

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1902.

Number 237.

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.

"National prosperity!" answered Secretary Shaw, the other day in Philadelphia, when asked how he accounted for the stringency in the money market. "National prosperity," he said; "that alone will account for it, I think." What a diagnosis! "Good health!" said the doctor, when asked why a patient was sick. "Good health," said he; "that alone will account for it, I think."

Mayor Maybury, of Detroit, curiously illustrates a misuse of the word "radical" when he calls himself one and then enumerates opinions which he holds that are no more radical than the tire on a wagon wheel. "Radical" does not mean fanatical, but is an allusion to "root." That which goes to the root is radical. As applied to social reformers it describes not those who make a multifarious fuss about social wrongs, but those who try to eradicate them.

When the Chicago board of aldermen, Republicans and Democrats, voted for a resolution, as they did on the 13th, memorializing Congress to obtain control of undeveloped coal lands in order that the fuel monopoly might be broken by competition with the general government, they showed that they "hear a bell ringing but don't know where the clapper is." If undeveloped coal mines were taxed at the same rate in proportion to market value as farms and cottage homes, the fuel monopoly would be broken without delay and effectually, by private competition.

A significant commentary upon the recent proclamation by the Brit-

ish government of several counties in Ireland as so lawless that jury trial therein must be abolished and public meetings forbidden, is afforded by the British "blue book" of Irish criminal statistics for 1901. According to the London Speaker, this government report discloses the fact that there is less crime in Ireland than in England and in Wales. For every three offenders in England and Wales, there are only two in Ireland. It is further observed that the Irish districts where there was least crime last year were the first to be divested of their civil rights this year. When imperialism gets in the saddle, popular government is in a fair way of being trampled upon, no less in Ireland than elsewhere.

It now leaks out that the Republicans of Alabama have been as anxious as the Democrats to bar Negroes from the ballot box; and they have availed themselves of the opportunity a wholesale disfranchisement affords, to exclude from their State convention every Negro delegate. Perhaps the Negroes of the country will begin to learn after a while, that the race question is no longer a party question, but that their rights are involved in the general question of fundamental democracy. No longer does the Republican party stand as a guardian over the rights of Negroes. Its imperialistic policy has taken all that sort of "nonsense" out of it. The rights of the Negro now depend upon the democratic Democrats and the democratic Republicans of the country, who defend them not because they want the Negro vote, ignoring them when he has none to give, but because he is a man.

Some Southern editors think they are meeting the child-labor question in their section, and duly rebuking Northern critics, by finding out from

"careful investigation" that, as one Southern paper puts it: "Laborers under twelve years of age in Southern cotton mills are relatively very few." The poor misguided section-mad creatures! Can they not see that no matter how few, relatively, child laborers are now, the vital fact is that they exist at all, and that they have come in with Southern "prosperity." Are these editors so obtuse that with all the experience of the North to enlighten them, they yet cannot understand that as this kind of "prosperity" increases in the South, the destruction of children in factories—so common at the North,—will become common also at the South? It is one of the piteous phenomena connected with the increase of poverty with the increase of wealth. Desperate parents throw their children among the factory wheels, as desperate travelers have been known to throw babies to packs of wolves, to save themselves. It is one of the lamentable effects of jughandled "prosperity."

Why it should have been supposed that the coal barons have yielded, even in the slightest degree, is something we venture to suggest no reflecting man can understand. Upon the face of the matter at least, Mr. Baer was right when he said that there had been no yielding. Acting together as a bosses' union, the barons refused to treat or arbitrate with the miners' union. They refused still. Offered the opportunity by the miners' union of an arbitration in which the union should take no part, the arbitrators to be appointed by the President without restrictions, they had refused that. They refused it still. All they did was to propose that each employer should arbitrate with his own men before arbitrators to be selected by the President out of certain specified and very limited

classes, which included the coal baron class but excluding the miner class. There has been no time during the strike when such a settlement would not have been acceptable to the barons. A more impudent proposal was probably never made before in the pacific name of "arbitration." The only concession that has been made since is in respect of a representative of the miners. They have allowed the President to appoint one man who may be presumed to have some sympathies with the under dog. As for the strikers, by acquiescing they have won the laurel wreath of public approbation which is doubtless worth something while it lasts.

The Supreme Court of Indiana handed down a wholesome and much needed decision on the 10th. It decided that the police "sweat box" is utterly illegal, and sustained a judgment for damages against a sheriff who had subjected a prisoner to some of its processes. No bodily injuries had been inflicted. The sheriff had merely arrested a suspect without a warrant and probed him with questions to make a case. But the highest court of the State decides that "an officer cannot legally hold the person arrested in custody for a longer period of time than is reasonably necessary, under all the circumstances of the case to obtain a proper warrant or order for his further detention from some tribunal or officer authorized under the law to issue such a warrant or order." If law suits like that of Indiana were instituted against the lawless "sweat" box policemen of Chicago, an excellent effect might be produced. The Indiana court has declared no local policy nor new law. It has simply applied to a modern instance legal principles as old and universal as the political principles of English liberty.

A comparison of notes last week between banking institutions of New York with foreign connections showed that American bankers are indebted to foreign bankers in an

amount somewhere between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000—probably not less than \$135,000,000. What becomes then of our "favorable" balance of trade, about which Republican orators and newspapers have been boasting so glibly?

Consider the figures of the "favorable" balance as furnished by the treasury department. At the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1902, our excess of merchandise and silver exports amounted to \$500,622,235. This "favorable" balance had been increased at the time of the latest monthly report, Sept. 30, 1902, by excessive exports of merchandise and silver amounting to \$59,743,088. At the end of the fiscal year there had been an excessive import of gold to the amount of \$807,938; but as the excessive exports of gold during the first three months of the new fiscal year were \$4,614,023, the difference makes a net excess of gold exports for the 14 months, of \$3,806,085. So far, then, as merchandise, gold, and silver go, we have done a rushing export business in all. Yet now we are told that instead of foreigners owing us anything for this exported wealth, we owe foreigners \$135,000,000 on bankers' balances alone. For convenience of examination let us tabulate this extraordinary commercial situation:

Export balance of merchandise and silver for year ending June 30, 1902	\$500,622,235
Export balance of same from June 30 to Sept. 30, 1902	59,743,088
Export balance of gold for the same 14 months	3,806,085
Due nevertheless on bankers' balances	135,000,000
"Favorable" aggregate	\$699,171,408

It is now in order for some one to explain why all that outgo, with no offsetting income, is so favorable that voters ought to "stand pat" for a continuance of the political policy that makes it.

According to the report of the bureau on insular affairs, and upon the Republican theory of exports, the American occupation of the Philippines must have been disastrous to Philippine prosperity. The islands

are being overwhelmed in increasing degree with imports. Their "unfavorable" balance is mounting. Here is the table:

	Exports	Imports	"Unfavorable" Balance
1899	\$12,366,902	\$13,113,010	\$746,108
1900	19,751,068	20,601,438	850,370
1901	23,214,948	30,278,406	7,063,458
1902	23,732,079	32,141,842	8,349,763

When statistics are used for enlightenment and not for worship, they are valuable aids to study. But juggled statistics are to the student what perjury is to juries. They not merely fail to enlighten; they positively mislead. It is such misleading statistics that the statistical bureaus at Washington have been frequently charged with manufacturing for partisan effect. The census statistics, for instance, which make it appear that wages have advanced, are challenged as deceptive. But these criticisms of the good faith of bureau statistics have been superciliously ignored by the census officials. Now, however, the criticism comes in a form which cannot be ignored. Silence will be equivalent to confession. It is made circumstantially by Henry L. Bliss, one of the best analytical statisticians in the country, in a pamphlet on "Our Juggled Statistics," which should be very generally read.

It seems that one form of the juggle with reference to census statistics is to change methods of computing averages with each census, so that the censuses will not be comparable, and then comparing them. By this juggle average wages in the manufacturing industries of Michigan, for example, appear to have increased by \$39.57 per year since 1890, whereas an examination into the figures juggled shows that instead of increasing they have decreased by \$11.40.

Especial value is given to Mr. Bliss's able pamphlet by the incorporation of a letter from the chief statistician for manufactures—S. N. D. North. Mr. North says in this letter that "any comparison of the statistics between the two censuses"—that of 1890 and that of 1900—would be

"practically worthless." He also says that it is impossible to ascertain "by ordinary census methods, whether or not the average earnings in any industry or in the country as a whole have increased or decreased." Also in the census report itself it is admitted that the change in method "undoubtedly invalidates in a marked degree any comparisons that may be attempted between the returns of the two censuses." Yet in that report, as finally published, comparative tables of average wages are given! Why? Of what use are comparative tables of incomparable statistics? Of none whatever, that appears upon the surface, except to enable partisan speakers and editors to quote them as evidence of "prosperity among the working classes," without quoting the few words that are buried in the text and which invalidate them. If the census officials can make any answer to Mr. Bliss's damaging arraignment it will be wise for them to do so. As the matter now stands the census computations appear to be not merely valueless but fraudulent.

Single tax men over the country cannot complain of being overlooked this year by the Democratic party in the distribution of nominations for offices in which they might promote their cause. There are a large number of Democratic candidates who qualifiedly indorse single tax principles and methods, and no inconsiderable number are pronounced advocates of this reform. One of these is Franklin K. Lane, the Democratic candidate for governor of California. Another is L. F. C. Garvin, the Democratic candidate for governor of Rhode Island. Herbert S. Bigelow, the Democratic candidate for secretary of state of Ohio, has been heard upon the single tax platform from coast to coast. William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, one of the oldest single tax men, is the Democratic candidate for sheriff of Mahoning county, Ohio; and Prof. Lybarger, a single tax orator, has the legislative nomination in a Pennsylvania dis-

trict. For Congress, Edmund G. Vail, of Cleveland, is the nominee in Tom L. Johnson's old district. Robert Baker has been nominated in the Sixth district of New York. George A. Miller, a prominent New York lawyer, is the nominee in the Seventh New Jersey district. Vernon J. Rose is running in Jerry Simpson's old district, the Kansas Seventh. And James O. Monroe is contesting the Eleventh of Illinois. All these are not only democratic Democrats, and able men, but single tax advocates of long standing.

Mr. Monroe's Congressional district is distinctive in that it lies in an agricultural region. Yet he does not shrink from the principles he has espoused. He has issued a platform of his own, in which he urges "the abolition of all special privilege," declaring that—

it is by special privilege, national, State and municipal, that the great monopolies of our land have been incubated, encouraged and protected. This has destroyed labor's opportunity, has forced organization in self-preservation, which, to be effectual, must result in the strike, and thus the masses must suffer as the result of the folly of their own creation.

In harmony with this general doctrine he demands—

the greatest freedom of trade permitted by the constitution of the United States, and calls the attention of the people to the fact that the commercial greatness of this country is due to the absolute free trade existing between the States.

Even a few men like that in Congress, clear in perception and courageous in expression, would soon create a political sentiment in which monopoly could not breathe and trusts would be asphyxiated.

In answer to the tales of Republicans about trusts in free trade countries, ex-Gov. Boies, of Iowa, makes an offer to which only three kinds of reply are possible. These Munchausenites must either prove up, back down, or, after the manner of Mr. Hanna, "stand pat." Gov. Boies makes them this offer:

If they can establish by competent testimony before an impartial tri-

bunal that there is one trust or combination of any kind in any free trade country on this earth that manufactures articles of necessity of any kind and makes a business of exporting them to other countries and selling them in markets foreign to their own at regular market prices substantially below those for which they sell the same articles in their own markets at regular market prices there, as our trusts are doing every day in the year, I will pay every dollar of the expense of obtaining such evidence and withdraw from this campaign and permit the election of the Republican candidate for Congress in this district without the expenditure of another hour of time or another dollar of money.

Out in Colorado, seated in the chair of economics of the University of Denver, they have a professor of the name of Le Rossignol, whose pen is now being utilized by the land grabbers and land speculators of Colorado to discredit the Bucklin amendment, which is to be voted on by the people of Colorado this Fall. Prof. Le Rossignol's profound respect for the right to life and liberty may be fairly inferred from his declaration that "if it could be shown that private ownership would best tend to the improvement of land, air or sunlight, then it would be right and beneficial for society to permit of such private ownership under proper restrictions." Voters of Colorado, how would you like to have your right to the light and warmth of the sun, and your right to breathe the air, left to the will of private owners, subject to "proper restrictions," if somebody, perhaps before you were born, had thought private ownership of privileges in sunlight and air a good thing? Prof. Le Rossignol might like it, but how about the rest of you? The spirit of this Denver professor is really borrowed from the Nehemiah Adamases of our old slavery days, who thought chattel slavery right because they thought it improving to the slave and beneficial to society. It is much the same thing whether you make men subject to ownership by others, "for their own good and that of society," or make their sources and conditions of life—land, air and sunlight—subject to ownership by oth-

ers for like altruistic or "scientific" reasons.

Prof. Le Rossignol, however, is a dubious advocate for his land monopoly cause. One point he dwells upon in a way well calculated to make votes for the Bucklin amendment (which would allow each county to exempt personal property and improvements if its voters wish to), rather than against the amendment. Considering the probable effect of the system of taxation which the adoption of that amendment would permit if desired, this astute economist says:

Already, in anticipation of the possible adoption of the amendments, the depression in land values which began with the panic of 1893 has been unduly prolonged. If the amendments are carried at the November election, this condition of depression will no doubt be greatly intensified and the value of unimproved land is likely to fall in anticipation of the adoption of the land tax in one or more counties of the State. If, at the general election of 1903, a single county should adopt the tax, there would follow a sharp decline in the value of unimproved land in that county, together with a sympathetic decline throughout the state.

What possible objection to that result anybody could have who is not a land forestaller, it is extremely difficult to imagine. The basis of prosperity is cheap unimproved land, as the history of this country abundantly testifies. Cheap land makes prosperous farmers, high wages, brisk business; dear land checks prosperity and culminates in hard times. The Denver professor argues for dear land neither wisely nor well, but fallaciously enough to induce the forestallers of land in Colorado to publish what he writes in order to humbug the monopoly-ridden people of Colorado into voting for dear land. When dear air and dear sunlight are good things for anybody but their owners, dear land will be a boon. But never before, and let the voters of Colorado mark it well.

If it were not for our tolerant disposition a good many people that we know would lose our friendship.—Puck.

STRIKE BREAKERS AND STRIKE MAKERS.

A new business has sprung up under the pressure of that thickening conflict between labor and monopoly, which is so often miscalled the "conflict between labor and capital." It is the business of supplying "strike breakers."

To illustrate the character and scope of this detestable occupation we quote from the advertising card of a New York detective agency which has embarked in it, evidently on a large scale:

Special.—We are prepared to furnish strike breakers, men to take the place of strikers, in every capacity from messenger boys to locomotive engineers on reasonable notice. This includes machinists, boiler makers, blacksmiths, carpenters, conductors and brakemen for steam roads, conductors and motormen for trolley roads, etc., etc.

If labor were in great demand how could "strike breakers" be so easily secured. If there were real prosperity they would be better employed. That they can be secured, however, does not depend upon the unconfirmed advertisement of a detective agency. It is demonstrated by actual experience. A large squad of "strike breakers" was recently taken by a Chicago detective agency a distance of 1,000 miles from Chicago to New Orleans to break a street car strike.

Rioting resulted, of course. So long as human nature is what it is, such things will cause violent outbreaks. If you dispute it, put yourself for a moment in the place of the New Orleans strikers. You have your home in that city. Your family is dependent upon your wages. Your wages are low and your hours are long. You solicit of your corporate employer a consideration of your condition, asking for a few pennies more in wages and a few minutes less in working time. Your solicitations are ignored. Then you do the only thing you can do, unless you merely keep on at your work, with its exhausting hours and shabby pay; you join with your associates in a peaceable strike. While this is in progress a group of strange men, imported from a thousand miles away, come into your city, in charge of a private

detective. They do not come to settle among you as neighbors. They do not come to cast in their lot with the citizens of the city where your humble home is established. They come as aliens, as enemies, as professional "strike breakers," and their coming means the loss of your home as the alternative of continuing in the slavish dependence for a negligently livelihood upon the soulless body corporate for which you work.

Perhaps you wouldn't heave a brick at the interlopers. But have you ever been put to a similar test and withstood the temptation?

If it were true that strikers wantonly prevent their fellow citizens who are nonunion men from working, something might be said for the "strike breaking" business. But it is not true. When they do interfere in this way it is not wantonly, but as part of a struggle between two sets of men, each wanting the same scarce jobs and each needing them in order to live and rear their families. One set is meekly willing to suffer greater impoverishment to get them, while the other adopts the more strenuous policy of fighting for them.

"We are contending," protested the president of the Erie railroad, referring to the anthracite coal strike, "for the right of the American citizen to work without regard to creed, nationality, or association," and he went on to declare that it is a crime to prevent this.

Is that liberty loving gentleman quite sure that he was not talking just for buncombe? Didn't he really mean that he and his monopoly associates were contending for power to control the American citizen's right to work? And isn't that what his sympathizers wished to see?

For instance, the anthracite coal area of Pennsylvania is very extensive. Only a small part of it is open for mining. The rest is kept closed by so-called owners.

If their privileges of monopolizing natural resources were abolished, American citizens, "regardless of creed, nationality or association," could voluntarily exercise their right to work by working there. Nor would capital be lacking to open and

operate these coal deposits, though it is lacking to buy permission to do so.

But what would the president of the Erie road and his sympathizers say to a proposition to secure to the American citizen the right to work, by giving him access to the monopolized natural coal deposits? Would they say it is a crime to prevent it?

If they would, then the virtue of sincerity may be attributed to the sentiment he expressed when denouncing the miners' union for interfering with the right to work. If they would not, then the liberty loving sentiment which he expressed and his sympathizers profess to admire is a good doctrine in a bad cause, quoted merely because it happens momentarily to serve a selfish purpose. The devil often quotes Scripture in that spirit.

There would be no interference by labor unions with the right to work, if men like this railroad president and his sympathizers did not systematically restrict the right to work by forestalling and monopolizing natural opportunities for work. There would be no excuse for "strike breakers" if land monopolists were not such effective strike makers.

ARTHUR H. STEPHENSON AND JOHN H. MOORE.

The recent death of these two men, both unknown to that larger world which buzzes away with its sensations and follies, but in their respective parts of the country prominent figures among thoughtful people, adds to the roll of those who have responded to Henry George's "clarion call" and like himself have passed away almost before the opening of the battle he planned.

Widely separated by distance and unknown to each other, Mr. Stephenson in Philadelphia and Mr. Moore in Texas had for nearly two decades, each in his own way and among his own people, devoted themselves to the popularizing of George's theory of social regeneration. Either might have been a plutocrat in his social ideals and political affiliations without exciting special wonder. For both were, by comparison at any rate, favorites of

fortune. Yet each turned away from the temptations of personal "success" to work for the general good.

Mr. Moore was the son of a wealthy slaveowner, once chief justice of Texas. His own opportunities in the conventional Democracy of a generation ago were good enough to advance him, while still a young man, from a seat in the Texas legislature to the post of secretary of state. But personal advantages lost their importance to him when George's voice awoke the sterling democracy of his nature; and in the fullness of health and at the height of a promising public career he embraced the then unpopular cause.

The circumstances of Mr. Stephenson's choice of a life were not much different. It was a brilliant commercial career that opened before him, and which, without being undiligent in business, he subordinated to the higher calling to which "Progress and Poverty" invited him. He was among the very first to respond to George's call. Throughout the rest of his life he never wavered with reference either to the moral principles involved or the economic adjustments proposed, nor hesitated in the work for their realization.

Both were men of reasonable financial means, of about the same age, of great natural abilities, and of excellent educational acquirements. In business the one was successful in spite of his practical and effective devotion to a moral ideal. The other, had his health not suddenly failed him, would doubtless have risen to political leadership while impressing that ideal upon the common sentiment of his State. They were types of men whom it is a satisfaction to contemplate in times when the spirit of money-making has become an obsession and spectacular examples of mere success are held up to the young for emulation.

ANGER.

The tendency of a good deal of modern writing and preaching is to discredit anger of all degrees and kinds. We might mention certain much-read periodicals and books that savor of a constant peaches-and-cream sweetness. They would criticize the devil himself with gentle-

ness and forbearance. Their cue seems to be to assume an air of judicial superiority which forbids them ever to be angry or even indignant.

The philosophy of these superior people seems to rest in the idea that "all's well with the world," warping Browning's saying out of its true interpretation. We must believe that "all's well with the world," so far as God's laws are concerned; but to use the expression with the extended idea that man's acceptance of, and dealing with, God's laws are all well, is simply playing with words.

Another cause of this all-serene attitude probably lies in the surrender of the idea of an absolute standard of right and wrong. All right and wrong being merely relative, who can say that this or that course of action is right or wrong? And so, why condemn anything, without a large and exceptional "but"? If we cannot be sure that anything is evil, then of course we cannot "hate the thing that is evil."

Doubtless also some of this notion of the advisable suppression of all anger is due to a partial view of the words of Jesus. Some think of him as meek and lowly, and forget that he was more. No one ever showed more of genuine anger, or gave stronger expression to his passion. Can we imagine a more stinging epithet than to call a class of men "sons of snakes"? And yet this is the literal translation of words which Jesus in his anger—why should we shirk the word?—applied to certain men whom he saw in Jerusalem.

We have said this much merely for the purpose of introducing a quotation from the Rev. C. Ernest Smith, an Episcopal clergyman of Baltimore, who is reported by the Sun to have spoken as follows in a recent sermon:

"What is the need of anger? First, the whole man needs anger as part of his make-up, along with the sterner qualities of an inflexible will, aggressive courage and righteous indignation. Lacking these he is developed but on one side. Second, the world itself is poorer without it. Anger has its part to play. When a man sees some dastardly deed, it is his business to express his opinion in a clear, unmistakable manner. In doing so the very air is clearer and

the atmosphere is purer. I imagine if the coal operators, whose hearts, judging from the recent conference, are as hard as the coal they mine, were confronted with an angry public we would have coal in a short time. The world is ever better for righteous indignation expressed at vile wrong.

"Finally, remember the prohibition 'sin not.' Ordinarily a man should keep cool at any personal injustice, but he will do well ordinarily to be angry at an injustice to another. Doubtless there are other excellent ways of meeting the wrongs of the world, such as kindness, but there are times when kindness fails and then the only weapon in the Christian quiver is a strong, righteous indignation. Failing in that, the Christian has failed in his duty."

This seems to us an excellent view of the just province of anger, as a passion not selfish but wholesome. Have we not recently had an instance, how by a brief display of it "the very air is clearer and the atmosphere is purer." Fortunately Baer made Odell angry, and Odell's words in reply have given the American people as genuine satisfaction as any of the many that have been uttered during the coal strike. By speaking out in righteous anger Odell came at once to the point of immediate difficulty in the settlement of the strike, and came to it with an emphasis that cleared the atmosphere of murkiness. "You've got to recognize the union," says Odell. "We won't do it," says Baer. This is straight talk; and how much better appearance even Baer makes than in his pious letter of blessed memory!

Another point in the preacher's discourse is worthy of note, where he says, "Ordinarily a man should keep cool at any personal injustice, but he will do well ordinarily to be angry at an injustice to another." This is the doctrine which has been ably supported by Bishop Gore in his very interesting commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. In this work the Bishop argues that one should be angry at an injury to one's self only when the injury is of such a nature as to be social rather than personal. It would appear that this distinction is the key to the true interpretation of the New Testament doctrine, where certainly no argument can be found for a weakish or compromising condemnation of social injustice.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

The anthracite coal strike (p.421) was compromised on the 16th.

At the time of our report last week the President had proposed to Mr. Mitchell that if Mr. Mitchell would secure the immediate termination of the strike the President would appoint a commission to investigate the merits of the strike and do all in his power to settle the questions at issue in accordance with its report. Mr. Mitchell had replied to this proposal, but his letter had not yet been made public. It is dated the 8th and was published on the 10th. After a courteous introduction, in which he tells the President that he has consulted with the district presidents of the miners' union, who fully concur in his own views, Mr. Mitchell writes:

We desire to assure you again that we feel keenly the responsibility of our position and the gravity of the situation, and it would give us great pleasure to take any action which would bring this coal strike to an end in a manner that would safeguard the interests of our constituents. In proposing that there be an immediate resumption of coal mining upon the conditions we suggested in the conference at the white house we believed that we had gone more than half way and had met your wishes. It is unnecessary in this letter to refer to the malicious assault made upon us in the response of the coal operators. We feel confident that you must have been impressed with the fairness of our proposition and the insincerity of those who maligned us. Having in mind our experience with the coal operators in the past, we have no reason to feel any degree of confidence in their willingness to do us justice in the future; and inasmuch as they have refused to accept the decision of a tribunal selected by you, and inasmuch as there is no law through which you could enforce the findings of the commission you suggest, we respectfully decline to advise our people to return to work simply upon the hope that the coal operators might be induced or forced to comply with the recommendations of your commission. As stated above, we believe that we went more than half way in our proposal at Washington, and we do not feel that we should be asked to make further sacrifice. We appreciate your solicitude for the people of our country who are now, and will be, subjected to great suffering and inconvenience by a prolongation of the coal strike, and we feel that the onus of this terrible state of affairs should be placed upon the side which has refused

to defer to fair and impartial investigation.

Closely following Mr. Mitchell's letter, Secretary Root came on from Washington to New York and conferred with J. Pierpont Morgan on the latter's yacht. Two days after the Root-Morgan interview, a conference of representatives of the coal carrying roads was held at New York. On the same day Mr. Morgan went to Washington with his partner, Robert R. Bacon, arriving at 9 in the morning. They were met and immediately conducted by Secretary Root to the White House, where a conference lasting into the early hours of the 14th took place between Mr. Morgan, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Root and President Roosevelt. At its close Secretary Cortelyou gave to the press an address to the public which Morgan and Bacon had laid before the President. This address, signed by Geo. T. Baer, E. B. Thomas, W. H. Truesdale, T. P. Fowler, R. M. Oliphant and Alfred Waters (the latter for the Lehigh Valley, which had not before appeared), thus coming from all the anthracite coal and coal carrying interests, is too lengthy for reproduction here in full. It opens with the statement that "there are in the anthracite regions about 75 operating companies and firms and 147,000 miners and workmen (of which 30,000 are under age), comprising some 20 nationalities and dialects," and asserts that "of these workmen possibly one half belong to the United Mine Workers' Union, of which John Mitchell is president." The address then declares that from 7,000 to 10,000 miners are now at work, and many more have wished to work but have been prevented by violence, continued and steadily increasing, which Mr. Mitchell "either cannot or will not prevent." As to wages it expresses the belief of the coal companies that "the wages paid in the coal regions are fair and full, and all that the business in its normal condition has been able to stand if the capital invested is to have any reasonable return." In explanation of the refusal to arbitrate, the address insists that its signers "are not and never have been unwilling to submit all questions between them and their workmen to any fair tribunal for decision," but that they of not willing to enter into arbitration with the miners' right union," which they describe as "an organization chiefly composed of men in a rival and competing and

terest," the allusion here being to a preliminary statement that the miners' union "was originally formed in the bituminous coal region, and three-fourths of its members are miners of bituminous coal." The address also puts its refusal to accept the arbitration heretofore proposed upon the further ground that such arbitrations ignore the right of miners to work in safety whether they are union men or not. In conclusion the address proposes terms of settlement as follows:

We suggest a commission to be appointed by the President of the United States (if he is willing to perform that public service) to whom shall be referred all questions at issue between the respective companies and their own employes, whether they belong to a union or not, but decision of that commission shall be accepted by us. The commission is to be constituted as follows: (1) An officer in the engineer corps of either the military or naval service of the United States; (2) an expert mining engineer, experienced in the mining of coal and other minerals and not in any way connected with coal mining properties, either anthracite or bituminous; (3) one of the judges of the United States courts of the Eastern district of Pennsylvania; (4) a man of prominence eminent as a sociologist; (5) a man who, by active participation in mining and selling coal, is familiar with the physical and commercial features of the business. It being the understanding that immediately upon the constitution of such commission, in order that idleness and nonproduction may cease instantly, the miners will return to work and cease all interference with and persecution of any nonunion men who are working, or shall hereafter work. The findings of this commission shall fix the date when the same shall be effective, and shall govern the conditions of employment between the respective companies and their employes for a term of at least three years.

The foregoing proposal was not satisfactory to the strike leaders because it made no provision for allowing the strikers any representation in the arbitration board, while it did provide for representation for the corporation; and Mr. Mitchell went to Washington on the 14th to confer with the President. All of the 16th was spent in negotiations through the President with the conflicting parties, with the result that at 20 minutes after two o'clock on the morning of the 16th the following official announcement was given out at the White House to the newspapers:

After a conference with Mr. Mitchell,

and some further conference with representatives of the coal operators, the President has appointed the members of the commission to inquire into, consider and pass upon all questions at issue between the operators and miners in the anthracite coal fields:

Mr. E. W. Parker, Washington, D. C., as an expert mining engineer. Mr. Parker is chief statistician of the coal division of the United States geological survey and the editor of the *Engineering and Mining Journal of New York*.

Hon. George Gray, Wilmington, Del., as a judge of a United States court.

Mr. E. E. Clark, Cedar Rapids, Ia., grand chief of the Order of Railway Conductors, as a sociologist, the President assuming that for the purposes of such a commission the term sociologist means a man who has thought and studied deeply on social questions, and has practically applied his knowledge.

Mr. Thomas H. Watkins, Scranton, Pa., as a man practically acquainted with the mining and selling of coal.

Bishop John L. Spalding, of Peoria, Ill. The president has added Bishop Spalding's name to the commission.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright has been appointed recorder of the commission.

The compromise consisted in the appointment of Bishop Spalding as the special representative of the miners. Both sides are understood to have accepted the commission as appointed.

The Detroit conference over the coal strike, which was assembling as our last report (p. 422) was written, adjourned on the 9th after a long one-day's session. Its work consisted in the adoption of an address and the appointment of a committee to transmit the address to President Roosevelt and to call another meeting of the conference in its discretion. The address urges the President to instruct the attorney general to institute civil and criminal proceedings against the coal trust under the inter-state commerce act; to direct the inter-state commerce commission to investigate; and to advise Congress to empower the inter-state commerce commission to fix rates of transportation. It requests the governor of Pennsylvania to call a special session of the legislature and advise it to provide for the condemnation of coal mines and coal carrying roads under the principle of eminent domain. It requests the President to call a special session of the lower house of Congress and recommend to it the appointment of a committee of investigation. It censures the representatives of the

roads and mines, and expresses sympathy with the miners. It condemns the bituminous operators for taking advantage of the situation to raise the price of bituminous coal. Finally, it compliments President Roosevelt. Senator Mason, of Illinois, was permanent chairman of the conference.

The New Orleans street car strike (p. 424) came to an end on the 12th, through mutual agreement. Both the militia and the police were largely in sympathy with the strikers in their riotous demonstrations against imported "strike breakers," and at one time the city was reported to be under the control of a mob. On the 11th Gov. Heard issued a peace proclamation, and on the following day the strikers accepted the proposal which he had exacted from the companies. The basis of settlement is 20 cents an hour for a minimum day of seven hours and a half and a maximum of ten, no discrimination to be made against strikers. On the 13th, accordingly, the cars resumed operations after an interval of two weeks.

In American politics the period for nominating conventions has about drawn to a close. The latest convention to meet is that of the Republicans of Rhode Island, which assembled at Providence on the 9th and nominated Charles Dean Kemble for governor.

In the Ohio campaign Senator Hanna's party proceeded on the 7th from Barnesville (p. 423) to Bridgeport, the center of a tin plate industry, where they had an audience of between 4,000 and 5,000. They were at Marietta on the 8th, where a small opera house was packed to hear them. The Republican candidate for secretary of state, Mr. Laylin, takes the part of attacking Mayor Johnson at these meetings, though Senator Hanna contributes to that part of the discussion. It was authoritatively announced at Athens on the 9th that the Republican speakers would not accept invitations to discuss the issues from Democratic platforms. This was in answer to invitations to debate. At Logan on the 9th the party spoke in a circus tent. On the 10th Senator Hanna's future engagements were cancelled, owing to his illness, though he filled that date at Columbus before an audience of 4,000 or more.

Mayor Johnson's campaigning party went from Wooster on the 6th (p. 423) to Orrville, in the same county, Wayne, on the 7th. Mr. Bigelow, the Democratic candidate for secretary of state, announced at this meeting that he would hold tent meetings for six nights in Hamilton county, and invited the Republican candidate, Mr. Laylin, to be present at any or all his meetings to discuss the questions of home rule, equal taxation, and any other issue of direct interest to the people of Ohio. The meeting at Orrville, a town of 2,000 inhabitants, numbered 3,000. Next the party went to Massillon, in Stark county, a Republican locality, where they were greeted by an audience of 4,500. At Canton, in the same county, on the 9th, the large tent was too small. Over 5,500 got inside and thousands were turned away, the weather being too cold to permit of raising the sides of the tent as had been done elsewhere. For the first time Mr. Bigelow was not present, he having parted company with Mayor Johnson to hold meetings in other parts of the state. Newton D. Baker, of Cleveland, has taken Mr. Bigelow's place in the Johnson tent. The recreancy of the Republican auditor of this county, with reference to railroad taxation, was the text for part of Mayor Johnson's speech at this meeting. Mr. Bigelow spoke the same night at Lancaster, Fairfield county, which is Democratic, to an audience reported by the dispatches to have been immense. He was supported by ex-Attorney General Frank Monnett and W. G. Lawrence, the coal miner who is running against Grosvenor for Congress. Mr. Bigelow spoke at Sidney in the Democratic county of Shelby, on the 10th, while Johnson was at Alliance, still in Stark county. Johnson's audience numbered 3,500; Bigelow's is not reported. While Mr. Baker was speaking at the Alliance meeting, he asked the audience, "Why shouldn't the railroads pay taxes as other people?" Before he could proceed, a Republican interrupted with a reply based upon a party campaign document: "Because Tom Johnson don't pay his taxes." Mr. Baker was as prompt as his questioner. He said:

That is no reason. If Tom Johnson don't pay his taxes, make Tom Johnson and the railroads both pay. As a matter of fact the people of Cleveland do not believe that Tom Johnson owes any taxes. They have been trying to prove it for five years, and during all that

time all the city officials have been Republicans, all the judges have been Republicans and the tax inquisitor is a Republican. And they have not been able to collect those taxes which they claim Tom Johnson owes. With a good rake off for many of the officials, and with the additional incentive of partisan hostility against the mayor don't you suppose that those Republicans would have collected the taxes if there were any to collect?

From Alliance Johnson went on the 11th to Salem, in the Republican county of Columbiana, where the night was stormy and his audience numbered only 2,800. After a Sunday's rest, the last week of the tour was begun by Mr. Johnson, supported by John H. Clarke, of Cleveland, and John S. Crosby, of New York, before an audience of 4,700 at Youngstown, in the Republican county of Mahoning.

While the Johnson and Hanna forces are stumping the State of Ohio, the two houses of the legislature, both Republican, have been trying to come to an agreement on the bill for making a municipal code for cities. At the time of our last report (p. 409) each house had a separate bill before it. In acting upon its own bill, the lower house has adopted a clause curing the defects in the 50 year franchise law so as to make the Cincinnati street franchise secure; and on the 2d it defeated a home rule amendment by cutting off debate. On the 7th it rejected the senate bill, passing its own, and immediately afterward the senate rejected the house bill. A conference committee was appointed the following day. Only one Democrat is on this committee and he had voted with the street car Republicans on the franchise clause. Democrats therefore declare that the committee is solidly Republican. The committee holds its sessions behind closed doors. Latest reports from the committee room are to the effect that the Cincinnati or "board plan" of city government will be adopted.

An international question has been decided this week by the arbitration court at The Hague, the first decision of that tribunal since its establishment pursuant to the peace conference of 1899. (See Public, No. 60, p. 9; No. 61, p. 10; No. 62, p. 10; No. 63, p. 10; No. 69, p. 9, and No. 70, p. 10.) The parties to the controversy were Mexico and the

United States, and the subject matter what is known as the "Pius fund." A trust fund for the support of Roman Catholic missions in the Californias was established in 1697, the trustee being the Society of Jesus. Seventy years later, the Spanish crown having expelled the Jesuits from Mexico and the Californias, assumed the administration of the fund through a crown commission. This continued until Mexico achieved her independence, after which she continued to administer the fund through a government commission. But upon ceding upper California to the United States, Mexico discontinued distributions of the income of the fund to the Catholic church there. In 1868 the Roman Catholic prelates of California made claims upon Mexico, through the American government, and the question was submitted to Sir Edward Thornton, as umpire, the delegates of the two governments disagreeing. Thornton decided that the income should be apportioned equally between the church in California and the church in Lower California, and required Mexico to pay the church in California \$904,700, being interest from 1848 to 1869. This payment was made, but Mexico refused to continue the annual distribution between the two churches, on the ground that the umpire had exceeded his authority in deciding that the obligation in favor of the California church was a customary one. On complaint of the Roman Catholic bishop of California, the United States government began pressing the claim in 1897 with the result of securing an agreement submitting it to The Hague tribunal; and that body made a decision on the 14th, holding that Sir Edward Thornton's award was conclusive and condemning Mexico to pay to the United States \$1,820,000 in Mexican currency on the 2d of February, 1903, and \$43,050.99 annually thereafter forever. The United States was represented before The Hague tribunal by Jackson H. Ralston, of Washington.

NEWS NOTES.

—The crown prince of Siam called upon President Roosevelt at the temporary White House on the 11th.

—By orders promulgated on the 15th the war department has reduced the strength of the army to the minimum prescribed by law, 59,600.

—The Grand Army of the Republic

held its annual encampment at Washington last week. It elected Gen. J. T. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, as commander in chief.

—Carroll D. Wright has been chosen president of Clark college, Worcester, Mass., and has announced his intention in consequence of resigning his office of United States labor commissioner.

—A public memorial meeting in honor of the memory of the late Arthur H. Stephenson, the Philadelphia single tax leader, was held at Odd Fellows' hall, Philadelphia, on the 12th.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the two months ending September 30, 1902, as given by the September treasury sheet, are as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M	\$299,012,122	\$245,701,296	\$53,310,824 exp.
G	10,490,723	5,876,700	4,614,023 exp.
S	12,049,685	6,617,321	5,432,364 exp.
	\$322,552,490	\$258,195,319	\$64,357,171 exp.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE ANTHRACITE STRIKE.

Columbus (O.) Daily Press (Dem.), Oct. 14.—How condescending the coal kings have become at last. They are willing to arbitrate if allowed to "pack the jury," which the President can have the "honor" of naming.

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Oct. 11.—The feeling among the men of the national guard is very different this year from what it was on former occasions, when called out by labor troubles. The sentiment of the Pittsburg regiments, and the crowds who saw them go off, was evidently in sympathy with the miners.

Albany (N. Y.) Argus (Dem.), Oct. 11.—Public ownership of the anthracite coal mines, with just compensation to their present owners, is the way out. The Democratic plank is not radical, not hasty, not ill-considered; but conservative, wise, and calculated merely to put fuel, like water, another necessity of life, beyond the control of private monopoly.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Oct. 11.—We have been asleep eaters. And the awakening is upon us. We were soothed to sleep with promises. We were content to let well enough alone. We are asked to do it again. We are asked to draw the frayed blanket tighter about our shoulders and turn over and go to sleep once more, lest we lose the bed and the blanket and the time to sleep.

Duluth News-Tribune (Rep.), Oct. 8.—There is nothing for the strikers to do but to go back to work without any concessions whatever from the operators, accepting a technical defeat, but achieving a grand triumph in winning the good will of the whole American people, who are resolved to investigate this question to the bottom, and to see that a balance of justice is hereafter struck between these poor men and their employers.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Oct. 14.—Never was a surrender to circumstances more ungraciously made; never were the conditions made by a defeated party couched in more dictatorial phrase; never were the facts forcing a surrender more deliberately distorted and the cause and course of the opposing party so virulently assailed, as they have been in the statement issued by the six presidents agreeing to arbitrate where for six months

they have stubbornly insisted there was nothing to arbitrate.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Oct. 15.—It is almost an affront to the President and is a reflection upon the character of the United States judiciary that the operators are not content to submit their case to any judge of the United States selected by the President, even though he does not hold court in "the Eastern district of Pennsylvania." . . . It would be interesting to inquire who appointed these judges, whether they were recommended by Senator Quay or Penrose, or both, and whether the Pennsylvania railroad approved their "papers" before they were sent in.

CAUSE OF COAL MINE MONOPOLY.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Oct. 10.—The Reading company alone owns many thousands of acres of anthracite coal lands. Just what proportion of its more than princely estate it is using in its operations does not appear, but probably not a fourth of it. The rest is merely forestalled. The Reading company is enabled thus to monopolize coal lands which it does not use and which it cannot at present use only by reason of a favor extended it in violation of the law. This favor takes the form of merely nominal taxes upon its unused opportunities. . . . Can there be any justification of the privilege it enjoys of having land worth \$1,000 or more an acre taxed on a valuation as low as \$2.50 per acre?

THE BUCKLIN BILL IN COLORADO.

Durango (Col.) Democrat (Dem.), Oct. 9.—Every tax dodger, every land gambler, every useless speculator, every grabber of a special franchise, every plutocrat who loves the dear people so much that he is unwilling to get off their backs, and all their attorneys and hangers-on, are trying their worst to defeat the Australasian tax amendment.

TOM L. JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.)—If the Democratic party of the nation is ever to become the close-knit and disciplined body which it must be if it is successfully to contest for supremacy with the effectively-managed Republican organization, it must develop such a leadership as this—strong, resourceful, masterful, paying little attention to old party labels, but making principles the test and compelling candidates and representatives of the party to square themselves with those principles and remain squared. It is barely possible that this radical and popular millionaire of Ohio, who is displaying such a mastery in the State political field, may be the one who is to lead the national Democracy out of its present demoralization, and make of it a positive, aggressive, enlightened, radical force in the politics of the nation.

MISCELLANY

A PLEA FOR THE MINERS.

For The Public.
I sat in the autumn sunshine
On an old oak form, near a shaft,
From whence came the black, black diamonds,
Through the skill of the miner's craft.
There, deep in the darksome cavern,
He toils through the dreary day;
With naught of the warmth and sunshine;
Endangering life for pay.
Tolling, clearly tolling,
For pittance meager and small;
Grimy, dirty, appalling—
Just barely existing, that's all.
Shut out from the light of Heaven,
And the charm that Nature gives,

Braving the "damps" and gases,
Is the daily life he lives.

By the power of gold ensiaven
He toils in his prison cell,
Where the light of day is hidden
In the dusk of a rayless Hell.

Befouled by slime and water,
Choked by its noisome breath,
He asks that you pity his torture
In his somber vaults of death,

And make for the struggling miner
An earnest, daily prayer,
That his life may know of comfort,
As of toll, its honest share,

Only the right of living
As a human being should live,
And the ease for his famished children
That his constant toil should give.

This is the boon the miner craves—
His honest share from the mine:
Yet CORPORATE GREED is digging
graves,

And claims "ITS RIGHTS DIVINE."
T. S. HAYES.

THE FARMERS' PROSPERITY.

An extract from a private letter from a farmer in Minnesota, dated September 23, 1902.

I am a farmer, living in one of the most, if not the most, fertile farming sections in the United States, but there are not good times here. Hogs are high, because cholera has swept us for a number of years. Only a few favored ones escaped. Beef cattle are high, because there was no grain to fatten them. Two-thirds of the farms are encumbered, and hopelessly so. And our delinquent tax list every spring tells of a condition of things that is far from prosperous. Everything we wish to buy is rising in price. Lumber has gotten above the reach of the average person, and we, living almost within hearing of the largest sawmills in the world. Our clothing and food are of the cheapest and plainest kind. We labor 15 hours per day. The farmers' children labor from the time they are able to carry a hoe or a fork until they are grown up, and then very often they are broken in health. The schooling the average farmer's boy gets is comparatively nothing, so he reaches maturity starved in body and mind. The generation of to-day are far more ignorant than their parents, and, like the serfs of old, are becoming utterly oblivious of their surroundings.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.
HE DOESN'T GIVE OFFICES FOR VOTES.

A suave officeseeker who appeared at the city hall yesterday seeking an appointment on the board of elections for one of his friends was turned down summarily. His face was unknown within the confines of the hall, but he

asked to see the secretary of the board in private. This was granted him. After announcing his name and stating confidentially that he was a Republican he asked if there were any vacancies on the board.

"I have a friend in the Fifteenth ward," he said, "who would like to get on the board. What can you do for him?"

Secretary Gongwer announced to his caller that there were no vacancies at present, but that he would be pleased to consider his friend's name if there should be one at any time. He then took the name and address.

"Make a place for him if you can," added the suave caller, "it will mean several votes for the Democratic party. I am a Republican myself, and so is my friend. We have several other friends and they will vote the Democratic ticket if you get this man a job."

"You had better take this name. You may need it. We won't," was the reply of the secretary as he showed his caller to the door.

"What is the matter?" exclaimed the man in astonishment.

"Nothing," said the secretary, "except that we don't want any votes, not in that way."

"You won't consider the name, then?" exclaimed the visitor.

"No."

"You will lose the votes for the party."

"All right. I told you we didn't want them."

"I'll see the board," said the man, angrily, as he turned and walked out.—*Cleveland Plain Dealer of October 7.*

CAUSES OF THE COAL STRIKE.

For The Public.

The Bishop of Central Pennsylvania is quite clear in his mind that the striking miners precipitated the crisis when no real grievances existed which could not have been peaceably adjusted.

"Precipitated" is a good word to describe what has taken place. Two perfectly clear liquors by mixing become cloudy, and a precipitate is the result. But there has been something done beforehand to induce this precipitation.

Surely there is a cause in this case. Doth the wild ass bray when he hath grass? Or loweth the ox over his fodder? For years the coal miners have been oppressed in ways difficult to endure. They have been obliged to mine from 20 to 50 per cent. above the legal weight for a ton. Their wages have been cut down, while the price of coal

has gone up. They have been obliged to pay more than the market price for powder. They have not been able to work full time, nor to get into the breakers the coal they have mined; reducing their wages by this much. In many cases they have been compelled to deal at the company's store, and pay more by from 5 to 25 per cent. than the market price for food and clothing. They paid their bills before they received their wages. They are tenants at will, and liable to be ordered away from the village at the merest whim of the superintendent, or boss of the mine. And things of this sort have been going on for years. In some cases these miners were not allowed to have any opinion of their own in politics, and in religion they could not follow their preferences.

An ancient philosopher asked, when there arose a difference of opinion between himself and a Roman emperor, on a question of ethics: Who can argue with the master of 20 legions? But the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania expects an ignorant, unlettered Hungarian to argue freely with Mr. Baer, of the Reading Coal & Iron company—the Mr. Baer to whom Almighty God in his wise providence has committed for administration the coal lands of Schuylkill county.

But although there is no objection to an understanding among gentlemen by which six or seven men have it in their power to say to the people of the United States, "You must pay our price for anthracite coal or go without it," there is very serious objection to a trade union among 150,000 coal miners, who are asking for wages to enable them to live decently. The gentlemen have a right to come to an understanding. But the miners have no right to form a union.

Is not the right of the poor to form a union for mutual help and protection a God-given right? Is the right to conduct one's own business God-given? Is the right to own the business of coal mining a God-given right? The right to form a trade union arises from the nature of trade. But these so-called God-given rights which the Bishop of Central Pennsylvania and Mr. Baer are so strenuously defending are all the creatures of special, legislative privileges. They are rights to rob men under the forms of law. And having these legal privileges in their possession, the presidents of these coal and mining companies are strong enough to disregard the wishes of the president of the United States, and the people of the country. They

pay no more regard to Mr. Roosevelt than to a small boy on the street, while they lecture him soundly on his duty as commander in chief of the army.

The Bishop of Central Pennsylvania is to be congratulated upon the good company he keeps. He uses the precise arguments of the great seven arbiters of the coal regions. If John Mitchell, who seems to be "singularly lacking in the qualities of real masterful leadership," were only a presbyter in good standing of the Diocese of Central Pennsylvania, how easy it would be to shut his mouth. Yet even in Pennsylvania most people still believe that the commonwealth is so constructed that it should be a government of laws and not of men. But the Bishop's friends are living, and working, and exercising their God-given rights in open defiance of the constitution of Pennsylvania, which forbids coal miners to be coal carriers. Yet they clamor for the protection of the law.

LECTOR.

HARD AS PHARAOH'S HEART.

In that wonderful book is an account thirty-five centuries old of the emancipation of the children of Israel, true to the history of the human race in all periods of its struggles. And one phase of it carries a truth that lies deeper than the facts.

You remember that Moses and Aaron made their remonstrance to Pharaoh after the tale of bricks was doubled and the supply of straw was withheld, to which Pharaoh gave no attention.

Then the river was turned to blood, yet Pharaoh heeded not.

When the plague of frogs came Pharaoh was moved to send for the prophets and entreat them to release the land from the curse. But when he saw there was respite Pharaoh hardened his heart.

Plague of lice followed, but Pharaoh's heart was hardened. Plague of flies made the nation miserable; Pharaoh again hardened his heart. Plague of murrain added disaster to discomfort. Pharaoh's heart was hardened.

Here comes the remarkable feature of the narrative. When the plague of boils was visited upon them, "the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh." Then the scourge of hail, devastating the land, and again he hardened his heart.

But when the locusts ate up every green thing that was left by the hail, and when darkness over the land af-

flicted them with nameless terror, "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart."

With clang of doom the verse recurs, "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart," "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart."

In the beginning he was free to let the Israelites go. As the fearful experiment proceeded, he became powerless to recede from his obstinacy. And in the final chapters of the exodus he ceased to have will power of his own. Events had encrusted his obstinacy, had ossified his will. The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart."

In his terror he would have given anything to be rid of the curse; his agony impelled him to make any concession to escape the doom. Appeals from every side urged him to let them go, but he could not. God's logic bound him to the bitter struggle. He was helpless to avoid the catastrophe, as he was to flee when the wall of water in the Red sea swept down to engulf him and his chariots and his horses. His heart was hardened, and at the last, The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart.

Do you suppose Pharaoh was egregiously wicked, eminently cruel? He was probably no worse than the average potentate of his day, no prouder than the typical tyrant of every generation.

He was no more stupid than George III., whose fatuous stubbornness cost England the colonies and gave America its excuse for being. He was no worse blinded than the slave holders whose folly brought on the civil war and ended in emancipation of the blacks.

He was of the same mold as the Spaniard who could not let Cuba go its gait to work out its own salvation or fail in the supreme hazard. He was no worse; he was probably equally with these conscientious.

It is easy enough to sit here and make faces at Pharaoh. But he was made of ordinary human nature. Any other gentleman who succeeded to the despotic powers of fourteen generations of ancestors would also be a despot. That's in human nature. Pharaoh was undoubtedly a gentleman according to the standards of his time, a pious gentleman, no doubt, as pious as Baer.

Speaking of Baer, whose name has recently been uncommonly rich in execration, Baer is no worse than any tyrant. He has wielded despotic power. It has made him a despot. He has hardened his pious heart. And as events roll on his heart is hardened.

Shall we read the last clanging verse into it? That would be presumption. For the record is not complete and he may have saving graces that Pharaoh missed. There may be some lurking sense of humor in him to prevent the summit of folly.

So far as the record goes, at least, he is true to tradition, reflects the character which the bible unerringly portrays.

Read the chapter in Exodus and compare it with Baer's haughty insolence before the coal conference. Is it not Pharaoh word for word, Pharaoh's lineaments carved in the modern lord of the taskfolk, Pharaoh's traits graven in the twentieth century rebel against doom? Does it not stir in one something of the same indignation that rises over the record of that obstinacy thirty-five centuries ago?

It seems so silly, Baer's headstrong insistence on going to his ruin. He would rather lose everything than yield an inch. He can't help it. He is in the same fix that Pharaoh was.

It is wonderful how truly the great drama depicts the characters that move in it. Not a feature is missing. We marvel at Pharaoh's contumely. Yet here in contemporaneous records, we pick up the newspaper and follow the identical performance in its republican setting.

From pride, vainglory and hypocrisy—do you know why those three words are so linked in the liturgy—good Lord deliver us.—John Stone Pardee, in Red Wing (Minn.) Argus of October 9.

TOM JOHNSON TO THE FRONT.

An editorial, with the above title, which appeared in the New York Nation of September 11.

The Ohio Democratic state convention at Sandusky on September 3 must challenge the attention of politicians throughout the country. It revealed Tom L. Johnson as the absolute dictator of the Democratic organization this year, and apparently assured his nomination for governor by the party next year. Moreover, it has given him a position of such importance that his views regarding the proper policy for the Democratic party to pursue with reference to the campaign of 1904 will carry great weight.

Mr. Johnson's victory marked the application to the whole state of the power which he has wielded over the Democrats of Cleveland during the past 18 months. A year ago last April he ran for mayor of the city, and was elected by a great majority. In the following November he secured the

election to the legislature from Cleveland of several members who accepted all that he stood for. During the past few months he has been steadily extending his influence throughout the state, until at last he was strong enough to invade Hamilton county (Cincinnati), so long controlled by John R. McLean, and to beat that boss in his home. After that, all was plain sailing. Mr. Johnson controlled the whole organization of the convention, became its presiding officer and saw the platform which he had written accepted without the change of a word.

The man who has thus come to the front in Ohio Democracy is one of the most interesting and picturesque figures developed in our politics for a number of years. A poor boy, he made himself very rich by availing himself of all the advantages allowed by our laws, and then denounced the very laws by which he had so greatly profited. Thus, he enjoyed the undue protection granted the manufacturers of steel, and declared his conviction that free trade is the best policy for this nation. He dealt in street railroads charging five-cent fares, making vast sums by some of these operations, as in Brooklyn a few years ago, and then came out as a champion of three-cent fares. He improved every opportunity offered to such a man by our present system of taxation, and at the same time was the earnest supporter of Henry George and a vigorous advocate of the single tax. In short, he comes about as near as possible to standing on the platform that the methods which enabled him to acquire great wealth are wrong and ought to be abolished. He appears to have a wonderful hold upon laboring men, especially those who come within the range of his personal influence. The ordinary Democratic politicians who have aspired to the nomination for governor next year, and who went to Toledo to push their "claims," found themselves utterly neglected.

Mr. Johnson stands for radical principles regarding corporations. He would have all taxable property appraised by assessing boards at not less than its selling value. He would have the proceedings and deliberations of those boards open to the public, and a representative employed to present the interests of the public in all hearings. He would specifically provide that the property of steam railroads and other "public-service" corporations be assessed "at not less than their salable value as going concerns." He would require all "public-service" corporations to make sworn public re-

ports, and would give the power of visitation and examination over such corporations to the proper auditing officers, "to the end that the true value of the privileges had by such corporations may be made plain to the people." There are minor provisions, but here are quite enough to startle and alarm the average corporation man.

While Mr. Johnson urged that state issues should be pressed in the pending state campaign, he took pains to declare his position in regard to national politics. His platform expressly indorsed the Kansas City platform of 1900, and personally commended the candidate who stood upon that platform. Nor did he stop here. In his speech he served notice that nobody can be a good Democrat in 1902, 1903, or the first half of 1904 who is not ready to accept the platform of 1900 until that of the next presidential campaign shall be framed. The Democrats of Ohio, he declared, can identify themselves unmistakably with the Democratic party of the republic "only by acknowledging the authority of the latest national expression of party doctrine on national questions;" and, of course, the rule must apply everywhere. This means that the new leader of Ohio Democracy will oppose the "reorganizers" in the party who would put a stigma upon Bryan, and who would have Democratic state conventions ignore the Kansas City platform, as was done deliberately in Indiana a few weeks ago, in Michigan somewhat later, and in Wisconsin on Wednesday week. He stands with those Democrats in Missouri, Arkansas, North Carolina and other states in the south and west who have "reaffirmed" the Kansas City platform, and with that element in the Iowa Democracy which on September 3 fought for Bryanism on the convention floor, and cast 344 votes, as against 384 for omitting all mention of the Kansas City platform. This element is particularly strong in regions where the feeling against "the money power" is most pronounced; and many Democrats of this type openly say that they would rather have the Republicans carry the presidency again than support a so-called "conservative" Democrat who represents the "reorganizing" element in the party.

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR.

An article with the above title, by Bliss Carman, published in the Chicago Tribune of September 6.

As far as I am concerned I suppose I am not qualified to speak on the subject of labor (so called) at all. For

by "labor" one is popularly supposed to mean only physical work—work with the hands—while other kinds of work, however arduous, rejoice in the genteel title of professions. And one who is a journalist by trade is apt not to designate himself a laborer.

The truth is, however, that every man is a natural born laborer, and idleness is an unhappy disease. It is as natural and inevitable for man to work as it is for him to eat or sleep. In fact, the one is only the reflex action of the other; we receive constant nourishment and daily recuperation, and we live under an iron necessity to set free the accumulated energy which rest and food produce. It is inevitable that we should hate many kinds of work—work for which we are unfitted—but it is more inevitable that we should enjoy work of some kind.

If it were permitted to the professional mind to have opinions on practical matters I believe I should think of the strike (or of all strikes) somewhat as follows:

In the first place, the present strike, for all its wastefulness, is productive of one priceless good—it has shown people the absurdity and moral wrong in private ownership of natural monopolies. Is it not the limit of comic perversity? Here is the delightful spectacle of a great nation, with boundless resources in so necessary an article as coal, hampered and annoyed by the obstinate wrangling between an obstinate clique of powerful capitalists on one side and a band of discontented hirelings on the other. And while these two factions, each absolutely selfish, are holding their squabble week after week, the people must go in want of coal! The position is intolerable, and a poetic justice would send the delinquents quickly packing about their business and hand over the coal fields to state ownership.

Poetic justice, however, is slow, and is only wrought out through the tardy and difficult act of men as they gradually come to apprehend the finest demands of ethics and to shape their conduct accordingly.

The trouble is that the great industrial game of modern civilization is run on principles that are morally rotten. Why? Because it does not recognize right and wrong as absolute standards of conduct. Because it has superseded one false conception of life—the conception which said: "Might makes right"—and has set up in its place another equally false, the ideal which says: "Shrewdness makes right." But right and wrong are not matters that can be governed by shrewd and clever

self-interest, any more than they can be regulated by brute strength. They are matters of the heart; they always have been so, and always will be as long as the world lasts. And any form of civilization which is built on a moral judgment is bound to fall, as all its predecessors have failed before it. In our systems of ethics we have had the wit to perceive the significance of moral ideals and to declare them necessary and inviolable. In "practical life," however, as we fatuously call it, we have been content to maintain the old cutthroat system of ethics which we inherit from the beasts below us.

And yet one must always be careful not to rail against things as they are. Let us acknowledge they are bad and manfully attempt to right them. It seems to me that wealthy people are really quite as great sufferers from the social evils as the poor are, only their woes are not so apparent. The poor suffer from atrophy of the body; the rich suffer from atrophy of the soul.

Now, I think we all acknowledge that every man has a right to work. But he also has another right which custom does not recognize at all; that is, the right to own the fruit of his work. Under present conditions no matter how hard a workman may toil, no matter how eminently skillful he may be, he is only permitted to retain as much of the wealth he produces as will enable him to live and go on working. The landlord and the usurer get the rest.

This is true of all men who earn a living. The landlord and the capitalists are often, perhaps usually, workmen, too, and earn a good living, as they should. But they make more than they earn; and this is wrong, because it is made out of the earnings of other men—workmen—without the workmen's consent.

Now, the interests of labor and capital are not diverse; they are one. Both classes are bent on the production of wealth. Neither can do a thing without the assistance of the other. They must work by a compact. And yet the proceeds of their joint efforts are not divided according to any mutual agreement. For one party to the compact takes everything and allows the other party a starvation wage. To the simple hearted intelligence this seems a monstrous iniquity. I believe that it is so. Surely every man is entitled to his share of the wealth of the community in proportion to the value and difficulty of the service he renders to that community. Certainly the unintelligent workman cannot expect an equal share with his skillful fellow.

But their shares should differ in proportion to their skill, not in proportion to their chicanery. Capital has to employ labor; it also employs the laborers. But labor, quite as truly, has to employ capital. Why doesn't it employ the capitalists?

No, we shall not have any better state of affairs until we have more honest capitalists and more intelligent workmen—men who will refuse to live on the earnings of others, and men who will refuse to work slavishly for the benefit of others. Until we reach such a grade of intelligence and honesty the more strikes we have the better.

PUBLIC SERVANTS AND FREE SPEECH.

An editorial which appeared under the above title in the issue for August 14, of *The Arena*, of Melbourne, Australia.

Mr. Bent's autocratic refusal to hear a representative from the Victorian railway department who wished to make a protest on his fellow employes' behalf against the proposed treatment of them by the government, and the rebuke administered to other employes for disclosing certain figures connected with the department, invite consideration of what checks, if any, should be placed on the freedom of speech of public servants. It is generally assumed that the public service must go to the dogs if officers employed in it are given the right of criticising their superiors, and are not strictly forbidden to make public facts and figures of which their position makes them cognizant. Discipline, it is said, must be maintained, but it is very questionable whether any good results from discipline which denies to public servants the right of free speech which is allowed to other private citizens. For a railway man to adversely criticise the minister of railways on the public platform is generally recognized as a terrible offense which might reasonably be punished with dismissal, and yet the railway man might be in an excellent position to form a useful judgment on departmental matters and help the country of which he and the minister alike are servants by making his opinions and the facts upon which he bases them known to the public. Why should he not do so? The state pays him for his work as an engine driver or a clerk, and employs him for his supposed efficiency in that work, which need be in no way marred by his entertaining an unfavorable opinion of the doings of his superiors. We give our civil servants votes. We

know that they have great political influence, and that influence would surely be more healthy if they were allowed to say what they think on public matters just as happily as those outside the department.

What harm could result to the state if an engine driver, for instance, were allowed to say at a public meeting that he considered the minister an incompetent or an idler? Any man in private employment may say it; any newspaper may spread the opinion broadcast, but in the engine driver such an expression would be condemned and punished, although his capacity or his willingness to do his prescribed work would not suffer one jot in consequence. It may be said that criticism of superiors by inferiors would cause friction in the department, and there is no doubt that the inferior who took upon himself by means of press or platform to find fault with his superior would not increase his chances of promotion, for human nature is but human nature. Of course, on the other hand, by expressing valuable views or exposing some serious abuse a civil servant might enforce recognition of his usefulness and merits. At any rate, in our view the permission of outspoken comment would secure better service to the state than the present state of affairs under which grievances rankle, or are anonymously communicated to members of the press. The military idea of discipline is not properly applicable to civil affairs, nor in the conduct of state departments is secrecy as to figures, finance, or almost any of their dealings conducive to their usefulness. These institutions belong to the public, which wants all possible information concerning them, to order their conduct through its representatives in parliament who are in immediate authority over the departmental officers themselves. From every public servant there is reason for demanding diligence in his duties and absolute obedience in fulfilling his duties, but we doubt if there is any good reason for demanding, out of office hours, abstention from any form of criticism of departmental methods which would be permitted to a citizen not in government employment.

Republicans commit verbal assaults on the trusts and give them privileges. Democrats recognize in them a natural development and are not afraid of their operation when opportunity is made equal.—Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

For The Public.

President Roosevelt is growing more and more strenuous. This is manifested by his recent gymnastics to resuscitate the Monroe doctrine, while ignoring the fact that we ourselves struck the death blow.

The president says: "We believe in the Monroe doctrine, not as a means of aggression at all, it does not mean that we are aggressive toward any power;" but he fails to tell us how we believed in it in 1898—why we changed our belief in that doctrine long enough to grab the Philippines, thus meddling in the affairs of a European nation.

The president then proceeds to render an interpretation of the Monroe doctrine, quite as remarkable as his recent civil service interpretation. He says: "It means merely that as the biggest power on this continent we remain steadfastly true to the principles first formulated under the presidency of Monroe through John Quincy Adams—the principle that this continent must not be treated as a subject for political colonization by any European power."

The president refers to "principles" formulated, and quotes a "principle." Is he ignorant of the second principle underlying the Monroe doctrine? or does he think that the American people are ignorant of it? or has he failed to mention it because we have not remained "steadfastly true" to principle number two?

The substance of the Monroe doctrine is as follows:

Principle 1.—That the American continents were no longer open to the colonization of European nations; that European governments must not extend their system to any part of North or South America, nor oppress nor in any manner seek to control the destiny of any of the nations of this hemisphere.

Principle 2.—That the United States would not meddle in the political affairs of Europe.

The president evidently means to say that we remain "steadfastly true" to principle No. 1, while ignoring the rights of our European neighbors as set forth in the second principle. The Monroe doctrine is all right. It is the spirit of the Golden Rule applied to an international problem. It is the president's one-sided interpretation that is at fault—an interpretation which makes it an arbitrary, selfish thing, dependent upon might for its maintenance—an interpretation which will necessitate the

expense of an increased navy to command its observance. If President Roosevelt is going to wipe out the second principle of the Monroe doctrine by interpretation, as he did the rights of the civil service army, if he is going to continue to meddle in the political quarrels of European powers, if he proposes to police the world, he must prepare to back that policy up with ships and men and money, for Europe will most certainly retaliate.

And that is exactly what President Roosevelt proposes to do. He is not a man of peace; the fever of war is in his blood. This was recognized in Washington during the Cuban campaign, when it was ordered that in the event of battle Roosevelt's regiment should be permitted to go to the front; and doubtless it was a great disappointment to him that he struck Kettle hill, from which the last Spaniard was fleeing, instead of San Juan hill, which had been taken by the Negro troops. Since that day he seems to have brooded upon war. War is his theme. He is spreading broadcast the doctrine of war, and if he is re-elected in 1904 the United States will be plunged into war, if not before that time. The mimic war games going on are in anticipation of the real wars which are almost upon us. When we began meddling in European affairs in '98, we antagonized Germany to the very point of hostilities, and Germany has not forgotten it. Already we have cast covetous eyes upon the British West Indies. That is why we are told "they want annexation." That is another reason why we need an "efficient navy." Any thoughtful person who has had his eyes and his ears open for the past two years knows that we also need an "efficient navy" to benevolently assimilate the South American republics, and a little later, Mexico.

President Roosevelt is now engaged in preparing the American mind for the new conditions and in spurring it on to approve his policy. After interpreting the Monroe doctrine in a way which cannot fail to make trouble with Europe, by ignoring the principle which gave protection to Europe, he says to the American people: "If our formulation consists simply of statements on the stump or on paper, they are not worth the breath that utters them, or the paper on which they are written. Remember, the Monroe doctrine will be

respected as long as we have a first-class navy, and not very much longer." But he failed to tell us that this additional expense upon the taxpayer only became necessary after we ceased to respect the Monroe doctrine ourselves, and only because we repudiate one of its principles.

The president continues to "dare" the American people thus: "In private life he who asserts something, says what he is going to do, and does not back it up, is always a contemptible creature, and as a nation the last thing we can afford to do is to take a position which we do not intend to try to make good."

After this stirring dissertation, which is evidently intended to launch the increased navy, with which we will meet the European powers in whose matters we have meddled and intend to meddle, the president cries: "Shame to us if we assert the Monroe doctrine, and, if our assertion be called in question, show that we have only made an idle boast, that we are not prepared to back up our words by deeds;" which, being interpreted, meaneth, Shame if the American people fail to endorse an interpretation of the Monroe doctrine which will ensure war, and under cover of its smoke enable Roosevelt to make a grand charge and capture a second term.

REBECCA J. TAYLOR.

THE OWNERSHIP OF THE RAILROADS.

For The Public.

The irrepressible conflict between the rights and liberties of the people and the arrogance and greed of the railroad cormorants, has reached a critical stage. The coal strike has forcibly demonstrated the danger and folly of intrusting to individuals the control and management of enterprises that are completely monopolistic.

The idea, assiduously inculcated by the privileged classes, that railroads are the private property of the stockholders, is as preposterous as it is pernicious.

Railroads are public, and not private property; the fact that they are managed as if they were private property does not alter their character.

A railroad is a public highway, and its managers are public agents or state officials. It is impossible to regard them in any other light, or conceive any other relation. A railroad that is not managed by public agents is not a public highway. The state could not exercise its right of eminent domain if a railroad was private property. To

take the property of one person and bestow it upon another, even with just compensation, would be such an arbitrary exercise of the sovereign power that no state constitution would tolerate it.

Judge Jeremiah S. Black, of Pennsylvania, one of the ablest jurists this country has produced, clearly defined the legal relations existing between the state and the persons whom she authorizes to manage her highways, in an opinion rendered in the case of the Erie & N. E. R. R. vs. Casey (2 Casey pp. 307-324).

T. F. MONAHAN.

JUDGE BLACK'S DECISION.

The authority given by the Act of Assembly of October, 1855, to the defendant to take possession of the railroad is asserted by the plaintiff's counsel to be an act of confiscation—a taking of private property for public use without compensation. If this be true, the injunction ought to be awarded; for no legislature can do such a thing under our constitution. When a corporation is dissolved by the repeal of its charter, the legislature may appoint or authorize the governor to appoint a person to take charge of its assets for the benefit of its creditors and its stockholders; and this is not confiscation, any more than it is confiscation to appoint an administrator to a dead man or a committee for a lunatic. But money or goods or lands which are or were the private property of a defunct corporation, cannot be arbitrarily seized for the use of the state without compensation paid or provided. This act, however, takes nothing but the road. Is that private property? Certainly not. It is a public highway, solemnly devoted by law to the public use. When the lands were taken to build it on they were taken for public use; otherwise they could not have been taken at all. It is true the plaintiffs had a right to take tolls from all who traveled or carried freight upon it according to certain rates fixed in the charter, but that was a mere franchise, a privilege derived entirely from the charter, and it was gone when the charter was repealed. The state may grant to a corporation or to an individual the franchise of taking tolls on any highway, open or to be opened, whether it be a railroad or river, canal or bridge, turnpike or common road. When the franchise ceases by its own limitation, by forfeiture or by repeal, the highway is thrown back on the hands of the state, and it becomes her duty as the sovereign guardian of the public interests to take care of it. She may renew the franchise, give it to some other person, exercise it herself, or declare the highway open and free to all the people. If the railway itself was the private property of the stockholders, then it remains theirs, and

they may use it without a charter, as other people use their own—run it on their own account—charge what tolls they please—close it or open it when they choose proper—disregard every interest except their own. The repeal of charters on such terms would be courted by every railroad company in the state, for it would have no effect but to emancipate them from the control of law, and convert their limited privileges into a broad unbounded license. On this principle a corporation might be rewarded, but never punished for misconduct. Repeal of its charter instead of bringing it to a shameful end, would put "length of days into its right hand, and in the left riches and honor." But it is not so. Railroads made by the authority of the commonwealth upon land taken by her right of eminent domain, and established by her laws as thoroughfares for the commerce that passes through her borders, are her highways. No corporation has any property in them, though corporations may have franchises annexed to and exercisable with them.

Such a franchise the plaintiffs had, but they have it no longer. The right to take tolls on a road is an incorporeal hereditament, which may be granted to a corporation or to an individual, and the grantee has an estate in the franchise. But what estate? The estate endures forever if the charter be perpetual; for years if it be given for a limited period; and at will if it be repealable at the pleasure of the legislature. This corporation, after its privileges were abused, had an estate at will and the commonwealth chose to demand repossession. That terminated the estate as completely as an estate for years would be terminated after the expiration of the term. The grant was exhausted, the corporation had lived its time out. Its lease of life was expressly limited at the day of its creation to the period when the legislature should dissolve it for misconduct. When the legislative will had spoken the hour had come. Having no right to keep the franchises any longer, it would be absurd to claim compensation for taking them away. To say that the stockholders have a right to compensation for the franchises, because they are wrongfully taken, and that they were wrongfully taken because they have a right to compensation, would be reasoning in a very vicious circle. If the stockholders had a right to retain the franchise, the charter could not be repealed at all with or without compensation. If they had no right to retain them they have no claim to compensation.

A brief recapitulation of the main points in the case may serve to make the grounds of judgment somewhat plainer.

1. The charter was granted with a reservation of the right to repeal it, if

the franchises should be abused or misused.

2. We are satisfied that, in point of fact, those franchises were abused and misused.

3. After that event happened, the general assembly was invested with the full power to repeal the charter, and the corporations held their franchises from the state merely as tenants at will, in the same manner as if there had been an unconditional reservation of the right to repeal.

4. After the interest of the corporations had been cut down by their own misconduct to an estate at will, the legislature only could enlarge the charter, so as to make it a perpetual grant or put the corporators on another term of probation.

5. The judicial proceedings against the corporation did not and could not disarm the legislature of its reserved right to repeal, nor enlarge the estate of the corporation in its franchises, nor change the terms of the original grant, for these are things which the judiciary cannot do, nor the executive either.

6. The power of the legislature is not restricted by the rules of pleading and evidence which the courts have adopted; and therefore the state may act in the legislature upon a truth which she would have been estopped to show in a court had not the legislature interfered.

7. The power to repeal for abuse of corporate privileges is a different right from that of demanding a judicial sentence of forfeiture.

8. The charter being constitutionally repealed the franchises are as a necessary consequence resumed to the state, and the road remains where it always was—public property.

9. The corporators cannot be entitled to compensation, for they had no property in the road, and after their default they held the corporate franchises at the will of the legislature, and the exertion of that will in the resumption of the franchises did them no injury but what they agreed to submit to.

The injunction which the plaintiffs have moved for is refused.

In the estimation of the French-Canadians, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the greatest, if not the only great, person living. Some time ago a "habitant," arriving in the city of Quebec, met an old friend and fell to talking politics. In the course of the conversation he happened to mention the name of Queen Victoria, and the friend informed him that the queen had been dead for more than a year. "Dead!" exclaimed the countryman, "and who, then, rules in England?" When it was explained to him that the prince of

Wales had succeeded to the throne he shook his head wisely. "Mon dieu!" he said, "but he must have a pull with Laurier!"—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

It will be seen at a glance that the eagle's mouth is fitted for screaming rather than for licking revenue stamps.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

MEMOIR OF SIR GEORGE GREY.

Readers of that delightful book, the "Life of Henry George," by his son, will remember the pleasant allusions to Sir George Grey, governor of New Zealand, who, as far back as 1880, had written to Henry George, saying: "It has cheered me much to find that there is so able a man working in California upon subjects on which I believe the whole future of mankind now mainly hangs." His enthusiastic reception of Henry George at Auckland is told in the Life, how they "conversed until the very last moment of the stay, walking on the wharf together while the captain considerably held the ship something beyond her time." At the period of this meeting Sir George Grey had been four times governor of important colonies, and was still, as Henry George said of him, "an intense democrat."

Knowing this much of Sir George Grey and the bare details of his life as told in the encyclopedias, I looked with eager anticipation at the attractive volume before me, handsomely published by Longmans, and illustrated with three beautifully engraved portraits of the subject of the memoir. Besides, the title page showed the author of the memoir to be the distinguished historian and bishop, Dr. M. Creighton.

Alas! the reading of a few pages disclosed the fact that the Sir George of the memoir was not the Sir George of New Zealand. They were contemporaries, they both held important offices, they both were men of exceptional character, and yet, except remotely, they seem not to have been of the same family.

The Sir George Grey of the memoir was a distinguished member of Parliament, having been elected in 1833, immediately after the great victory of parliamentary reform. His most distinguished service was as home secretary, and he will probably be longest remembered as the official to whose lot it fell to quench the revived chartist movement of 1848. He was, however, while opposed to violence, an advocate of reform, and vindicated Whig principles, as founded on "progressive improvement." He would support a measure for upholding order in Ireland, but on the other hand he was ready to support measures of justice and reform. He strongly opposed the foisting of the established Church of England upon Ireland as the established church of the Irish, and called it "an act of arbitrary and unjustifiable force" for England to deprive the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland of their revenues and transfer them to others. He always heartily advocated factory reforms and the shortening of hours of labor, and he was once presented with a handsome set of silver by thirteen thousand workmen of Northumberland for his support of the cause of free trade. When the miners of his constituency began to organize, they had his full sympathy in their efforts to better their condition.

But the chief value of this memoir, that which makes it worth reading and causes us almost to forgive this Sir George Grey for not being the man we took him to be, consists in the beautiful picture we have of a beautiful private life, refined, self-controlled, dignified, and yet at bottom sympathetic and loving. The fruits of such a



"STAND PAT."

But will the long-suffering tax payer of Ohio "Stand Mark" any longer?

life he devoted to his public duties, so that his work, whether in Parliament or in the Cabinet, was characterized by perfect sincerity and a high sense of honor.

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

—That excellent periodical, the International Journal of Ethics (Philadelphia and London), offers in the October number a paper on the ethics of Nietzsche and Guyau, one on the treatment of the criminal in England, and one on "the pampered children of the poor."

—The Cosmopolitan (New York) for October is distinguished by two articles that every one should read. John Fiske's posthumous essay on Alexander Hamilton is a fine characterization of an able and honest aristocratic statesman by an able and honest democratic historian; and Herbert G. Wells, in writing upon the problem of the birth-supply, furnishes much excellent food for reflection to those pseudo-scientists who suppose that man's moral and intellectual nature may be improved by breeding, as is the purely animal nature of cows, horses and dogs.

—The International Monthly has followed the Forum in becoming a Quarterly. The September-December number presents a very handsome appearance and contains in its 212 pages an unusual number of interesting papers. The first article is on "Property Rights in Water." "The growing value of water," says the writer, "and the changes in men's opinions about its ownership are among the most interesting economic facts of Western settlement. . . . The speculative value of the personal ownership of running water is so great that every argument which the ingenuity and intellect of the best legal talent of the West can produce has been presented to the courts in its favor. That it is opposed to public welfare, that it places users at the mercy of appropriators, is not a matter of theory, but of experience." As gigantic object lessons of placing users at the mercy of appropriators, Western water and Pennsylvania coal are just now doing conspicuous service in the primary classes of the great American people. It may be that these lessons, along with others in the course, will promote us out of the primary grade sooner than some of our teachers imagine.

priators, Western water and Pennsylvania coal are just now doing conspicuous service in the primary classes of the great American people. It may be that these lessons, along with others in the course, will promote us out of the primary grade sooner than some of our teachers imagine.

J. H. D.

PROGRESSIVE Religious Literature FREE. Apply Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Avenue, Chicago.

"Economic Tangles"

by Judson Grenell: deals in popular yet practical way with industrial problems. Cloth, postpaid, \$1.

OTHER ECONOMIC LITERATURE BY HENRY GEORGE:

Progress and Poverty.....	.50
Social Problems.....	.50
Land Question.....	.50
Protection vs. Free Trade.....	.50
A Perplexed Philosopher.....	.50
Condition of Labor.....	.10
Property in Land.....	.10
Compensation.....	.05
Science of Political Economy.....	\$2.00
Moses.....	.05
The Single Tax: what it is and why we urge it.....	.05
Study of Political Economy.....	.05
Story of My Dictatorship.....	.10
Socialism, Rev. W. Poland.....	.10
Life of Henry George, Henry George, Jr.....	1.50
Natural Taxation, Thos. G. Shearman.....	.50
Shortest Road to the Single Tax.....	.10
The Single Tax, Louis F. Post.....	.25
The Case Plainly Stated.....	.05
Six Centuries of Work and Wages, Rogers.....	.25
Economic Principles, Twitchell.....	.10
Report of the Revenue Commission of Colorado.....	.05
Success in Life, Louis F. Post.....	.05
The Single Tax and Direct Legislation.....	.10
Single Tax Catechism.....	.05

PURDY PUBLISHING CO.,
McVicker Bldg., 74-84 Madison St., CHICAGO.

CHARLES A. JOSLYN, JR.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT AND AUDITOR,
Room 302 Omaha Bldg.,
134 Van Buren Street, Chicago.

REFERENCE—F. W. Morgan, Pres., Morgan & Wright; A. Baldwin, Pres., Royal Brush & Broom Co.; G. A. Noden & Co. Wholesale Jewelers; A. A. Worsley, Atty., 1010 Tenthon Bldg.; A. C. Bartlett, of Hibbard, Spencer, Bartlett & Co. (Your business respectfully solicited).

The Public

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

TERMS.

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

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

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

POST OFFICE ADDRESS:

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,

618 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,

HOUSTON, TEXAS.

Presley K. Ewing.

Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,

COUNSELLOR AT LAW,

BENNETT BLDG.,

89 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
Tel. Call, 1858 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012
NEW YORK.

OUR JUGGLED CENSUS.

An exposure of the methods adopted at the present census for the purpose of concealing the truth as to Wages and Female and Child labor. Sent postpaid for 10 cents by the author,

H. L. BLISS,
7341 Vincennes Road, Chicago.