

Annual Subscription	\$2.00
Semi-Annual Subscription	1.00
Quarterly Subscription50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks)10
Single Copies05

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to and including the first issue of the month printed on the wrapper. The figures following the month, refer to the year in which the subscription expires.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:
THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1858 Cortlandt. Rooms 111-112
NEW YORK.

"TRUSTS"

By JOHN MOODY, Editor of Moody's Manual of Corporation Securities.

Price, \$1.50 Per Copy, Net.

To Be Issued About September 25, 1902.

Address, **THE CIVIC PUBLISHING CO.**
43 Cedar Street, NEW YORK.

NOTICE OF INCREASE OF CAPITAL STOCK OF THE AMERICAN BANK SERVICE COMPANY, OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

Notice is hereby given that the Capital Stock of the American Bank Service Company has been increased from \$5,000 to \$14,000 (\$4,000 of said new stock being preferred stock).

Chicago, Illinois, August 22, 1902.
AMERICAN BANK SERVICE CO.,
Per M. J. Foyer, Sec'y.

ECONOMIC TANGLES, by Judson Grenell; deals in popular yet practical way with industrial problems. Cloth, postpaid, \$1. **PURDY PUB. CO.,** Room 81, McVickers Bldg., Chicago.