The Public

Fifth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1902. Number 220.

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.

In ostentatiously ignoring the national platform adopted at Kansas City, the Democratic convention of Illinois has assured the defeat of the party in the state. If there were no other way of proving this in advance, the delight of the Republican press and politicians would be proof enough.

—

It is to be regretted that this concession to the enemy, this political blunder, should have been made in connection with what is on the whole one of the best and most democratic platforms that any Democratic state convention of Illinois has ever adopted. And for the sake of what the platform does say, it is to be hoped that the radical democrats of the state, of all parties, will overlook what it does not say, and give it their support.

—

We are aware of the objection to John P. Hopkins, now the leader of the party in the state, that he is a mere politician with plutocratic associations, to whom the principles of a platform are only what cast-off clothing is to an old clo' man. But with Ben T. Cable on the state committee, the home rule and municipal ownership clauses of the platform are not likely to be treated as dead letters in the campaign, whatever Mr. Hopkins may do. Notwithstanding Mr. Cable's financial interests, and in spite even of the stronger influences of personal associations, there are few Democrats more genuinely democratic than he.

—

There is nothing to be said for the head of the ticket except that he wouldn't be there if the dispensers of nominations had expected to win at the election. And it is safe to assume that the legislative candidates likely to be elected will bear close watching. But there are times when candidates are of secondary importance, and this is one of them. Taking the city of Chicago and the state together, the Democratic party represents in this campaign no less important reforms than local self-government in matters of taxation and public utilities, as well as the initiative and referendum, and the public ownership of public monopolies. Sadly handicapped though it is by the inexcusable blunder of ignoring the Kansas City platform, yet a vote for its candidates is a vote for those reforms. If the candidates prove false, a time of reckoning will come. But this is the hour for the people to give instructions, not to question whether they will be obeyed.

—

Not the least satisfactory outcome of the week's flurry in Democratic politics is the "turning down" of Mayor Harrison. His overthrow is complete. He never did count for much more than the power of the patronage he commands; he can hardly come even up to that measure any more. His disastrous contest with Hopkins for state leadership, in which he carried only a bare majority of the Cook county delegates after he was supposed to have routed Hopkins at the primaries, and got hardly a third of the convention, takes away from him as a politician all the glamour he ever had among politicians—his only place of strength. Mr. Hopkins may be no better than Harrison. But one thing at a time. With such Democratic platforms as those of Cook county and the state to stand upon and work for, or betray, Mr. Hopkins may do much in the next nine months either to expose his unworthiness as a Democrat or to revive public confidence in his democracy and fidelity.

—

An opportunity came to the better element of the Democratic party of Chicago this summer, to give a new stamp and a better character to their party. The politicians had for some occult reason called upon them to form an advisory committee, and this they did. In some respects they availed themselves of their opportunity. Their platform recommendations were excellent, and their list of recommended candidates contained unexceptionable names. But in adopting the ordinary political methods of choosing candidates with reference to political "pull," they lost their opportunity, so far as the personnel of the ticket was concerned. It was right that they should select several names for the same office; they ought not to have assumed the role of dictators. But in their suggestions they should have considered only two things—party affiliations and fitness. Instead of doing that, they consulted this interest and that, this race or nationality and the other, this organization and those organizations, including even the Democratic machine, with a view to learning not about the fitness of candidates but about their acceptability. The natural result was that in their list of recommendations there appeared a machine man for almost every place. The machine was able therefore to nominate its own favorites upon the advice of this advisory committee.

—

Did you ever see a ledgerdemain performer "force" a card from the pack upon an unsophisticated spectator? Then you understand how the Democratic machine of Chicago made its own nominations upon the

"advice" of the voluntary committee. The committee wholly neglected its true function in regard to recommending candidates. It should have named them without regard to personal preferences, but solely upon the basis of personal merit with reference to capacity and political merit with reference to Democratic principles, and left the conventions to accept its advice or substitute machine favorites at their own peril. By the "sandwich" process, which the committee seems to have adopted somewhat extensively—one preordained machine candidate bunched in with two or more advisory committee candidates—it has done not a little to bring the advisory committee plan into contempt. It might have raised it to a high place of dignity and influence.

The platform of the Democratic party of Cook county, adopted on the 14th, and which is to be credited in its more important particulars to the advisory committee, is an excellent one. Besides the declarations of only formal and local concern, the following of general interest appear:

The notorious accumulation of vast corruption funds in the hands of trusts and corporations and the use thereof in debauching our legislatures and city councils render it imperatively necessary that the work of these legislative bodies be further safeguarded by bringing legislation closer to the source of all governmental authority—the people. We therefore declare in favor of: (1) Municipal ownership of all public utilities. (2) The initiative and referendum; and, (3) The direct nomination of all candidates for public office by direct ballot at the primaries; and we demand that the legislature of Illinois shall, at the earliest possible day, enact laws to inaugurate these reforms.

We further declare in favor of the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

We declare that local self-government is a basic principle in our civilization and vital to the safety and perpetuity of the republic. We therefore demand in all such matters as assessments for and collection of taxes, the appointment and control of municipal police, and the granting of municipal franchises, the strict application of the principle of home rule.

On the subject of Democratic platforms, that of the Liberal Democracy, which held its convention at New York on the 7th (p. 152), has the true democratic ring. Following is its statement of general principles:

We are fundamentally opposed to the present unjust distribution of wealth that creates a system of society in which the few get without working, while the many work without getting; a system which must result in either anarchy or despotism and the total destruction of our republic. This condition is due to the monopoly of natural opportunities and the creation of special privileges by law. We maintain that this government, which was dedicated by the fathers of the republic to freedom and equality of opportunity, shall fulfill its true mission. We demand the opening to all of the opportunities of nature and the abolition of all special privileges. In both of the great political parties of the nation are to be found two irreconcilable factions, one in favor of governmental usurpation, tending to the establishment of a new feudalism, and the other standing for industrial and political liberty. In the Democratic party of the nation lies the only hope of the perpetuation of Democratic institutions. Yet under the leadership of such traitors to Democracy as David B. Hill an attempt is being made under the guise of reorganization to dominate the party and to degrade it to the position of a mere tool of monopoly.

The platform then proceeds to ratify and reaffirm the Kansas City platform of the national Democratic party. Specifically it applies the principles of the Declaration of Independence to the Philippines; demands the "public ownership and operation of those public utilities which are in their nature natural monopolies, such as the railroad, telegraph, telephone, gas and electric lighting;" insists that "the right to issue and coin money is solely a function of the government;" and as to the "trusts and monopolies which are not public utilities or natural monopolies," demands that "those special privileges which they now enjoy, and which alone enable them to exist, should be immediately withdrawn." On the latter subject it holds that "corporations, being the creatures of government, should be subjected to such governmental regulation and control as will adequately protect the public." This democratic-Democratic platform then goes on to declare that "the land belongs to the people;" and, as a means of recognizing this right, to "demand that land values only be taxed." It favors "the initiative and referendum, the former to the end that the people may compel the enactment of good laws, the latter to the end that the people may veto legislative measures;" and it urges "the direct nomination of candidates for elective public office by the people at the primaries, and the election of United States senators and Federal judges by the people," while in municipal affairs it favors "local self-government and nonpartisanship," and "the administration of municipal government upon the principle of 'equal rights to all and special privileges to none.'" The regular Democratic party is as yet hardly democratic enough to go to the people upon a platform like this of the Liberal Democracy of New York; but it is encouraging to find so important an element of the party determined upon pressing these fundamental issues within the body of the party itself. Such a platform, with nominations of a character to amount to guarantees of good faith, would unify the real democrats of both parties and compel the plutocrats of both to huddle by themselves.

The reference in the foregoing platform to the taxation of land values recalls the recent adoption of this reform by the Johannesburg (Transvaal colony) city council, briefly mentioned on page 27 as an item of news, of which full reports are now at hand. The reports come in the Johannesburg Star, which opposed the reform. In adopting it the city council appears to have acted with the deliberate understanding that it was establishing the Henry George system of taxation. The measure came before the council on the 26th of March, being part of the "rating bill," or as we should call it in this country if we had home rule in taxation, of the "local tax ordi-

nance." The member who moved the measure, explained that the principle underlying it was that the only taxable property should be land in respect of its value, and that buildings should not be taxed. He argued that the value of land within the municipal area is not due to the individual enterprise of the owners, but to the collective industry and enterprise of the community and the expenditure of public money, and that by making land values the basis of assessment, the community would share, if only to an infinitesimal extent, in the value due to its industry and enterprise, and the expenditure of its own revenues. The seconder emphasized the point that, while the taxation of land value tends to reduce both the rental and selling price of land, the taxation of buildings tends to make rents higher and accommodation worse. One of the members who spoke against the measure characterized it as an expression of "the single-tax heresy so favored by Henry George and the Sand Lot orators of San Francisco, but discredited by thoughtful economists;" to which a councilman friendly to the reform replied, expressing surprise at any deprecatory allusions to "one of the greatest men America had produced in modern times." When the measure came before the council for final action, April 2, a motion to include buildings in the schedule of taxable property was defeated.

A shameful event at Harrisburg, Ill., confirms what we have more than once had occasion to say, that the undemocratic treatment of the Negro race in the South indicates no sentiment peculiar to that part of the country. This race animosity is universal in the United States. It finds expression in the North infrequently, as compared with the South, because Negroes are too few in number in the North, relatively to the whites, to make the race question a burning one there. But northerners going South to live, quickly become pronounced "nigger-haters;" Negro families in northern cities, respectable people and good neighbors though they be, are forced out of respectable neighborhoods. Even wealth does not protect them. If three or four wealthy Negro families were to move into a wealthy neighborhood, everybody would leave unless the Negroes could be induced to. Everywhere—in church, school, theater, hotel, street car, railway trains, notably in sleeping cars, and in the North as well as in the South—this race antipathy is in some irritating or oppressive way exhibited.

—

We call it race antipathy for convenience. What it really is is antipathy to the badge of slavery. On the one hand, had the Negro race never been enslaved, the antipathy would not exist. It does not exist in England, where his enslavement is only a matter of book knowledge and not of actual experience or tradition. Or, on the other hand, if the Negro did not wear in the color of his skin the tell-tale badge of ancestral servitude, the antipathy would have been by this time forgotten. To attribute to race antipathy or personal repugnance the white man's unwillingness, for instance, to eat in the company of Negroes, when he is willing to eat under their personal service—a much closer relationship physically—is nonsense. It is a shame that our race should resent its own wickedness in having lived off the unpaid labor of the Negro, by holding him in contempt. But it affords a striking exemplification of the saying that it is hard to forgive any one we have injured. And when the shameful bigotry goes to the extent of actually depriving the Negro of his civil rights, of mobbing and lynching his person and destroying his property, there are no words to fitly characterize it. It is both criminal and mean.

—

For many years partisan Republicans, themselves no friends of the Negro except for political purposes, have charged the South with outraging his rights. Only a few weeks ago Mr. Roosevelt made a speech in which he went far out of his way to allude to Negro lynching as if it were peculiar to the South and the Democratic party. Yet the shameful event at Harrisburg to which we refer above, occurred in the Republican state of Illinois, and in the county of Saline, which is Republican by 300 majority. In this Republican locality Negro inhabitants, people of respectability and good order, have had their school mobbed, their clergyman attacked in his home, and themselves threatened with lynching. They have been obliged to move away, though their only crime is that they are Negroes. The Republican governor and the Republican attorney general have indeed ordered the Republican local authorities to proceed against the criminal mob. But Southern governors have done that much in similar cases. The essential point is that in the North as in the South, in Republican as in Democratic localities, the old and infamous notion still holds, that the Negro has no rights which the white man is bound to respect. Whether these outrages occur in Georgia or in Illinois, in Texas or in Kansas, in Republican or in Democratic localities, they are undemocratic, un-American and a disgrace to the community that tolerates them. It remains to be seen whether the state of Illinois will allow the outrage by whites upon blacks in Saline county to go unpunished.

Civil service reform has apparently come to be a convenient device with the Republican machine for keeping its own henchmen in clerkships under hostile administrations and putting adversaries out under friendly ones. President McKinley dealt this reform a staggering blow almost as soon as he came into office for his first term, in order to facilitate Mr. Hanna's operations; and President Roosevelt, himself a professed civil service reformer, has gone on with the knock-down policy. We realize, of course, that it has all been for "patriotic" reasons and the "good of the service." The spoils system always was, if the

naked word of spoilsmen may go unchallenged. But what is the good of this pious pretense? Here for instance is the Rebecca J. Taylor case, to which we referred (pp. 147, 151) last week. Notice the tender way in which those good friends of civil service reform, the present administration and its supporters, have in that case treated civil service rules.

—

Miss Taylor had written and published a newspaper letter condemning the imperialist policy and criticizing Mr. Roosevelt's "stay put" speech. She was a classified clerk in the war department, but had written her letter "out of hours." In order to discharge her without officially assigning this insufficient cause, or any other, the President made a new civil service rule which throws down the bars to spoilsmen as completely as they could wish. In effect he orders that no reasons need be assigned provided the discharge is not for political or religious reasons. But when no reasons need be assigned, the discharge may be for political or religious reasons as well as any other. Miss Taylor's was for political reasons—because she was an anti-imperialist and said so. In consequence a resolution was offered in the lower house of Congress calling for an explanation; but this has been headed off by the committee on civil service which tabled the resolution by a strict party vote. A letter from the secretary of war was read, however, in which he said:

> No head of a department can maintain effective administration if he is obliged to depend upon the services of clerks who are so violently opposed to the success of the work in which they are engaged that they are unable to refrain from public denunciation of the purpose of the work and public insult to the President.

That letter has a plausible sound, but will it bear examination from any other point of view than that of a thorough-going spoilsman? We think not.

—

To consider the last point first, every one would probably concede that no clerk should remain in government employment who publicly insults the President. Neither should he remain if he publicly insults any other superior, or an equal, or an inferior in the service. But, unless the spoils system is to be perpetuated, the specific reason for his discharge should be given, with its appropriate characterization, so that it may be known whether the discharge was made by a faithful head of a department for the good of the service, or by a faithful spoilsman for the good of the party. In this particular case, Miss Taylor did not insult the President. She criticized a speech of his in which he had publicly insulted his political adversaries, but she did so while off duty, as a citizen and not as a clerk, and with propriety and restraint. For such conduct she would not be amenable to discipline under any bona fide merit system in the civil service; and of this the President seems to have been well aware, for he wrecked the rules in order to discharge her for her politics without officially assigning reasons.

—

Mr. Root's other point is that "no head of a department can maintain effective adminsitration if he is obliged to depend upon the services of clerks who are so violently opposed to the success of the work in which they are engaged that they are unable to refrain from public denunciation of the purpose of the work." Divested of its insinuating verbiage what does this mean? Nothing more than that it is contrary to the good of the service for government clerks to be so violently opposed to the policy of the party in power that they are unable to refrain from publicly opposing it! According to Mr. Root, then, government clerks must not criticize the party in power, though "out of hours," and though their clerical work be well done. Yet it is well known that they may safely applaud the party in power at all times, and denounce parties out of power even to the extent of calling them "cranks" and "traitors." They retain their rights of citizenship if they adopt the political policy of the party in power; they lose them if they reject it. So we see that stability of tenure under Mr. Roosevelt's civil service reform system differs very little, if any, from what it was under the spoils system. Fidelity to the policy of the party in power is still a condition of clerical tenures. Or, as Mr. Root would probably express it, "public denunciation" of "the purpose of the work" upon which government clerks are engaged is "incompatible with the good of the service." If pious pretense should go out of fashion in the Republican party, what would become of some Republican leaders? Habits once formed are hard to get rid of.

———

Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has won the first battle in the courts over the "ripper" legislation adopted by the Republican legislature of Ohio last winter. Johnson, it will be remembered (p. 141) had appointed a city board of tax review which attempted to tax the franchise corporations on the same basis of valuation with other property. A Republican state board, beneficiaries of railroad favors, came to the rescue, and annulled the action of the city board, thereby making the basis of franchise taxation only about a quarter as high as that of ordinary property. But it was known that the Cleveland board would raise the taxes of the privileged corporations again this year; so the plutocratic element of Cleveland, led by Senator Hanna, got the legislature to "rip" the board by passing a law authorizing the county auditor, a railway pass beneficiary, to call upon the state board, in his discretion, to appoint a tax board for Cleveland. Upon that being done the mayor's board was to be out of office. The auditor of the Cleveland county, acting under this "ripper" law, applied for a new board; and accordingly a board, manifestly calculated to serve the plutocratic interests was appointed. But the mayor's board promptly carried the matter into the courts. It applied to the auditor for clerks and messengers,

and upon his refusal to recognize it instituted mandamus proceedings. In the lower court, Judge Babcock has now decided this case in the mayor's favor.

—

An appeal from Judge Babcock's decision has been taken, but unless a very forcible opinion can be overcome or ignored there is little likelihood of a reversal. Judge Babcock in his opinion says:

This is, in so far as I can discover, the only enactment of a legislative body in this country where it has been left to the will, judgment, or caprice of one man to act as umpire for the legislature, with power to say whether the law shall go into active operation, touch the rights of the people, and help to shape the affairs in the state by the molding powers of the law, or, if the umpire decree otherwise, forever sleep as a mummy in the museum of legislative curiosities. Suppose the general assembly should pass a law declaring horse stealing a crime punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, and, in its enacting clause, declare it to be in force from and after its passage, and should provide in the law that it should go into execution in the different counties of the state only upon a written application of the county prosecutor to the governor. I venture the suggestion that no lawyer could be found who would contend for a moment that such a law would be valid. Who shall point out the constitutional difficulty with such a law which is not also a difficutly which can be pointed out with this law of tax review? Criminal laws are laws of a general nature, and cannot be enforceable in one part of the state and not enforceable in some other part of the state. This is also true of the taxing laws, including laws for boards of assessment, equalization and review. They both stand on the same principle, and stand or fall together when challenged by the constitutional provision embodied in Section 26 of Article 2 of the constitution, which says: "All laws of a general nature shall have a uniform operation throughout the state."

—

The following interesting bit of political history is going the rounds:

In one of his essays the late Edwin L. Godkin threw a very neat little harpoon into Henry Cabot Lodge in the following style: "In 1884 I learned of the prospect of Blaine's nomination from Henry Cabot Lodge, who called at the Evening Post office. He told me, with the proper expression of countenance, that there was a serious cloud hanging over the Republican party; that there was danger of Blaine's nomination and that he was on his way to Washington then to see some of the leading men with a view of preventing it if possible. I heartily approved of all that the good young man told me he had in mind and cheered him on his shining way. But I was chastened by seeing him on the stump for the said Blaine by the month of July."

It is a pity that in this connection Mr. Godkin could not have lifted the curtain upon a certain dinner party of three ambitious but baffled young reformers, gathered in conference immediately after Blaine's disappointing nomination and before that chastening appearance of Mr. Lodge upon the stump. He might have shown how two of them, Mr. Lodge and Mr. Roosevelt, decided, for personal reasons somewhat cynically disclosed, to abandon their dinner comrade to his awkward scruples.

PROPERTY RIGHTS OF PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATIONS.

Of late years the sentiment has been assiduously fostered that public service enterprises—such as railroads, street cars, lighting systems, telegraph and telephone lines, and the like—which depend upon legislative sanction for authority to operate, are private businesses, and as such should be as free from public dictation as any other private affair. So strong is the hold which this notion has come to have upon the minds of business men, even the great mass of business men who suffer in their vocations from the practical application of it, that they are usually willing to agree with the Vanderbilt dictum regarding railroad rights. They seem to feel that the legal obligations to the public of public service corporations are so slender, if any exist at all, that railroad magnates are fully within their legal rights, whatever may be thought of their generosity and wisdom, when they determine to run "their own business in their own way," and if the public doesn't like it—why, "the public be damned!"

It would probably surprise men of this way of thinking to learn that public service corporations, so far from being private persons managing private businesses, are state officers or agents performing public functions. Yet that is the fact.

Nor is this an irresponsible inference from charters or franchises or from the nature of the work in which such corporations are engaged. It is a legal characteristic, attested by legal literature, which has attached to these corporations from their origin, which is part of their legislative and judicial history, and of which they cannot be divested so long as the essential principles and the constitutional safeguards of the legal doctrine of eminent domain are acknowledged and observed. It is, so to speak, a corporate birthmark.

To be convinced that this is so, one need but read attentively a judicial decision of absorbing interest and the utmost importance, rendered threescore years ago by the highest tribunal of the state of New York, in which the true constitutional character of railroad corporations, then in their infancy, was expounded with extraordinary ability. It was there decided, and that decision has furnished the groundwork for all subsequent adjudications upon the subject—being what lawyers call "a leading case"—that the state, in taking private property for the purpose of making railroads or other public improvements of like nature (as it has the constitutional right to do upon giving just compensation), may either make the improvements itself through its regular officers, or make them "through the medium" of private enterprise. In different phrase, but with identical meaning, when private property is taken under authority of the state, for "making railroads or other public improvements of the like nature," it is the state that takes the property; it is for its own use that it takes it; it is for its own benefit that the railroad or other improvement is made; and, though the state may authorize private investors to make and maintain such improvements, those investors are for that purpose agents of the state. Their business in this connection is not a private business. It is a state function.

—

The New York case in question is known in legal literature as "Blood-

good vs. the Mohawk and Hudson River Railroad company," and is reported in the first 70 pages of the 18th volume of Wendell's reports of cases in the Supreme Court and in the old Court of Errors of the state of New York.

In the early days of American railroading, the New York legislature had granted a franchise to the Mohawk and Hudson River Railroad company authorizing it to construct a railroad from Albany to Schenectady and empowering it "to enter upon and take possession of and use all such lands and real estate" as might be "indispensable for the construction and maintenance" of its railroad, provided that all lands or real estate thus entered and taken possession of and used by the corporation, and which were not donations, should be purchased by the corporation of the owners, at a price to be either mutually agreed upon or ascertained by a commission. The proviso regarding compensation had been inserted in obedience to the state constitution, which prohibited the taking of private property for public use without just compensation.

Pursuant to this authority the railroad company confiscated land belonging to a man of the name of Bloodgood, and he sued it for damages as a trespasser. The company pleaded the authority of the franchise, but did not affirmatively assert that it had compensated Bloodgood before taking possession of his property. Bloodgood therefore filed a "demurrer," the effect of which was to concede the truth of all that the railroad asserted, but to insist that this did not amount to a legal defense. Two points of law were consequently laid before the court. One was purely technical, namely, whether the company (acknowledged on every hand to be financially responsible for all obligations) was legally obliged to compensate before taking possession. The other point was substantial and vital, namely, whether the legislature had the constitutional power to exercise its right of eminent domain and confiscate private property for the use of a private railroad corporation.

On both points the Supreme Court had decided in favor of the railroad company, and the case had been carried to the Court of Errors, then the highest court of the "Empire" state, which was composed of the state Senate, the chancellor, and the justices of the Supreme Court.

That was in 1837, when there sat as judges in this court such great lawyers and publicists as John Tracy, the president of the Senate; as Reuben H. Walworth, the chancellor; as Samuel Nelson (afterwards of the Supreme Court of the United States), the chief justice of the Supreme Court; and as Leonard Maison and Samuel L. Edwards, among the senators.

After the railroad case under consideration had been argued before this tribunal, some of its members delivered extended and carefully thought-out opinions, which are worthy to be ranked as classics in the legal literature of railway development in the United States.

Senator Tracy was one of the members of the tribunal who contributed a carefully argued opinion. On the vital point of public interest in the case, the question of the proper exercise of the power of eminent domain, he laid down this fundamental principle:

It has never been allowed to be a rightful attribute of sovereignty in any government professing to be founded upon fixed laws, however despotic the form of the government might be, to take the property of one individual or subject and bestow it upon another. The possession and exertion of such a power would be incompatible with the nature and object of all government, for, it being admitted that a chief end for which government is instituted is that every man may enjoy his own, it follows, necessarily that the rightful exertion of a power by the government of taking arbitrarily from any man what is his own, for the purpose of giving it to another, would subvert the foundation principles upon which the government was organized, and resolve the political community into its original chaotic elements. . . . Even Hobbes, the most ingenious of all advocates for the absolute powers of government, does not go further with his doctrine on this point than to say that the property which a subject has in his goods consists not in a right to exclude the sovereign from the use of them, but consists in a right to exclude all other subjects from the use of them. But no approved writer on public law will be found to go as far as Hobbes in vindicating the unqualified right of the sovereign to assume at will the property of the subject. Every other writer is disposed to recognize a distinction between right and power, as applied to sovereign and subject, and to acknowledge that a rightful government must be founded on some other principle than that of mere force.

Proceeding to the question of the right of governments to appropriate private property not to private but to public uses, Senator Tracey said:

Whether this principle be denominated the right of transcendental propriety, or of eminent domain, or as is more properly by Grotius the force of supereminent dominion, it means nothing more or less than an inherent political right, founded on a common necessity and interest, of appropriating the property of individual members of the community to the great necessities of the whole community. . . . In whatever this principle is founded, the difficulty is not the less in determining the limits that rightfully bound it. On this point the writers upon public law are not agreed. . . . No doubt it was in full view of the discordant opinions expressed by writers on public law, in regard to the application of the principle of supereminent dominion, and with a matured design of affording special and additional protection to the citizen against the exertion of it by the government, that the framers of our national constitution adopted the clause in question: and it is reasonable to presume that from the same motives and for the same object it was transcribed literally from that instrument into the present constitution of the state. In both instruments, it is designed to be as well a limitation as a definition of the right of the respective governments as sovereign political powers to interfere with the otherwise absolute right of the citizen to the undisturbed possession and enjoyment of his own property. It is therefore, I think, to be construed in both cases as equivalent to a constitutional declaration that private property, without the consent of the owner, shall be taken only for the public use, and then only upon a just compensation

Senator Tracy next applied the foregoing principles to the railroad case in hand:

Conceding freely to the legislature the right of appropriating private property to the public use, but denying confidently to it the power of making that a public use which in its nature is not, the question recurs whether the use by the defendants of the lands taken from the plaintiff for the purpose of constructing thereon a railroad to be owned and possessed by them as a corporation, is that public use for which alone private property can be taken. . . . It is not to be denied that railroads are in many cases public improvements of great value and usefulness . . . and that such is the character of the particular railroad owned by the defendants in this case, should be freely admitted. But is this enough to justify the con-

clusion that because the use to which it is dedicated by its owners, accommodates individuals, and thereby advances the public interest, therefore, it is such a public use that private property may be taken to promote it? . . . It is hardly necessary to illustrate by supposed cases the extent to which such a doctrine could be legitimately carried. A person aiming to establish a line of stages for the public accommodation, certainly might ask the interposition of the legislature to enable him to appropriate his neighbors' horses for the public use; and even in the present case, the legislature might have authorized the corporation to take personal property, such as horses, cars, etc., which was necessary for the maintenance of the railroad, on the same principle as that on which rests the authority to take the lands of the plaintiff. . . . In every sense bearing on this question, a license to keep tavern is a franchise, and the obligation of a tavernkeeper to the public and to individuals is as defined and as extensive in its nature as that of a railroad company, and there is the additional analogy of the license being granted for public accomodation and benefit. But when we come to cases like these, the distinction between the taking of private property for public use, and the taking of it for an individual use beneficial to the public, becomes marked and obvious. . . . The distinction between the taking of private property for a canal or other works owned by the state, or for a common, public highway, and the taking of it for a railroad to be owned by a corporation or by individuals, is too obvious to need particular illustration. But the distinction between taking private property for a turnpike road and the taking of it for a railroad, is certainly much less so. It is, indeed, not easy to draw the line; for at some points the two cases approximate and almost blend so as scarcely to admit of separation. Still, I think, there is a distinction, founded on sensible circumstances; and they who insist there is not should bear in mind that by confounding them they do not necessarily prove that the power granted to railroad companies of appropriating private property is constitutional—they may only prove that the power granted to the turnpike company is not. This distinction will be seen, I think, both in the different modes of using the two roads and in the nature of the property which the companies have in them. . . . A turnpike company has a limited or qualified, and not an absolute estate in its road. The sixteenth section of the general turnpike law (1 R. S., 584), and which is but a formal enactment of a provision inserted in almost every previous turnpike charter, provides that every turnpike corporation, when it shall have been compensated all moneys expended, etc., with ten per cent. interest, may be dissolved by the legislature, and then "all the rights and property of such corporation shall vest in the people of this state." The effect of this provision, it will be seen, is to secure the ultimate property of the road to the people, and to allow the corporation to keep the road and levy tolls for the use of it only until they are reasonably compensated for the moneys they have expended in its construction and maintenance. The corporations are quasi-mortgagees of the road, in possession for the purpose of reimbursing the investors, by tolls, for the moneys advanced by them in that behalf for the public; and the case, in this respect, is not essentially different from what it would be, if the state made these roads and imposed tolls for the mere purpose of obtaining repayment of the moneys expended, with interest to compensate for the risk. In the one case as in the other, the public at large has a benefit in the reception of the tolls, inasmuch as their application must be to discharge the incumbrance which is on the road, and to make it in every sense a free public highway. . . . But in the charter of railroad companies, especially the one under consideration, there is no provision securing the ultimate property to the public. There is, to be sure, a right secured to the state of purchasing within a prescribed period; but which, until exerted, creates no reversionary interest in the state, and consequently the public has no benefit, direct or remote, from the earnings of the road, which, however much they may exceed the original outlay and interest and expenses, are still for the exclusive advantage of the proprietors.

From the foregoing excerpts, it may be seen that Senator Tracy was of the opinion that the legislature had no constitutional authority to exercise the power of eminent domain for any other purpose whatever than that of acquiring the confiscated property for public uses and as public property.

Up to that point there was no conflict between this able jurist and profound statesman and those of his colleagues who recorded their views in formal opinions. The others were not so precise and perspicuous as Senator Tracy, but those who neglected to express agreement with him certainly did not question the correctness of his conclusions.

It was in connection with his next point that the conflict of opinion arose, and that his conclusions were overruled by a majority of his colleagues in the court. He held that the state cannot delegate its power of eminent domain to private individuals or to a private corporation, for them to exercise at their own discretion and for their own benefit. Alluding to the privilege conferred upon the railroad company then before the court, he argued:

This, it will be seen, is a delegation of a power of the sovereignty of the state, not to public officers or to a political corporation, or even to designated individuals, but to a private corporation, to be by that corporation exerted according to its own judgment of its own necessities. . . Admit that the use of private property for the purposes of the railroad is a public use, and that the legislature could make the appropriation, has the legislature in fact made the appropriation? Certainly it has not passed on the fact that any particular property should be taken for this purpose; nor has any other agent or organ of the sovereign power passed on the fact. How, then, does it appear that the state, by virtue of its sovereign right, has resumed this particular property. It cannot be contended that the right of eminent domain in the sovereignty is an alienable right and transferable? It would be a solecism to say so. Yet it would seem to be on this notion only that a private corporation through its own agents, could exert this great political prerogative.

Although the other members of the court did not attempt to refute this reasoning, a majority of them avoided its result by treating the railroad company as a highway officer or agent of the state.

Chancellor Walworth, one of these members of the court, filed an opinion. Repeating and adopting the substance of an opinion he had delivered in the court of chancery in another case, he said he had decided that—

the eminent domain, or right to resume the possession of private property for the public use, upon paying a just compensation therefor, remained in the government or the people in their sovereign capacity; and that such right of resumption might be exercised not only for public safety, but also where the interest or even the convenience of the state or of its inhabitants were concerned, or for the purpose of making turnpike and other roads, railways, canals, ferries, and bridges for the accommodation of the public. That it belonged to the legislative power of the state to determine whether the benefit, which the public were to derive from such improvements were of sufficient importance to justify the exercise of this right of

eminent domain in thus interfering with the private rights of individuals; and that the right itself might be exercised by the government, through its immediate officers or agents, or indirectly through the medium of corporate bodies or private individuals.

Senator Edwards, another member of the court to file an opinion, said:

Does the fact that the power to construct the road is given to a company alter the nature of the grant? Surely not. It is entirely immaterial who constructs the road or who defrays the expense of the construction. The object for which it is constructed must determine the nature of the grant, whether for public or private use. What object had the legislature in view in authorizing this company to construct the road in question over the plaintiff's land? It was not the private emolument the company was to receive for the use of the road. For such a purpose the right would never have been conferred The legislature, who are constituted the judges of the expediency of taking private property for public use, came to the conclusion that the public required the use of a railroad between the cities of Albany and Schenectady. It deemed it inexpedient to construct it at the public expense, and adopted the policy of having a company construct it at its own expense and risk, having the money expended refunded by way of tolls or fare from the individuals who should travel upon it; reserving the right, however, to take it as the property of the state within a certain period. Because the legislature permitted the company to remunerate itself for the expense of constructing the road, from those who should travel upon it, its private character is not established; it does not destroy the public nature of the road, or convert it from a public to a private use.

Senator Maison, the only other member of the court who filed an opinion, quoted Vattel's doctrine that "one of the principal things that ought to employ the attention of the government with respect to the public in general and of trade in particular" must relate "to the highways, canals, etc." and that as "the construction and preservation of all these works" are "attended with great expense, the nation may very justly oblige all those to contribute to them who receive advantage from their use. Upon this he commented:

These propositions have the ready assent of every enlightened individual in every country and under every and any kind of government. In the days of Vattel there were no railroads, and in all probability the obligation of government to construct railroads in no measure entered into his consideration when inditing those general propositions; they nevertheless come within the spirit of national obligation in a most emphatic manner, as the government are thereby most effectually enabled to fulfill the just expectations and serve the most substantial interests of the community. That the government have not only the power, but that it is most emphatically their duty and interest, to construct railroads where the public interest and convenience demand them, cannot admit of a doubt; for such purpose they are authorized to take private property, upon rendering just compensation; and they are in like manner justified in exacting toll from those who travel on them, as a means to reimburse the state for the expense of their construction and separation.. I apprehend no one will be disposed to doubt or question the truth of these propositions. . . . If, however, the state shall not deem it wise or expedient at its own expense to construct a railroad, can there be any doubt of its power to impart this authority to others? . . . Whether the toll be received by the state or by the corporation cannot affect the character of the road for public usefulness, any more than the receipt of toll at bridges and ferries fixes the character of those works.

It is clear from these opinions that the members of the court who delivered them were in accord with Senator Tracy against the right of the legislature to exercise the power of eminent domain for private purposes. They all agreed, that is, that it can be exercised only for a public use. It is clear, also, that, while they dissented from his view that private corporations cannot be delegated to exercise the sovereign power of eminent domain, they were in accord with him on the question of the right of the state to alienate its power. As he held, so they agreed, that the state cannot do this. They diverge from him in form rather than in substance, by setting up the theory that when this power is delegated to a private corporation the corporation exercises it, not in its own right and for its own purposes, but as an agent of the state and for public purposes. And this conclusion appears even more clearly in the final judgment of the court.

Inasmuch as all the members of the court who delivered opinions were agreed, and in this were supported by 15 others, that the railroad company was bound to show affirmatively that it had made compensation before taking possession, the judgment of the lower court was reversed. On that point, therefore, the company lost the case. But by a vote of 17 members of the court to 3, it was decided to incorporate in the judgment a declaration that—

the legislature of this state has the constitutional power and right to authorize the taking of private property for the purpose of making railroads or other public improvements of the like nature, paying the owners of such property a full compensation therefor, whether such public improvements are made by the state itself, or through the medium of a corporation or a joint stock company.

Here the prevailing principle is stated with clearness and brevity. In theory of law it is the state that builds all railroads and like public improvements. It may build them itself directly, or it may build them indirectly, through the medium of a corporation. Either way, the improvement is a public work. It is a work of the state, and the property of the state, subject only, when built and operated through the medium of a private corporation, to the right of that corporation to collect authorized tolls. Upon no other theory was the New York court able in this pioneer case to sustain the constitutionality of a delegation of the state's sovereign power of eminent domain to railroad corporations.

It is to be regretted that Senator Tracy's firm adhesion to first principles was not imitated by a majority of his colleagues in the court. Had they followed his lead the economic history of this country might have been radically different from what it is, and in some respects infinitely more satisfactory.

Railroad companies would in that event have been obliged either to enter into voluntary agreements with landowners for rights of way, or to insert in their charters a clause recognizing the right of the public to own their roads as soon as they had realized a fair return upon their investments. Whichever course they had adopted, the railroads of the country would long ago have become public property without any clash of interests or disturbance of investments.

For if they had at first decided to buy rights of way by voluntary agreement, they would have found themselves so harassed by land owners along their proposed routes, that they

would soon have gladly accepted the benefits of the power of eminent domain even at the cost of agreeing to turn over the roads to the public when their tolls had fully compensated them.

But, though we have been deprived, by this unfortunate pioneer decision of the old Court of Errors of New York, of the benefits of a self-operating solution—prevention, rather—of our public service problems, we have only to recognize and assert the underlying principles of that decision to secure the public against further aggressions by railroad corporations and to recover the authority they have usurped.

According to that decision railroad corporations are agents, officers or trustees of the state, in possession of rights of way over land seized from private owners by authority of the state, for public uses, under the power of eminent domain, and placed in their control to enable them to recover their investments. These rights of way, then, belong to the state, subject only to the equitable claims of the companies to be allowed to compensate themselves fairly out of the tolls. Their rails, their cars and engines, their pipes or wires, their station houses and power houses, all their plant are their private property, and to be respected as such. But the rights of way they control are public property. As to these they are not owners, they are trustees. This is the true relation of public service corporations to the rights of way they have secured through the exercise of the power of eminent domain; and that this is, and always has been their true legal relation to that kind of property, should be kept green in the public mind.

As possessors of rights of way, they are not private business organizations managing their own private property. They are public agents, officers, servants, or trustees, managing public property; and like other public servants they are accountable to the public for the tolls they receive, for the services they render, and for the property itself. It is neither confiscation nor "socialism," therefore, for the public to dismiss them from office and resume its functions.

A Political Pointer.—If you don't want a thing done, appoint a commission to consider how to do it.—Puck.

NEWS

In some respects the Democratic state convention of Illinois, held on the 17th, was the most important political gathering thus far of the coming political campaign, though in others it was of minor moment. The highest office on the ticket is state treasurer, and there was no contest for the nomination; but over the platform and party leadership in the state there was a vigorous struggle and a decisive and significant result.

—

The struggle for leadership was between Mayor Carter H. Harrison and ex-Mayor John P. Hopkins, of Chicago. Hopkins was a member of the old state committee and its chairman, and Harrison sought to prevent his being a member of the new committee, first, by defeating him as a member from his senatorial district, and then by running against him as member from the state at large. In the first step, Mayor Harrison was successful. In the district caucus he elected Thomas J. McNally as district member over Hopkins by a vote of 27 to 23. But in the convention, the list of candidates for committeemen at large which was headed by Hopkins and upon which the name of Ben T. Cable also appeared, defeated that headed by Harrison, by 862 to 397. This is regarded as a triumph of Hopkins over Harrison for state leadership.

—

In the choice of committeeman there was nothing especially significant of the atitude of the convention toward the pledges of the national party in the platforms of 1896 and 1900. Hopkins "bolted" the national ticket in 1896 and supported it reluctantly in 1900; and while Harrison supported it both years, he is not regarded as having done so with enthusiasm. His defeat therefore was not a defeat of the silver men. But the platform committee, whose report was adopted by the convention, did ignore that issue. No mention of Bryan is made in the platform, and the nearest approach to any allusion to the campaigns of 1896 and 1900 is in the declaration of—

adherence to the fundamental principles of the Democratic party laid down in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and repeatedly affirmed by past national Democratic conventions, particularly noteworthy among which at this time is the doctrine of equal rights for all and special privileges for none.

—

While the Illinois platform has thus ignored the free silver issue, it is outspoken in other respects. Besides favoring legislation directly against trusts it denounces "the Republican tariff as the prolific mother of trusts," and demands—

thorough revision of the tariff and the abolition of all special privileges, and as the first, most obvious and most effective means of eliminating special privilege from our laws and of restoring to American citizenship the equality which is its birthright, that every product of a tariff-protected, competition-destroying trust be placed in the free list.

It also denounces the imitation by this country of "the British system of colonization, by means of which powerful selfish interests are enabled to employ the resources of the people to enslave inferior races and to enrich themselves," and describes the various measures adopted by the Republicans for the government of the Philippine islands as "monopolistic and undemocratic and dangerous to liberty at home as well as to liberty abroad." The affirmative Philippine policy it advocates is that—

the American Government should at once announce to the Philippines that it is not our policy to permanently retain their country, but as soon as hostilities cease and a stable government has been established the United States will recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands, as was done in the case of Cuba.

On questions of local taxation the platform declares:

We believe that under the constitution all property and property rights should be assessed and taxed justly and proportionately, and we are in entire sympathy with the movement which has for its object the compelling of all persons and corporations to pay their just proportion of the taxes.

But the most advanced prononucement is on the subject of the initiative and referendum and of home rule with reference to public utilities. On this point the platform reads as follows:

Local self-government being a fundamental Democratic principle, we favor the extension to municipalities and towns, under proper safeguards, of the right of submitting to a vote of the people all important questions, particularly those relating to grants and franchises and the public ownership and control of properties and enterprises used or enlisted in the public service; and we favor the enactment

of such laws as will enable municipalities to acquire, control and operate any or all of the public utilities therein in case they decide so to do.

Then comes a demand in the platform for jury trial in cases of "contempt of court committed out of its presence," which is its way of opposing "government by injunction." This is followed by demands for merit laws in the civil service, for the abolition of convict labor, and for liberal pensions. After congratulating the Republic of Cuba, expressing admiration for "all our brave soldiers and sailors," referring with "horror and deep regret" to "the monstrous crime which removed from the nation its much-loved and mourned president, William McKinley," the platform closes with the following tribute to the late Gov. Altgeld:

We deplore the untimely death of the late John P. Altgeld. An exemplary citizen, a sterling Democrat, a great governor, a firm friend of the oppressed, an uncompromising foe of shams and pretenses, an unyielding opponent of special privileges, he died as he lived, fighting for human freedom and liberty and the uplifting of earth's races.

—

The candidates named by the convention were George W. Duddleston, of Chicago, for state treasurer; John L. Pickering, of Springfield, for clerk of the supreme court; Anson L. Bliss, of Mount Vernon, for state superintendent of public instruction, and Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, of Chicago, Dr. J. E. White, of Champaign, and S. S. Maxwell, of Monmouth, for trustees of the state university.

Republican politics now oscillates about the question of reducing the tariff on Cuban sugar (vol. iv, pp. 673, 792, 822), the party in Congress being divided on that question and the President having now become involved in the controversy. It seems that when the Cuban delegates came to this country (vol. iv, p. 56) to consult President McKinley with reference to the Cuban constitution, Mr. McKinley promised that if Cuba would accept the Platt amendment, "he would use his influence"—we are quoting from Walter Wellman, in the Chicago Record-Herald—"to secure commercial concessions from Congress." To that promise, says Mr. Wellman, "there are plenty of living witnesses," and "the Cubans accepted it at par value." President Roosevelt has undertaken to redeem it. Accordingly, on the 13th, he sent a message to Congress, in which he called attention to the recommendations in his annual message for a reduction of duties on imports from Cuba, and embodied a cable dispatch sent through the American minister to Cuba by President Palma asking for legislative relief before Cuba is financially ruined. President Roosevelt then discusses in his special message the object of the tariff law, and objecting to the proposition to relieve Cuba by collecting full duties and paying a bounty in the nature of a rebate over to Cuban exporters, asks for "that open-handed help, of a kind which a self-respecting people can accept." Although not specific, his message is evidently intended to further the plan of making a 20 per cent. reduction of the tariff on imports from Cuba.

—

The conflict in the Republican party which has called out this message, is one between the beet sugar interests, which do not want their protection interferred with, and the refined sugar trust, which wishes to weaken the beet sugar interests by lowering the duty on raw sugar from Cuba. The trust is accidentally supported by tariff adversaries and by Cuban sympathizers, because what they believe in the trust happens to want. When the House bill came before the Republican caucus on the 13th of March the beet sugar interests were defeated by a vote of 85 to 31 (vol. iv, p. 793), the caucus agreeing to introduce a bill, such as the President now indicates his desire for, reducing tariff rates on Cuban sugar 20 per cent. That bill was introduced March 19. The committee on ways and means of the House agreed (vol. iv, p. 822) to report it favorably, the vote being 9 Republicans and 3 Democrats in the affirmative, and 2 Republicans and 3 Democrats in the negative. On the 18th of April this bill came to a vote in the House, but by a union of Republican protectionists who oppose reduction on Cuban sugar, with Democrats who oppose protective tariffs, an amendment prejudicial to the sugar trust, reducing the tariff on refined sugars no matter whence imported, was first adopted, against the Republican majority (p. 44), by a vote of 199 to 105. The bill as so amended was then passed by 247 to 52. But the Senate committee refuses to recommend this House bill, the Republican majority having agreed upon the Spooner compromise bill which proposes a 20 per cent. reduction for five years. That was the situation when the President sent in his special message noted above.

—

It was hoped that the message would secure favorable action on the Spooner compromise, but that hope appears now to have been abandoned. Senator James K. Jones states the Democratic position when he says:

In my judgment there will be a solid Democratic vote against the Spooner bill as agreed to by the Republican members of the committee. If the Senate were given the chance to vote on the measure as it passed the House, including the striking off of the differential duty on refined sugar, then, I am sure, every Democrat would have been glad to vote for the bill. But that proposition has been eliminated by the action of the Republican managers.

As to the possibility of getting a majority from the Republican vote alone, the administration senators are reported as admitting that agreement is impossible. Mr. Wellman, the correspondent already quoted, who is friendly to the administration, writes in the same issue of the Chicago Record-Herald, June 18:

President Roosevelt has met with his first serious defeat. Cuban reciprocity is beaten. . . . Defeat for the President. That is what it is. An unmistakable defeat. He has failed to carry his party with him on the most important issue of his administration up to date. He has been slaughtered in the house of his friends. But it is a defeat for the party, too. It is a confession that the Republican party is so wedded to high protectionism that it can do nothing in the way of a revision or a reformation, however slight. Confronted by the conflicting demands of two greedy trusts—a sugar refining trust on one side and a sugar growing trust on the other—it could not choose between them. So it does nothing and "lets well enough alone." With a large majority in the House, and nearly two-thirds of the whole membership of the Senate, it is forced to admit its impotency.

This prediction was partly verified on the 18th, when at a Republican Senatorial caucus, 18 senators, under the lead of Senator Elkins, declared that they would not support the President's policy. Decisive action, however, was not taken, and the caucus adjourned until the 20th.

Nothing very definite in connection with the anthracite coal strike has transpired since our last report (p. 138), though the condition is evidently becoming more tense. As a

body the strikers are maintaining order and giving no occasion for police or military interference. The only aggressive movement on their part is a boycott, centering in Wilkesbarre, and directed at retail merchants, wholesalers and employees who lend their influence to the coal operators' interests. One factory, for instance, has closed down because the great majority of the employees refused to work with five who were relatives of non-union employees of the coal mines. A "citizens' union" has been formed in Wilkesbarre to prosecute the boycotters. But while the body of the strikers are keeping the peace, there are instances here and there of rioting. This is attributed to the "coal and iron police," a private police force employed and paid by the coal owners and under their orders, pursuant to a special law of the state. The companies began to recruit and arm this private force in May, before there were any indications of disorder. As early as May 29, over 1,600 had been commissioned, and within three days the number was doubled. Speaking of this force, President Mitchell, of the Mine Workers' union, was reported on the 4th as saying:

It is queer to see a lot of men, the majority of whom are absolutely irresponsible persons, garbed in the blue and brass of coal and iron police, stalking about the mines with guns on their arms, while the strikers have no thought of damaging the property of their employers. The power vested in the coal and iron police is not generally known. They are as much the private standing army of the operators as were the serfts of feudal barons. A ridiculous state law has made it possible for them, at such a time as this, to arm a mob of disreputable men, who will incite more trouble than they will prevent. In the strike two years ago these men actually visited the homes of strikers and compelled the poor, ignorant fellows by a show of authority and brass buttons to report to work at collieries against their will. The state fosters this system that might well shame the most tyrannical Russian laws.

Whether from irritation by this private police or other cause, some of the strikers appear from the reports to have become disorderly and riotous. Numerous instances are telegraphed of stoning nonunion workmen and shooting at "iron and coal" policemen by strikers or their sympathizers. In one case of shooting at Wilkesbarre the chief of the Wilkesbarre police made an investigation and placed the blame on four of the guards employed by one of the collieries. On the 13th it was reported that peace then reigned throughout the anthracite region, and but little contrary to this has been reported since. The fifth week of the strike closed on the 14th, with 165,000 men and boys out. Some of the companies have begun eviction proceedings against their tenants who are on strike.

—

With a view to bringing the strike to a close, the New York Board of Trade requested President Roosevelt to appoint an arbitration committee to act under a law of Congress of 1888. The subject was discussed at a cabinet meeting on the 6th, when it was decided that the President could take no such action because the law in question had been repealed in 1898. But he directed the labor commissioner, Carroll D. Wright, to investigate the strike. Mr. Wright proceeded at once to make the investigation, and on the 12th delivered his report to the President. The nature of the report has not yet been disclosed.

—

Instead of coming to an early close, this strike now bids fair to extend so as to embrace all the coal mining interests of the country, bituminous as well as anthracite. As stated at page 119, enough organizations had united several weeks ago to compel President Mitchell to call a national conference of the United Mine Workers' Union of America to consider the question of a general strike. He has at length issued the call. The conference will meet at Indianapolis on the 17th of July. From present appearances the conference will have a majority of delegates in favor of striking.

Another strike, and one in which serious trouble has been reported, is that of the street car employees of Rhode Island (p. 140), which they are making against the companies to compel the latter to obey the 10-hour law of the state. The first acts of violence occurred on the 11th at Pawtucket, when a crowd attacked and demolished a car guarded by special deputy sheriffs. The governor thereupon sent a detachment of militia to Pawtucket, and on the 12th a car escorted by militia and guarded by special deputy sheriffs was bombarded by a mob with stones. The special deputies fired a volley in reply and killed a boy of 12, who was in the crowd. It appears that the rioting was due primarily to the use of deputies. The mayor, following the successful example of the mayor of San Francisco (p. 56), had refused to man the cars with police, but the sheriff swore in employees of the company as special deputies and the governor supported them with militia. After the rioting of the 12th representations were made to the sheriff by citizens that the deputies accomplished no good purpose but only incited the crowds to violence, and on the 13th he withdrew them. The city became quiet immediately. But the militia remained, and disorder broke out anew on the 15th. In the course of the day the militia inadvertently invaded the neighboring city of Central Falls and threatened the inhabitants there, but withdrew upon the protest of the mayor who objected that he had not requested their services.

One of the great strikes has been settled, the victory being with the strikers. It is that of the International machinists in the Allis-Chalmers shop of Chicago, which was last referred to in these columns in vol. iv, at page 458. This strike was begun May 20, 1901, by the machinists of the United States and Canada. They demanded a nine-hour day with an increase of wages, 12½ per cent. (vol. iv, pp. 90, 105, etc.), sufficient to make the wages for nine hours the same as they had been for ten. In many shops settlements substantially on this basis were soon effected, but the Allis-Chalmers establishment held out. They had already conceded the nine-hour day, but were willing to increase wages only five per cent. So the strike dragged on for 13 months, with its long record of picketing, injunctions, assaults, etc., two persons having been killed, and was not settled until the 11th. In the settlement the employers have allowed a 55-hour week instead of a nine-hour day, have increased wages 11 per cent., and have recognized the union.

Once more it becomes necessary to report operations of the Mexican army against the Yaqui Indians. This Indian war, which began in the summer of 1899 (Vol. ii., No. 71 p. 8), is likely to culminate in the complete extermination of the Yaquis. The Yaquis are a remnant of the Aztec race. They live in the Mexican state

of Sonora, in the valley of the Yaqui, which empties into the Gulf of California, and are not savages, but in religion are Christian converts of Spanish priests and economically are industrious farmers and miners. Though physically strong and brave, they are a docile people. But they have never submitted to Mexican sovereignty, having retained their own laws and customs; and they have been resisting Spanish aggression for three centuries. In the effort to subjugate them the Mexican government is said to have lost 35,000 soldiers and spent millions of dollars. In July, 1897, they for the first time laid down their defensive arms and made a treaty with Mexico, in which they were guaranteed peaceable possession of the Yaqui valley. In return, outlying lands which they had claimed were to be thrown open to settlement under Mexican authority. This caused the present war. Mexican and American miners and land grabbers, with Mexican authority to enter these lands, encroached upon the rich mining regions of the Yaqui valley, and in consequence the Yaquis again revolted. The Mexican government has been engaged ever since in trying to subjugate them, and from time to time morsels of news about the war have leaked into this country around the Mexican censorship. The story may be followed in these columns in Nos. 71 p. 8, 72 p. 10, 73 p. 10, 78 p. 10, 94 p. 10, 102 p. 9, vol. iii, pp. 153, 602. The latest item, coming by way of Tucson, Ariz., on the 12th, is to the effect that troops of Gen. Torres' army have attacked a Yaqui village, guarded by 80 men, and massacred every one of the guard and 106 women and children. Only a few days before, there were reports of a battle between 2,000 Mexicans and 500 Yaquis, in which nearly all the Yaquis were killed. Col. Christy, the president of a Phoenix, Ariz., bank, who is recently from Sonora, is authority for the statement that all the Yaqui men and boys falling into the hands of the Mexican army are shot.

European news is meager and incomplete. The only important event with definite outline is the institution of legal proceedings against leaders of the new Irish movement—the United Irish league. As reported in April (p. 41), the British government had "proclaimed" nine Irish counties and two cities, which means that in these places public meetings were forbidden and trial by jury suspended. This move seems to have been ineffectual to suppress the "no-rent" agitation, and the landlords' association, in the name of Lord De Freyne, whose tenants in Roscommon county refuse to pay rent and have consequently caused him great loss, has taken out writs for conspiracy against John Redmond, John Dillon, W. J. O'Brien, Michael Davitt and others connected with the United Irish league's "no-rent" movement. The accusation is that the members of the league have conspired to injure De Freyne in his property rights. By the Irish leaders these proceedings are looked upon and welcomed as a concerted movement on the part of the Irish landlords; and they are so declared to be by prominent Irish landlords themselves.

NEWS NOTES.

—The National Association of Credit Men met on the 12th at Nashville.

—The Republicans of Tennessee nominated H. T. Campbell for governor on the 18th.

—The National Militia association met in convention at Baltimore on the 14th.

—Spain has agreed in cabinet council to recognize the Republic of Cuba, and will send a minister to the island.

—Dr. A. A. Ames, now serving his fourth term as mayor of Minneapolis, was indicted for bribery on the 17th.

—S. G. Gould was nominated for governor of Maine by the Democratic convention sitting at Bangor on the 17th.

—The annual communion service of Christian Scientists at Boston took place on the 15th. It was attended by about 13,000 people.

—The M. A. degree was conferred by Columbia university on the 11th upon Moses L. Frazier, a Negro born in slavery 42 years ago in New Orleans.

—A labor riot of large dimensions and threatening character broke out in Paterson, N. J., on the 19th in connection with the strike of silk weavers there.

—The court of appeals of New York has affirmed the conviction of John Most (vol. iv. pp. 435, 473) for publishing an essay defending the murder of crowned heads.

—Ex-President Grover Cleveland received on the 17th from the Augustinian college of St. Thomas of Villanova (Catholic) at Philadelphia, the degree of doctor of jurisprudence.

—The Republican convention of Nebraska met at Lincoln on the 18th, and, after endorsing President Roosevelt's policy, especially with reference to the Cuban tariff question, nominated John Mickey for governor.

—On the 13th the supreme court of Mississippi sustained the constitutionality of the Noel primary law, under which all party nominations are required to be made at primary elections, nominating conventions being abolished.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the eleven months ending May 31, 1902, as given by the May treasury sheet, are as follows (M. standing for merchandise, G. for gold and S. for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	$1,292,422,975	$829,952,130	$462,470,845 exp
G	48,177,425	48,078,788	98,637 exp
S	46,479,824	26,570,138	19,909,186 exp
	$1,387,079,724	$904,601,056	$482,478,668

—Col. Arthur Lynch, an author and journalist and native of Australia, who served with the Boers in the South African war and while in the field there was nominated for parliament from Galway and afterward elected, was arrested on his arrival in England from France on the 11th upon a charge of treason. A preliminary hearing before a magistrate has been begun, but has not been concluded.

PRESS OPINIONS.

STRIKE VIOLENCE.

Chicago American (Dem.), June 18.—Order must be maintained in the anthracite coal fields. When strikers resort to violence they at once reinforce their employers with the whole power of the courts, police, militia and regular army. . . . Order and the security of person and property must be preserved whenever they are assailed. There can be no argument about that. The alternative is anarchy. So when strikers grow violent the practical effect of their violence is to change their antagonist. Capital comfortably retires from the battle, and the courts, police, militia and army take the fight off its hands. Violence would mean simply that the anthracite coal workers prefer to war with the state of Pennsylvania and with the United States government rather than with the coal trust.

THE ANTI-ANARCHY BILL.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), June 12.—The logic of the anti-anarchy bill would seem to justify an anti-lynching bill along the lines suggested by the former attorney general of Massachusetts. There is no apparent ground for a distinction between officers and citizens. Yet the Senate judiciary committee dismissed the anti-lynching bill as a proposed violation of state rights! If the committee was right then, the anti-anarchy bill is unconstitutional. If the latter act is valid, an act of Congress to try and punish lynchers would be valid. A government which can protect its "machinery" can protect its sovereignty. If not, why not?

CHICAGO POLITICS.

Chicago Chronicle (con. Dem.), June 18.—The Chronicle performs an unpleasant duty when it asserts that the ticket nominated by Mr. Burke at the recent convention of Cook county Democrats was placed in the field to be beaten, and that neither Burke nor any of his associates had any desire to nominate a ticket that would be elected. It is a notorious fact that the relations ex-

isting between Burke and the managing Republican politicians of this county are very close. If there is not a formal agreement to that effect there is a tacit understanding that the Republicans shall have the county and the Democrats the city offices.

ILLLINOIS DEMOCRACY.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), June 19.—The platform of the Democratic party of Illinois favors things which no one opposes, sets up some men of straw to knock them down, and denounces policies not because they are bad in themselves, but merely because they are Republican.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind.), June 19.—In its national aspects the platform is notable chiefly for the effort to get away from Bryan and silver. That is the common drift of Democratic state platforms now, and it is prophetic of a change in the national platform from the famous Chicago dogma. Anti-trust, anti-tariff, anti-imperialism are the shibboleths of the present time.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), June 18.—There is no "municipal ownership" plank, to the disgust of that fair-weather champion of public ownership of "all" public utilities, Carter H. Harrison. The convention merely favors the enactment of such laws as will enable municipalities to acquire and operate public utilities, a proposition to which no objection is now offered from any quarter.

Chicago Chronicle (con. Dem.), June 19.—The Democrats of Illinois were wise in refusing to adopt the jargon of the socialists in the matter of the "initiative and referendum" and they were wiser still in declining to commit themselves to the principle of government ownership of all public utilities. . . . There is a vast difference between declaring unreservedly in favor of government ownership and declaring in favor of providing a means to that end if the people in any locality shall so determine. The one is Democratic local self-government. The other is state socialism without qualification or disguise.

REPUBLICAN SPLIT.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), June 19.—The strength of the opposition to the reduction in the tariff on imports from Cuba has been explained. The members of the senatorial cabal whose covert enmity to President Roosevelt has been suspected from the time of his nomination as vice president have allied themselves with the few senators who are sincerely interested in the protection of the beet sugar industry for the purpose of injuring the administration.

OHIO POLITICS.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), June 16.—Republican papers are already finding fault with Mayor Johnson's keynote speech at the Democratic state convention two months hence, although they haven't the slightest idea what he is going to say.

"WORLD POWER" PROGRESS.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), June 15.—Things have changed recently within the United States of America, and to-day Republican papers printed in this free land actually rejoice over the downfall of a pair of struggling republics, and over the triumph of the greediest nation that ever fattened upon conquest.

OHIO "RIPPERISM."

Butte (Mont.) Journal (Ind.), May 31.—That is the plan the legislature has now fastened upon Cleveland to punish it for becoming "Tom Johnsonized." In Toledo the police force has been placed under state control to get even with Mayor Sam Jones. Jones and Johnson honor the cities they serve as mayors, and honor a state that is unable to appreciate their exalted citizenship. Ohio has disgraced itself by its petty persecution of the popular majority in two of its principal cities.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, June 9-14, 1902.

Senate.

On the 9th Mr. Harris (p. 6908) and Mr. Morgan (p. 6908) spoke on the Isthmian canal bill, and Mr. Turner (p. 6992) spoke on the same subject on the 10th. Prior to adjournment on the latter day the Senate referred the House substitute for the Senate bill for the protection of the President (S. bill No. 3653) to the committee on the judiciary (p. 7014) instead of following the usual course of asking for a conference. On the 11th, before the regular business, a motion of Mr. Wellington's to discharge the committee on privileges and elections from further consideration of the joint resolution to amend the Constitution by making United States senators elective by popular vote, was considered, and by a vote of 35 to 21 rejected (pp. 7076 to 7083); after which the regular order, the Isthmian canal bill, was resumed, when Mr. Fairbanks (p. 7084) took the floor. At the conclusion of his speech it was unanimously agreed (p. 7096) to vote upon the bill on the 19th. During the morning hour of the 12th a motion (p. 7165) to refer to the committee on civil service and retrenchment a resolution instructing that committee to inquire into and report the reason for the discharge of Rebecca J. Taylor from the classified service, and whether it was made in accordance with law, was agreed to, but afterwards (p. 7200) reconsidered. The consideration of the Isthmian canal bill proceeded in the afternoon (p. 7173), but was informally suspended on the 13th, when the only matter of general interest was the receipt of a message from the President (p. 7205) recommending a reduction of the tariff on Cuban products. Consideration of the canal bill was resumed on the 14th, Mr. Morgan (p. 7283) speaking to the question.

House.

Upon assembling on the 9th the House voted upon the Senate bill for the protection of the President (S. bill No. 3653), as amended by the committee of the whole, which struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted the House bill, and the bill as so amended was passed (p. 6912)—179 to 38. Thereupon the House went into committee of the whole (p. 6914) on the bill (H. bill No. 11536) for the transfer of forest reserves to the control of the department of agriculture; and on the 10th the committee reported the bill back with a recommendation that the enacting clause be struck out (p. 7023), which was agreed to—100 to 78. The bill (H. bill No. 5) for the construction and operation of Pacific telegraph cables then coming before the committee of the whole under special rule (p. 7028-7029), it was discussed both on the 10th and the 11th, and on the latter day the committee recommended that the enacting clause be struck out (p. 7109), to which the House agreed—116 to 77. The privileged business before the House on the 12th was Senate bill No. 3057, for appropriating the receipts from the sale of public lands in certain states and territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands (p. 7132), which was debated through that day and the 13th, when, with amendments, it was passed (p. 7233). On the 14th a motion to withdraw from the committee on insular affairs a resolution calling upon the secretary of war to transmit a statement of the amount of money expended by the United States since May, 1898, for the cost of occupying the Philippine islands (p. 7297) was laid upon the table by a vote of 90 to 65.

Record Notes.—Speeches of Senators Hanna (p. 6863), Mitchell (p. 6877), and Harris (p. 7037), on the Isthmian canal; of Senators Spooner (p. 6925), and Beveridge (p. 7240), and Representative Gaines (p. 6951) on the Philippine question; of Representatives Spight (p. 7051), Smith (p. 7054), Scott (p. 7056), Henry (p. 7058), Littlefield (pp. 7060, 7115), Warnach (p. 7121), and Patterson (p. 7194), on "anti-anarchy" legislation; of Representative Richardson (pp. 7123, 7124) on the Pacific cable bill; and of Representatives Underwood (p. 7264), Snook (p. 7265) and Bell (p. 7266), on irrigation of arid lands.

Text of Senate bill for the protection of the President, etc. (S. bill No. 3653), and of House "anti-anarchist" substitute (p. 7060).

Text of the President's message recommending reduction of tariff on Cuban products (p. 7205).

Text of the political constitution of Colombia.

MISCELLANY

JOHN BROWN, OF KANSAS.

States are not great
Except as men may make them:
Men are not great except they do and dare;
But States, like men,
Have destinies that take them,
That bear them on, not knowing why or where.

The why repels
The philosophic searcher;
The why and where all questionings defy,
Until we find,
Far back in youthful nurture
Prophetic facts that constitute the why.

All merit comes
From braving the unequal;
All glory comes from daring to begin.
Fame loves the State
That, reckless of the sequel,
Fights long and well, whether it lose or win.

And there is one
Whose faith, whose fight, whose failing,
Fame shall placard upon the walls of time.
He dared begin,
Despite the unavailing;
He dared begin when failure was a crime.

When over Africa
Some future cycle
Shall sweep the lake-gemmed uplands with its surge;
When as with trumpet
Of the Archangel Michael
Culture shall bid a colored race emerge;

When busy cities,
Those in constellations,
Shall gleam with spires and palaces and domes,
With marts wherein
Is heard the noise of Nations;
With summer groves surrounding stately homes;

Their fugitive orators
To cultured freemen
Shall tell the valor and recount with praise
Stories of Kansas
And of Lacedaemon.
Cradles of freedom, then of ancient days.

From boulevards
O'erlooking both Nyanzas,
The statued bronze shall glitter in the sun
With rugged lettering:
"John Brown, of Kansas;
He dared begin;
He lost,
But losing won."

—Eugene F. Ware (Ironquill).

NOT A FATAL IMPEDIMENT.

Will Moody, son and successor at Northfield of the late Dwight L. Moody, tells the following story, apropos of recent theological events, about a young convert in the Salvation Army, who, earnest and zealous, was imbued with the idea that he must speak to every one on the sub-

ject of religion. He was especially moved one day while traveling to address a somewhat austere individual seated just in front of him. Touching him on the shoulder, he put the usual question: "My brother, are you a Christian?"

"Sir," was the reply—and perhaps with a shade of impatience—"I'm a professor in a theological seminary."

But this only seemed to call for renewed effort and the young man was equal to it. "My dear brother," he said, "as you value your soul, don't let a thing like that stand between you and the Lord."—New York Times.

EDWARD VI., 1553; EDWARD VII., 1902.

"Forasmuch as the Great and Almighty God hath given unto mankind, above all other creatures, such an heart and desire, that every man desireth to join friendship with other, to love and be loved, also to give and receive mutual benefits; it is therefore the duty of all men according to their power to maintain and increase this desire in every man, with well-deserving to all men, and especially to show this good affection to such as being moved with this desire come to them from far countries. . . . For the God of Heaven and Earth, greatly providing for mankind, would not that all things should be found in one region, to the end that one should have need of another, that by this means friendship might be established among all men, and every one seek to gratify all."

So runs one of the Letters Missive of King Edward VI., written A. D. 1553. The words sound strange in A. D. 1902, on the eve of the coronation of King Edward VII., when the rusty machinery of Protection is being reerected at our ports.—Glasgow (Scotland) Land Values.

MAYOR JOHNSON AND CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

A further significant fact in the franchise situation in Cleveland is the rapidly growing interest in civil service reform as a means of entering upon municipal management. A new force is rallying about the purification of city government in order thereby to render possible the public assumption of these public necessities. An interesting evidence of this has appeared in the water department, which is undergoing quite a transformation from the spoils system to a business administration, with general popular indorsement, and the transformation is being sustained by many who have hitherto been spoilsmen, because they see the necessary connection between efficent management and the further extension of public operation. In this connection may be quoted a recent letter of Mayor Johnson's, with respect to the water department:

"It is especially important that a public service of this kind should be conducted along business rather than political lines, and there is no better recommendation for municipal ownership of other utilities than to show that the ones now operated are run in the interests of good service, with economical and efficient management."

Reference may also be made to the fact that the city council has asked the legislature to grant the city the right which it does not now possess of owning and operating various municipal monopolies, and in so doing has asked that a stringent civil service reform act be provided for such undertakings.

As evidence of the greater ease of reforming the spoils system under public than under private ownership, which has always been the contention of the writer, reference may be made in closing to the fact that while the powerful financial interests of the city and most of the daily papers have either opposed or been silent upon both the increase of taxation and the reduction of charges of the street railway and lighting companies, there has been almost universal indorsement by these same influential elements of society of the effort to put the water department upon a nonpartisan business basis.—From a paper read May 8, 1902, before the National Municipal league, by Prof. Edward W. Bemis.

THE BRITISH BREAD TAX.

But apart from the evils of protection (meaning the enrichment of certain landlords at the expense of the community), there are objections enough to a tax on bread. Even if the tax were "not for protection, but for revenue only,"—supposing, for example, that home-grown and imported corn were equally taxed—it would not cease to be a matter for shame and regret. We have said that it was childish to pretend that the tax would not raise the price of bread. In poor districts, among people to whom the expenditude of every halfpenny is a matter of vital importance, competition always brings down the price of bread so low that there is no margin of profit for the trade, and if any tax is imposed, the price must go up, or bread could not be provided. For the poor, the loaf must rise in price or suffer in quality. On April 19, a doctor, writing from the northeast of London, said that in Hackney and Bethnal Green "the bakers have raised the price of the quartern loaf from 4½d. to 5d. A poor patient of mine (a widow with four children), whose earnings are but 12s. per week, explained to me yesterday that the rise means 7d. per week out of her pocket." The tax means little, no doubt, to the well-to-do and the fairly well-off, and the talk about "broadening the basis of taxation" is transparently absurd and insincere. It is hardly credible that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach should have spoken in Parliament, when leading up to the bread tax, of "finding an article of universal consumption from which a large revenue could be produced without putting any injurious or oppressive burden on any individual or class." He could not have devised any other tax which would fall so injuriously and oppressively on the class least able to bear the burden—namely, that large class of the population who already are short of the necessaries for healthy life. When Earl Percy defends the Budget by declaring eloquently that we all are, or ought to be, ready to make sacrifices for our glorious Empire, the thought occurs that, so far as the bread tax is concerned, the sacrifice is vicarious on the part of noble earls. To those living with something to spare above the bare subsistence level, the tax is an almost negligible quantity; to those hovering over that level, and to those who are sunk below it, it may be a matter of life and death.

For many years it has been the common aim of all reformers and philanthropists to raise the standard of living of the poor—to secure higher wages and lower prices. This has been done to some extent. Thanks to cheap food and comparative freedom of trade and industry, the workers in this country have enjoyed better conditions than those in any other European country. It is true that the development of trade and industry has meant a steady increase in land values, and that a large part of the increase of wealth tends to be swallowed up in rent. Nevertheless, the wage-earners have gained something, especially in the skilled and organized trades. There has, of course, remained a large number of people whose earnings seldom rise above the bare subsistence level, and who have to struggle against one another to obtain work at the lowest possible remuneration. But even

with such people things are not so bad but that they can be made worse. Things can be made worse by bad taxation, just as they could be improved by good taxation. It is certain that taxes on necessary food must lower still further the standard of living where it is low already. Those who were before half-starved may be killed outright or driven into the workhouse, and others may be reduced to semi-starvation. The good which has been achieved by the efforts and reforms of the last sixty years may be soon undone. The uphill struggle of labor against privilege and oppression has been slow and severe. Those who have been struggling up are now thrust down again; and once thrust down, their upward struggle again must, in any circumstances, be slow and severe. Even if the bread tax is abolished again in a few years, as we trust that it will be, its evil effects will last much longer in the shape of the lowered standard of living among the workers, which will enable the privileged classes to appropriate, for a time at any rate, the benefit of the remission of the tax.

We said above that things can be made worse by bad taxation, and could be improved by good taxation. Let there be no mistake about this. There is a method of taxation which in its very operation would tend to raise the standard of living and make it easier for everyone who works with hand or brain to obtain a livelihood. Just consider what becomes of the total wealth produced in this country year by year. It falls into three divisions. Part of it goes as return to labor and capital. Another part of it takes the form of land values, and is paid to those who control the use of the land—is paid to them, not in return for any effort or outlay on their part, but simply as a toll levied for the use of what is provided by nature. The third part is taken by the Government as revenue for national and local purposes. This third part has now to be increased: the Government require further funds. They can procure further funds by taking something either from the earnings of labor and capital or from land values. Which would be best? If the Government take by taxation any part of the return to labor and capital, as they do when they levy taxes on the processes, products and earnings of trade and industry, then they reduce earnings, raise prices, check industry and lower the standard of living for the workers. If we are to enjoy the benefits of free trade and free industry, we must not only abolish the duties on imports—on tea, sugar, corn, etc.—but we must also cease to levy taxes and rates, as we do at present, on houses, shops, warehouses and factories, on plant and machinery, on agricultural improvements, on mining works. The evil effects of such taxation are felt throughout the whole of society, but fall most disastrously on those who find the greatest difficulty in earning a living. So much for the one alternative. What of the other—the taxation of land values?

If the Government were to tax land values, they would not be depriving anyone of the return due to his labor or outlay, nor would they be diminishing anyone's earnings. For land values are not the outcome of the exertion or expenditure of any individual. Land values arise from the presence and activity of the community, and in taxing land values the Government would only be taking for public purposes what is essentially a public fund. The individual recipients of land values do not, as such, render any service to society in return for the value they receive. On the contrary, they are apt to use their power to the detriment of society by demanding an excessive toll, and refusing to allow the land to be used until that toll is paid. While taxation is not levied according to land value, landholders are encouraged to withhold some land from use, and enabled to exact inflated prices for other land. The result is that industry is checked and development retarded. The tendency would be counteracted by the taxation of land values, which would have an effect exactly opposite to the effect of other taxes. Other taxes depress industry, lower wages, and raise prices, thereby lowering the general standard of living. The taxation of land values would make it no longer profitable to withhold land from uses to which it could be put with advantage to society. By taxing land values we should make the national resources more freely available for industry. We should stimulate production and cheapen commodities, and leave earnings intact. Wages would tend to be higher and employment more regular; and the chief causes which keep down the general standard of living would be removed.

"What are we to do when we want a new source of revenue?" asked Sir Edward Grey in 1899. And he continued:

"You may tax an article of general consumption, but that is what we want to put off as long as we can get something better. The whole tendency of the time is against it. What other source are you to find? If you go to the resources of the wealthier classes you go to the income tax, but you cannot go on increasing that forever. You cannot tax removable property beyond a certain amount, because, if you do, it is apt to leave the country. But there is another source of property—fixed property, best known to us under the form of land values. Is it a fair source of taxation? I say it is not only a fair source, but I think it is one which, by reason of its very nature, recommends itself as being the fairest source."

These are the arguments which should have been heard in the discussion of the Budget of 1902. If Sir Edward Grey will not use them any longer, others will.—Glasgow (Scotland) Land Values.

The day Mark Twain received the degree of doctor of laws from the University of Missouri the Philadelphia North American telegraphed him: "How does it feel to be an LL. D.?" In an hour or two came this reply: "It feels like official emancipation from ignorance and vice."—Chicago Chronicle.

Our gifted and opulent fellow countryman, J. Pierpont Morgan, has decided to remain in London to witness the coronation. If he likes it he will order one for himself.—Chicago Chronicle.

"This restless, aggressive feeling!" exclaimed the Anglo-Saxon. "I must take something for it! Your territory would be good, I doubt not!"

"What's the matter with our measure?" insinuated the heathen, massing his Krupps and Creusots.

The Angle-Saxon was struck with the suggestion, and acted on it, quite wisely, as it proved, for when he had taken the heathen's measure, his restless, aggressive feeling was much relieved.—Life.

BOOK NOTICES.

"THE VALLEY OF DECISION."

This is the title of a novel by Edith Wharton, published in two volumes, by Charles Scribner's Sons. It is the first instance in America of a first edition of a novel appearing in two volumes. The custom is common in England, where the line of cleavage between the wealthier class of readers and those who cannot afford to buy high-priced books has hitherto been more marked than in America. The innovation is a sign that we are approaching the same condition here among bookbuyers.

This novel is a work of great power, and belongs to a class well above the popular novels of the day. The author is a gen-

uine artist. It would be necessary to go back to George Eliot to find her peer in that subtle combination of clearness and self-restraint which will be found in every work of art. It is only the true artist that can "tell it all," and yet be guiltless of what is vulgarly but very expressively known as "slopping over."

The permanent value of the book lies in its exposition of the social conditions in Italy at the time of the French Revolution, and of the influence of this revolution upon other European countries. The hero is a prince, who, before his accession to power, comes under the influence of the spirit of reform. He is led through the "Valley of Decision," along the old path between the rights of the people and the vested privileges of the upper classes. The tragedy of the story, however, consists not so much in the record of the hero as in the record of the people. Their blindness to sound methods of reform and readiness to become the tools of reactionists make the book end in pathos and despair. But it is well worth reading.

J. H. DILLARD.

Michael Davitt's, "The Boer Fight for Freedom" (New York & London: Funk & Wagnalls Co. $2), the first history of the war in South Africa from the Boer point of view, comes out just as the Boer cause is acknowledged to be a lost cause. But it is none the less valuable for that. The Boer war, though it has ended in subjugation, will be a land mark in history. The little South African republics have gone out. The place upon the map that knew them once, knows them no more. Two crown colonies of the British empire are there instead. Yet the story of their unequal struggle against astute diplomatic maneuvering and overwhelming military strength will always stand as an inspiration to free peoples and a warning to aggressive empires. Nor could this story have found a better contemporaneous pen to write it than that of Michael Davitt, the Irish patriot. He was upon the ground as an observer; he brought to his task the qualifications of a journalist, a publicist and a military critic, together with genuine sympathy with the Boers as a people and with their cause as one akin to that of his own subjugated country; and he has given the world the benefit of his powers at their best. As might have been expected Davitt's history is that of a partisan. But this is no criticism. It will be long before the history of that war can be written so as to be worth reading except by partisans. But partisan as it unquestionably is, there is no indication of misrepresentation. He who would understand the circumstances leading up to the war as the Boers understood them, and see the war in its progress as they saw it, must read this book.

THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

With the political campaign now opening, in which important questions of government, both political and economic, are at stake, we follow our usual custom of offering The Public at a reduced rate for the campaign, with the view of extending its influence and promoting its circulation. We will therefore receive

CAMPAIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS

from bona fide NEW SUBSCRIBERS from now on, to and including the issue of November 8, next, for

FIFTY CENTS.

This price is considerably below the regular terms, but we have found that a large proportion of campaign subscribers, becoming acquainted with and friends of the paper in that way, become regular subscribers, which makes it worth our while to encourage campaign subscriptions.

Address THE PUBLIC, Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

PERIODICALS.

—Civic Centers," by John DeWitt Warner, "Municipal Government in Australasia," by T. George Ellery, and "Street Railway Franchises in New York," are the principal articles in the spring issue of Municipal Affairs (New York), the feature of which is "City Monopolies."

—The American Federationist (Washington) for June devotes much of its space to the new Chinese exclusion law, including a legal opinion by Rolston & Siddons, lawyers of Washington, showing its ineffectiveness. Editorially the Federationist denounces the law as a "bunco."

—The leading article in the International Monthly for April, coming as it does from a colonel, contains two interesting points in regard to militarism which indicate a healthy development. As long as the soldier is to be with us, we ought to try to remember that he is after all a man and brother; and so we may wish him to be as little injured as possible by the exigencies of his profession. Col. Larned deals very cleverly with the subject of clothes. "War is sombre, bitter, outrageous, even when unavoidable, and surely the effort to clothe its sinister body in feathers and tinsel in rainbow hues and extravagant garments, is a grim irony." This, he continues, "has nevertheless, always been in harmony with the institutions and conceptions of absoluteism." He holds that "we are beginning to appreciate the grotesqueness of war paint and spangles as its livery." Another point in which he thinks modern notions and recent wars are working a revolution in military ideas is that of the automatic soldier, the soldier made into a machine. The soldier of the future will, he thinks, have "too much spontaneity and intelligence to conform to the automatic ideal."—J. H. D.

Home Rule and Tax Reform in Colorado.

Advocates of home rule in taxation should be interested in and lend their aid to the campaign now in progress in Colorado, for a constitutional amendment allowing counties desiring to do so to adopt land value taxation for local purposes, as is done in New Zealand and elsewhere in Australasia. The resolution submitting this amendment to popular vote passed both houses of the Colorado legislature by a two-thirds majority. An attempt subsequently made in the interest of land grant railroads and other speculative real estate interests to repeal the resolution was defeated by a close vote. The same special interests are now canvassing the state against the measure. They are spending money freely for this purpose, while the friends of the measure have but little to spend. As usual, what it is everybody's business to pay for nobody pays for. That should be remedied. It is to the interest of the whole country that this Colorado amendment be adopted, for its adoption would surely be followed by the adoption of similar measures in other states. We therefore call upon the people of Illinois to help the friends of home rule and just taxation in Colorado. Money is needed to send speakers through the state and to supply the people with explanatory literature. For the purpose of raising such a fund by national subscription a National Australasian Tax Reform association has been organized. Hon. James W. Bucklin, of Grand Junction, Col., is president. Lawson Purdy, of New York, is secretary, and August Lewis, of the same state, is treasurer. An Illinois branch of this association has been formed, which will receive contributions, either in bulk or in monthly installments, and forward them to the national treasurer. The amendment is to be voted upon at the Colorado election in November next, and funds are needed NOW. Send contributions to U. A. H. Greene, secretary, 138 Jackson boulevard, Chicago.

EDWARD OSGOOD BROWN,
Chairman Illinois Committee for the Promotion of the Australasian Tax System.
U. A. H. GREENE, Secretary.