

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1902.

Number 233.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

It is impossible at this time to measure the importance to American politics of Speaker Henderson's refusal to accept his renomination for Congress. All revolutions are precipitated, when the time is ripe, by some event of no greater magnitude in itself than this; and that a revolution within the Republican party impends, to which Henderson's declination is as the match to a powder magazine, is almost as certain as Fate.

What his motives may have been it is folly to speculate upon. He has stated them with apparent candor, and no reason appears upon the surface for suspecting his good faith. Having canvassed his district, he learned that a large proportion of his Republican constituents are hostile to his protection views. Without bad faith, therefore, in making his canvass, he could not hope to escape the humiliation of defeat; and he preferred to abandon the field with convictions undisturbed and conscience clear. Upon the face of the matter, Mr. Henderson seems to have set an excellent but extraordinary example of fidelity to principle and good faith toward constituents.

His precipitate action cannot fail, however, to advertise widely and with tremendous emphasis the condition which provoked it, and thereby accentuate "the Iowa idea" not only in his own Congressional district but over the entire country. It probably satisfies the public generally of what he was already doubtless convinced, that ex-Gov. Boies will be his successor

in Congress; and it is certain to create a stampede at the Congressional elections which may quite change the complexion of the lower House. Not that it will make clear-cut free traders of stanch protectionists. Conversions are seldom so easily effected. But it will have a marked tendency to strengthen and expand free trade sentiment among voters who have not been definitely attached to either side.

This sentiment has long been gathering volume in the Republican party, especially in the West; and now that Mr. Henderson has drawn the line sharply between Republicans who incline toward free trade, and those who, like himself, cling to the protection fetish, the cleavage is likely to become rapidly more and more impressive. One effect of his remarkable action has been to demolish the plan of campaign agreed upon between Mr. Roosevelt and the little coterie of Senators he had gathered about him at Oyster Bay. They had cozily arranged to keep the tariff question and the trust question apart, by proposing regulation of some sort as a remedy for trusts, and offering as a sop to "the Iowa idea," but wholly without reference to trusts, to make such modifications of tariff schedules from time to time as might seem wise. This agreement had hardly been effected when Mr. Henderson's declination fell upon it like a chunk of dynamite. On the one hand he thereby in effect rebuked the President and his advisers for offering to meddle with the schedules; while on the other he virtually admonished them that Republican sentiment in favor of abolishing trust-fostering tariffs is at present too strong for him to cope with in his own district and likely to be too strong to be overcome in the country at large.

It will be almost impossible now to keep the trust question and the tariff question apart. That member of the Republican Congressional committee was guilty of no exaggeration who exclaimed upon hearing of the Henderson declination: "This is an earthquake!"

The Outlook, of New York, in its issue of September 13, has brought together, in what it calls "authorized form," the speeches relating to trusts which were recently made by President Roosevelt at Providence, Boston, Fitchburg and Bangor. In doing this the Outlook has shown commendable enterprise and deserves the thanks of its readers. If we did not have all of these speeches together we might think from the earnest tone of one that surely there must be some real strenuosity in another. But reading them all together, and eliminating the sentence after sentence of what the President is candid enough himself to characterize as "perfectly trite," we find a strenuous example of strenuosity destrenuized. The whole situation is "given away" by the single fact that here are speeches on trusts and not a word in favor of reducing the tariff! This, too, even when conventions of the President's own party are seeing and proclaiming the inevitable connection of the two. President Roosevelt is not so quick as Speaker Henderson at seeing danger signals ahead.

In this same number of the Outlook a resolution of the Idaho Republican convention is quoted, as follows: "We, therefore, favor a revision of the tariff, without unreasonable delay, which will place on the free list every article and product controlled by a monopoly." And yet the President, in what purports to be a most serious discussion of trusts, ignores the discussion of the

remedy which is in the mouth even of so many Republicans. Well may the New York Evening Post say:

This is a subject on which President Roosevelt cannot persist in keeping silent. He must speak to establish his own sincerity. The charge is freely made that his speeches about restraining trusts are only declamation. . . . Unless the President is willing to rest under the suspicion that he is talking clap-trap, for political purposes, and that he has not really enlisted for a war against trusts by every legitimate weapon, he will soon take occasion to say that he agrees with those ardent supporters of his in the West who are clamorous for the removal of the tariff duties that shelter monopoly.

But Mr. Roosevelt had agreed to continue what the Post properly calls his "clap trap for political purposes," when Speaker Henderson stunned him. What he will say now, only the future can disclose. As to the trust speeches he has already made, one can think of no apter comparison for the state of his strenuousness than that of a lassoed bull.

In commenting in the Commoner upon the attitude of Mayor Johnson of Cleveland toward the silver question, as disclosed by Mr. Johnson in his speech as chairman of the Ohio convention, Mr. Bryan has very cleverly and completely laid bare the real motives of the "reorganizers" in their unqualified hostility to the Kansas City platform.

"While it is to be regretted," he writes, "that Mr. Johnson is not prepared to defend every part of the financial plank of the Kansas City platform, his frank acknowledgment of difference on the ratio will answer one good purpose: it will convince the public that the men who have made such a fuss about 16 to 1 are not sincere, for they will oppose Mr. Johnson as heartily as they would have done had he given emphatic endorsement to every word in the platform. Many have taken refuge behind the ratio, when their real objection was to some other plank in the platform." Mr. Bryan adds that "these will be unmasked by Mr. Johnson's position."

Sure enough! Mr. Bryan was right. His prediction was verified even before the public had seen it in print. The Boston Journal, a Democratic "reorganizer" of Republican affiliations, promptly declared that Johnson "would be almost as obnoxious to the conservative forces of the country as Mr. Bryan himself." Some of the Democratic "reorganizing" papers, of Democratic pretensions, found him even more obnoxious than Bryan; while the New York Times, which may be regarded as the journalistic leader of the plutocratic movement within the Democratic party, has lost no time in declaring the same war against Johnson that it has maintained against Bryan. "Between the reorganizers of the Democratic party," it belligerently announces, "and the reactionary Bryanites, with Johnson now at their head, there will be, there must be, open war."

Let it be observed that this war, which the "reorganizing" and "harmonizing" Times transfers from Bryanism to Johnsonism, is not a war against "16 to 1." It cannot be, for not only has Johnson never accepted that doctrine but he expressly declares his opposition to it. In making this hostile pronouncement, therefore, the Times, as spokesman for the "reorganizers," exposes the very insincerity with which Bryan charges them and which he predicted they would themselves expose. It is not the "16 to 1" clause of the Kansas City platform that they have been fighting all this time, under the absurd pretense that that doctrine is the root of all the political and economic evil. What in their hearts they have been arrayed against is the democratic character of the Kansas City platform in general. In some instances holding briefs for the plutocratic interests of the country, and in others deluded by those who do hold such briefs, the "reorganizers" in the Democratic party, while professing that what they want is "harmony," are ready at the drop of the hat to fight anybody and everybody

who does not fall meekly into the plutocratic procession. And of this they now stand self-convicted. No compromise would satisfy them which did not allow them to formulate the platform and name the candidates. As Johnson truly said in his convention speech, what the plutocratic leaders in both parties have feared is "not free silver but free men."

He would be a poor observer of affairs political who did not realize that the chief concern of the Democratic "reorganizers" is to prevent the nomination of a democrat as the Democratic candidate for President. They want a "conservative" Democracy; one that can divide with the Republican party the campaign contributions of the trusts; one that will contest with the Republican party for the plutocratic job in which that party has been profitably engaged; one that would be an assistant Republican party when out of power and an acceptable substitute for that party when in power. With this object in view they are looking hopefully forward to the election of Mr. Pattison as governor of Pennsylvania. Should he carry his own rock-ribbed Republican state, Pattison would be an ideal candidate, in many respects, for the "reorganizers." But Johnson is casting a bigger shadow than Pattison. He is not nearly so congenial to the plutocratic elements, but he is ever so much more acceptable to those that are genuinely democratic. Hence the bitterness toward him. Even Mark Hanna would not be so delighted were Ohio to poll her old-time Republican majority this Fall, as would that plutocratic coterie of Democrats which is composed of Grover Cleveland's intimates and to whose harmoniously belligerent sentiments the New York Times gives utterance.

These malcontents might possess themselves with patience. Johnson is not a candidate for the presidency, in the sense of pulling and pushing for the nomination. He is attending

strictly to the particular public business that has been entrusted to him. When asked by a newspaper correspondent last week whether he was a candidate for governor of Ohio and then for President, this was his reply: "I am not a candidate for anything except for mayor next Spring. It is my belief that my field of usefulness lies very close to the city of Cleveland." It is chiefly because he is Mayor of Cleveland that Mr. Johnson is campaigning the state of Ohio for Herbert S. Bigelow as the Democratic candidate for secretary of state, and the remainder of the Democratic ticket. The interests of Cleveland have been thrown into State politics by "ripper" litigation which has divested that city of its model charter, and the action of the Hanna governor and the Hanna majority in the legislature, which threaten to burden Cleveland, in common with all the other cities of the State, with board and boss government, and to perpetuate street car monopolies in the interest of Senator Hanna's personal "savings bank." It is necessary to secure if possible a popular condemnation of this policy at the polls this Fall; and that can be done only in the way in which Johnson is trying to do it—by going out among the people of the State and telling them the truth.

Because Johnson uses a large circus tents for this purpose, it pleases the plutocrats of both parties to sneer at his campaign as a circus performance. The one thing about it that is characteristic of a circus is the tent, which serves for a hall to accommodate thousands of people where local halls would hold only a few hundred. But in the estimation of the Republican press, the tent makes the affair a "circus," notwithstanding that the only performance is speech-making of the most serious and thoughtful kind. A striking commentary upon that clownish style of criticism upon Johnson was afforded last week by the Republicans of Chicago. They gathered

some 75,000 men, women and children into a park to participate in prize drawings and to receive hundreds of gifts comprising samples of nearly everything, from canned corn or a bottle of whisky to a house and lot. And food and amusements were abundant for all comers.

As described approvingly by the party papers, this Republican campaign opening was more suggestive of the old "bread and circus" days of Rome than of a serious political gathering. In those times the thoughtless herds of Roman voters were bought with gifts of bread and promises of circuses. The Republican managers seem to have reached the conclusion that America has now its thoughtless herds of voters, like those of ancient Rome, who can be bought with petty gifts and crude amusements. They may be right. But such demonstrations are not unlikely to cause the poor American voter, who is shrewd despite his poverty, to ask himself where the money comes from with which this intelligence-insulting generosity and display are paid for. When that question is seriously asked by the classes of people who were drawn by hopes of food and prizes to the Republican performance at Chicago last week, the Republican party as now organized will get a fatal fever.

If the Cincinnati Times-Star had more knowledge and less billingsgate in its editorial equipment, it would not print so many obviously vicious and transparently foolish things about Tom L. Johnson, Herbert S. Bigelow, and the late Henry George. Neither would it put itself in the ridiculous position before an intelligent public, of seeming to suppose that the kind of taxation which Johnson and Bigelow advocate is some new-fangled species of villainy. That it is neither villainous nor new-fangled, is fairly indicated by several facts which the Times-Star ignores. For one thing, the city of Glasgow and over 200 other cities and towns of Great Britain, including Liverpool

and London, are petitioners before Parliament for permission to adopt it in some measure. For another, the Royal Commission upon Taxation of Great Britain has recently reported in favor of adopting it in restricted degree; while one of the members, a distinguished British judge, advocates it in a minority report in full degree. For a third, over 50 municipalities in New Zealand, some of them farming regions and one of them the capital city of the colony, have adopted it by popular vote. Finally, its great advocate, Henry George, has never been answered in his logical exposition of this system of taxation (the only system that holds property rights as sacred), save as the Times-Star answers him—by billingsgate and diatribe.

An interesting account of the progress of the single tax movement appears in the Independent of September 11, from the pen of Joseph Dana Miller. Mr. Miller makes a brief survey of the world, with respect to this movement, calling attention to such experiments as those in Australasia and that of Germany in China, and to the advanced agitation in Great Britain, but referring particularly to the struggle now on in Colorado over the Bucklin amendment, and the policy Mayor Johnson has for eighteen months been pursuing in Cleveland and which he has now been able to extend to the State of Ohio. Had Mr. Miller written somewhat later, he might have been able to cite the most significant evidence of all, of the advance of this cause to which Henry George devoted his life. We refer to the effect upon the public mind of President Baer's bald claim that certain Christian gentlemen have been entrusted by the Creator with the ownership of the natural coal deposits of Pennsylvania. This assertion of ownership came in such a way as to excite public laughter where it did not excite public scorn or wrath, at the thought that these natural gifts of the Creator to all could be claimed as the private property of some. Such discussions

as have been seen and heard, in the papers and on the streets, since Baer's unguarded language, discussions which evidently rest upon a growing public perception of the rights of all to the enjoyment of the advantages of Nature's gifts to mankind, were formerly confined within the covers of Progress and Poverty and the walls of single tax clubrooms. The fact that they are now the common talk of "the man on the street" is the best possible evidence of the progress of the single tax movement.

"Well, gentlemen, what do you want? A change? Nominate your poison. State the remedy for a general condition of prosperity probably unexampled in this or any other country?" That is the comment of a cynical editorial writer of the Chicago Tribune upon recent bladder-blown business reports in Bradstreet's and Dun's. If it is workingmen the Tribune is addressing, the "poison" they might fairly "nominate" would be a share in this unexampled prosperity. With their living expenses increased 40 per cent., and their wages increased only slightly or not at all—in most cases not at all—they might be less timid about a change than the classes that are monopolizing all the prosperity in sight.

When President Roosevelt was in the South on his recent campaign tour, he complimented that section upon its increased prosperity as indicated by the Southern factories that have sprung up within the past few years. The essential character of this boasted prosperity may be inferred from the somewhat more minute observations of Irene Macfayden, published over her signature in the American Federationist. She says:

Only a few weeks ago I stood at half past ten at night in a mill in Columbia, S. C., controlled and owned by Northern capital, where children who did not know their own ages were working from six p. m. to six a. m., without a moment for rest or food or a single cessation of the maddening racket of the machinery, in an atmosphere insanitary and clouded with humidity

and lint. A horrible form of dropsy develops among the children. A doctor in a city mill, who has made a special study of the subject, tells me that ten per cent. of the children who go to work before 12 years of age, after five years, contract active consumption. The lint forms in their lungs a perfect cultivating medium for tuberculosis, while the change from the hot atmosphere of the mill to the chill night or morning air often brings on pneumonia, which frequently, if not the cause of death, is a forerunner of consumption. How sternly the "pound of flesh" is insisted on by the various employers is illustrated by the case of two little boys of nine and 11, who had to walk three miles to work on the night shift for 12 hours. One night they were five minutes late, and were shut out, having to tramp the whole three miles back again. The number of accidents to those poor little ones who do not know the dangers of machinery is appalling. In Huntsville, Ala., in January, just before I was there, a child of eight years who had been a few weeks in the mills lost the index and middle fingers of her right hand. A child of seven had lost her thumb a year previously. In one mill city in the South a doctor told a friend that he had personally amputated more than a hundred babies' fingers mangled in the mill. The average wage in North Carolina of the children under 14 is 22 cents a day, and in Georgia 25 cents is a liberal estimate. A correspondent gives a sample pay roll, showing an average of \$1.43 a week in a certain spinning room for all children employed. I know of babies working for five and six cents a day. A girl of nine, working at night, when six years old, received 12½ cents a night. The two boys who walked three miles to their work received 12 and 15 cents a night.

This is a side of the prosperity question that does not interest the prosperity "touters."

Socialists have an idea that political power is in process of yielding to industrial power; and that the time is not far off, if indeed it is not already at hand, when the political magnate will bow meekly before the industrial magnate. Of the plausibility of this theory of social evolution the people of the United States had an impressive exhibition last week. The political magnate of one of the greatest States of the Union, Gov. Stone of Pennsylvania, approached a private citizen, the industrial magnate of the greatest combination of industries in the world, J. Pierpont Morgan,—ap-

proached him on public business with all the meekness of the king on his knees at Canossa. The fact cannot be blinked that our political system, from the President down, has become subservient to the industrial powers over which Morgan and men like Morgan preside. Whether this is due to the system, as socialists would have it, or to the incapable or worse than incapable political officials, remains to be tested.

John Moody, the publisher of Moody's manual for investors (35 Nassau st., New York), has issued a booklet on the "morganization" of industry, which makes an excellent pocket companion in these days of trust discussion. It appears from this handy little pamphlet, and the details are given, that the steam railroad interests controlled by the Morgan crowd aggregate 55,555 in mileage and \$3,002,949,571 in capitalized value; while the industrial trusts controlled by the same crowd are capitalized at \$1,734,330,956—a total for this Morgan combination alone of \$4,737,280,527. It is an interesting fact that the word "morganize," recently invented to designate J. Pierpont Morgan's methods when he "organizes business," and adopted by Mr. Moody as the title of his booklet, "The 'Morganization' of Industry," has long been used in another sense—"to murder secretly." This amounts almost to a coincidence, when it is considered how "morganization" really affects legitimate industry.

In describing "morganization" Mr. Moody calls attention to the real secret of its success, without which no possible degree of organizing ability could avail. "Mr. Morgan," he says, "is at the head of no industry which does not have some special element of security and strength, outside of mere ability in management. In other words, his corporations all have an element of positive advantage or strength which prevents them from ever becoming subject to the

merciless competition of indiscriminate rivals. And it is herein that Mr. Morgan displays his real scope of mind. While many other less secure and more weakly planned combinations will sooner or later go to the wall, the Morgan properties all contain additional elements of strength which, in the worst of times, will add vastly to their security. For instance, the United States Steel Corporation owns and controls enormous sources of supply; its competitors, in many cases, do not. The 55,000-odd miles of railroad with which Mr. Morgan is identified control rights of way, coal lands, terminals, competing lines, steamship connections and the like. Thus, in addition to their essentially able management, they all stand on a broad and solid foundation of special advantages which would seem to make their future in many respects doubly secure."

HOW TO ABOLISH THE LOBBY AND THE BOSS.

Two years ago the Illinois legislature enacted what is known as "the Crafts law." This law, proposed by Allen Ripley Foote and introduced in the legislature by Clayton E. Crafts, provides for an advisory vote by the people upon any question that may be submitted in accordance with the law.

To submit a municipal question, a petition signed by 25 per cent. of the voters of the municipality is requisite, while only 10 per cent. of the voters of the State is necessary for a State question. When a petition is legally filed, the questions it proposes, not to exceed three in number, must be put upon a separate ballot, which the election officers at the ensuing election are required to give to each voter. The result of the vote is without legal effect. No one is bound by it. But it serves admirably as an indication of public opinion, which is the object of the law.

The first experiment under this law was made in Chicago last Spring, with startling and most encouraging results. The next is to be made

throughout the state of Illinois at the general election next November.

The petition for this purpose was filed with the secretary of state on the 4th of September. It contains in round numbers 150,000 signatures, or 30,000 more than the law requires. The questions proposed for submission to popular vote are stated in the petition as follows:

1. Shall the next General Assembly enact a statute by which the voters of the political subdivisions of the State of Illinois may be enabled to initiate desired local legislation, by filing a petition therefor, signed by eight per cent. of the legal voters in said political subdivisions, and to have referred to the voters any legislation enacted by the several local legislative bodies, by the filing of a petition therefor of five per cent. of the legal voters of any such political subdivision; the action of a majority of those voting to decide in each case?

2. Shall the next General Assembly submit to the people of the State of Illinois, at the next State election, a constitutional amendment providing for the control of legislation by the people, by means of the initiative and referendum; said amendment to provide for the initiation of legislation upon a petition of eight per cent. of the voters of the political divisions affected; and for the reference of legislation upon a petition of five per cent. of the voters of the political subdivisions affected, the action of the majority of the electors voting to be final; thus restoring to the people the power they once held, but which they delegated to the General Assembly by the constitution?

3. Shall the next General Assembly take the necessary steps under article 5, of the constitution of the United States, to bring about the election of United States senators by the direct vote of the people?

Reduced to general terms these three propositions ask the voters in November to advise the legislature of Illinois, to be chosen at the same election, as to whether it shall or shall not—

1. Adopt the initiative and the referendum for local purposes in the several political divisions of the State—counties, cities, towns, villages, etc.

2. Provide for a constitutional amendment adopting the initiative and the referendum for State purposes.

3. Take the necessary steps for bringing about an amendment to the Federal constitution requiring the election of United States senators by direct vote of the people.

Nothing more important than these propositions, especially the first two, demands the action of the Illinois electorate this year. In com-

parison with them, the question of whether one man or another shall hold office is of trifling importance except to office seekers.

To consider the third question first, the lower house of Congress has several times passed a constitutional amendment requiring senators to be elected by direct popular vote; but the Senate has every time either defeated or pigeon-holed the measure. It is evident, therefore, that the only way in which this reform in Federal legislation can be secured is by action of the States over the head of the Senate. This is provided for by section 5 of the constitution, which requires Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments whenever the legislatures of two thirds of the States demand it.

If the proposition now under consideration were adopted at the ensuing Illinois election, the legislature would not be thereby compelled to petition Congress for a constitutional convention, but the sentiment of the people in favor of electing senators by popular vote would be manifest. It could no longer be said, so far at least as Illinois is concerned, that the people do not want this reform.

The merits of the question would require too much space to discuss them fully. Perhaps all the facts which indicate the necessity for changing our method of electing senators are epitomized in the one fact that the Senate has become "a club of millionaires." Rich men who could not be elected governor of their States, who could not be elected mayor of their cities, are sent to the Senate. The inference is obvious. They can buy legislators when they cannot buy the people. This kind of corruption has become so common, that elections of United States senators are almost invariably signals for scandals at the State capitals. The obvious remedy is to make senators no longer elective by legislatures, and to restore this power, democratic fashion, to the people themselves.

A vote for the third proposition to be submitted to the voters of Illinois this Fall will count one in favor of that change.

The other two propositions have

to do with the initiative and the referendum—one for State purposes and the other for local purposes. Whoever believes in one must believe in the other. They may, therefore, be discussed together as a single proposition.

The initiative and the referendum, modes of direct legislation, would make no change in present methods of law-making, so long as the law-making bodies remained true to their obligations. Those bodies would continue to draft, consider and enact laws, ordinances, etc., precisely as they do now. No reference to popular vote would be made if they performed their duties—pigeon-holing no good measures, and enacting no bad ones.

But if the legislative body were to enact a bad law, five per cent. of the voters affected could interfere and demand that the bad law be submitted to popular vote. If they did so, the bad law would not be operative until the people had voted on it; and if a majority voted against it, it would not be operative at all.

Or, if the legislative body were to pigeon-hole a good law, then eight per cent. of the voting population could demand that it be taken out of the pigeon-hole and submitted to popular vote. If a majority voted against it, it would remain in the pigeon-hole; but if a majority voted for it it would be a law whether the lobby liked it or not.

The initiative and referendum would abolish the lobby and abolish the boss.

One of the strong points about this reform is that it would often be effective without being used.

So long as there is no such means of keeping legislatures and local governing bodies honest, they pigeon-hole good bills and pass bad ones with impunity. It usually depends upon what the lobby wants or some boss demands. But if eight per cent. of the voters could pull good bills out of the legislative pigeon-holes and submit them to the people, and five per cent. could stop the operation of bad bills until the people had voted directly on them, legislators would hesitate about pigeon-holing good bills, and be very

timid about passing bad ones. Though an initiative and referendum law has been in operation in South Dakota for several years, it has never yet been appealed to. This fact is urged against the utility of the law, but is in fact a strong argument in its favor. For though the law has never been publicly appealed to, it has more than once been held over the heads of legislators like a Damocletian sword and with excellent effect. At least one most vicious bill which the bosses of the Democratic party in the South Dakota legislature demanded, was defeated because the minority threatened to appeal its passage from the legislature to the people. When that threat was made, the majority yielded and the bill was killed.

If the initiative and the referendum were in operation in Illinois, no bad law could be passed by the legislature if a majority of the people opposed it, and no good one could be pigeon-holed if a majority of the people favored it; no monopoly franchise could be granted by any city if a majority of the people of that city objected, and no municipal reform could be strangled if a majority of the municipal voters really wanted it.

Whoever wishes to see this wholesome regulation of legislation in force in Illinois, will take the pains to vote "Yes" to the first two propositions quoted above. Though a majority vote in the affirmative will not in itself enact the law, though it will be only advisory, it is not likely that the legislature next winter will be indifferent to advice of that kind if expressed with the emphasis of a heavy majority.

For legislators are politicians, and politicians know that if they would succeed in politics it is more important to obey the people than a boss. If they are usually more obedient to bosses, it is because they always know what the boss wants them to do and are not always certain about the wishes of the people.

Let the voters of Illinois make their wants clearly and emphatically known by voting in the affirmative on these questions, and the legislators may be depended upon to do the rest—boss or no boss, lobby or no lobby.

NEWS

The most exciting political event for months, one which may well prove to be of the utmost moment in its influence upon national politics, is the declination of Speaker David B. Henderson as the Republican candidate for re-election to Congress from the Third district of Iowa. Mr. Henderson's action is especially important because of his position as speaker of the lower house of Congress, of the critical circumstances under which he declines re-nomination, and of the significant reason he gives for declining.

His decision was announced to the President, at Oyster Bay, by Chairman Babcock of the Republican Congressional committee, on the 16th. The President had just closed a political conference with Senators Allison of Iowa, Aldrich of Rhode Island, Hanna of Ohio, Spooner of Wisconsin, and Lodge of Massachusetts, together with Postmaster General Payne, and had agreed with them upon a policy for the campaign. According to the special report of the Chicago Tribune of the 17th, the leading Republican paper of the middle West, this agreement embraced five propositions: (1) The President's policy regarding trusts was to be approved and he was to emphasize it in his further speaking; (2) the lawsuits instituted by him against the beef trust and the railroad merger were to be made the basis of an appeal to the people to patiently await the decisions of the courts, which would show whether further legislation or a constitutional amendment is necessary to check the power of trusts; (3) the President was to stand on the record he has made by those lawsuits, and refrain from proposing tariff revision as an anti-trust policy; (4) Cuban reciprocity was to be approved; and, (5), as to the tariff the position was to be taken that the party is committed by the platform of 1896 to the principles of protection but not to particular schedules, and that tariff rates are to be regarded as details to be settled by Congress from time to time. As the Tribune's report sums up the decision of the conference with reference to the tariff and trusts, it was—

agreed by all that there will be no adherence to the theory that the tariff can be or should be reduced merely because certain articles were produced

by trusts or monopolies. The effort will be made at all times to keep the tariff and the trusts as separate questions to be dealt with on their merits. There will be no abatement of loyalty to the general principle of protection, but there will be an admission that certain articles are now receiving more protection than is desirable. The plea will be made and insisted upon that any revision or readjustment of the tariff should be made by the friends of protection and not by free traders, and the country will be appealed to not to jeopardize existing prosperity by turning the tariff over to its enemies.

Hardly had this conclusion been reached and given in substance to the reporters, when the distinguished conferees were stunned by the news of Speaker Henderson's refusal to be the party candidate for Congress in his district, because, to quote Mr. Henderson's own language in his message to Chairman Babcock—

I cannot agree with many of my party who would prescribe free trade in whole or in part as a remedy for trusts.

Mr. Henderson's letter declining the nomination that had been tendered him several weeks ago by acclamation, puts his long delay in answering, and his final declination, upon the following ground:

Reported conditions in the public mind in my district upon public policies induced me to make this delay. Since my return to the district I have made a careful study as to the sentiment in the district and State and I believe there is no little sentiment, and a growing sentiment, among Republicans, that I do not truly represent their views on the tariff question. Believing this condition to exist and knowing that I do not agree with many of my people that trusts, to which I am and have been opposed, can be cured or the people benefited by free trade, in whole or in part, I must decline to accept the nomination so generously and enthusiastically made.

After thus formally declining, Mr. Henderson issued a formal address to the voters of his district. His policy as therein outlined is to regulate and control trusts by repressive legislation, securing power through a constitutional amendment if necessary, and not to disturb tariff schedules. While he asserts that he has never been and is not now opposed to "making needed changes" in the tariff, he adds:

I must say, and say emphatically, that I don't believe that a single schedule of the Dingley tariff law can

be so amended as to relieve the people from the oppression of trusts, or combinations of capital, however named, and that such action may involve the retarding of our expanding commerce and getting and holding of foreign markets.

The conclusion of his address, in so far as it relates to his declining, is in these words:

After a careful study of conditions and political views in Iowa and in my own district, I am satisfied that I am not in harmony with a great many of the Republican voters, who believe that free trade, in whole or in part, will remedy the trust evil. I believe that it will not, but that such a remedy is likely to involve the nation in dangerous results, and so believing I feel that I should not accept the nomination for Congress, which was so generously tendered me, and I have decided accordingly.

All efforts to induce Mr. Henderson to recede from his position had, up to the 18th, been unavailing. A letter, numerously signed by party leaders of national repute and influence, urgent private telegrams from similar sources, and a message from the President in which the latter writes: "I most earnestly ask that you reconsider your determination not to run," had been met by him with refusals to alter his published address. It is regarded as significant that neither Gov. Cummins nor any of his faction had joined in or encouraged these requests to Mr. Henderson to reconsider.

Five days prior to Speaker Henderson's delayed and unfavorable response to the Congressional nomination the Republicans had tendered him, ex-Gov. Horace Boies was nominated for Congress by the Democrats of the same district. The convention, which sat at Waterloo on the 11th, nominated Gov. Boies by unanimous vote. The burden of the convention speeches was a prediction that Boies would defeat Henderson and carry to Washington "the Iowa idea" of tariff reform—abolition of tariff on foreign commodities that compete with trust-made domestic commodities. The vote in this district in 1900, for President and Congress, was as follows:

	Vote.	Plurality.
McKinley (Rep.).....	29,874	11,081
Bryan (Dem.).....	18,793	
Henderson (Rep.)....	30,181	11,325
Birdsall (Dem.).....	18,856	

Though 75 years old, ex-Gov. Boies is still strong in body and mind. He

practiced law at Buffalo, New York, from 1849 to 1867, serving meanwhile a term in the New York legislature in 1858 as a Whig. With the collapse of the Whig party he became a Republican, and in 1867 removed to Waterloo, Ia., where he has ever since lived, practicing his profession. Leaving the Republican party because he opposed its prohibition policy in the State and its protective policy for the country at large, he affiliated with the Democrats, whose candidate for governor of Iowa he has been at three elections. In 1889 and 1891 he was elected, but was defeated in 1893. Gov. Boies stood second in the final balloting for President at the Democratic convention of 1896. He is a radical tariff reformer, and though he has withdrawn his support from the ratio of 16 to 1 is understood to be still a bimetalist. It is reported from Waterloo that it is his intention to make his Congressional campaign almost exclusively upon the tariff question and the trust question as affected by the tariff.

At the Democratic convention of Delaware, held at Dover on the 16th, Henry A. Houston was nominated for Congress, and the supremacy of Addicks, the "commercial adventurer and his creatures," was declared to be the question of overwhelming importance.

The Utah Republican convention met at Ogden on the 11th, and after recommending President Roosevelt as his own successor, nominated Joseph Howell for Congress. The Democrats, in convention at Provo on the 16th, nominated W. H. King for Congress and endorsed the Kansas City platform.

At Tacoma on the 11th the Republican convention of Washington (p. 360), nominated Cushman Jones and W. F. Humphrey for Congress; and on the 16th the Democratic convention of the same State, also in session at Tacoma, nominated G. F. Cotterill, S. E. Barron and O. R. Holcomb for Congress, and after reaffirming the Kansas City platform endorsed United States Senator Turner for reelection.

At the Republican convention of Alabama, held at Birmingham on the 16th, the report of the executive committee, which decided all contests against Negro delegates, thereby removing every Negro from the convention, was sustained. On the

17th the convention nominated J. A. W. Smith for governor, and indorsed President Roosevelt for the next presidential nomination.

Assembling on the 16th the Republican convention of Connecticut completed its deliberations on the 17th, nominating Abram Chamberlain for governor, urging changes in tariff schedules when they protect monopolies, and indorsing Roosevelt for the next presidency.

The Republican convention of Texas, at Fort Worth on the 11th nominated George P. Burkitt for governor.

In Massachusetts the Democratic controversy over the endorsement by the State convention of the Kansas City platform resulted on the 16th in the defeat in the committee on resolutions of the supporters of that platform, under the lead of George Fred Williams, by the opponents of that platform, led by Josiah Quincy. A minority report affirming the platform was introduced in the convention, but was defeated. William A. Gaston, a gold standard man who is uncompromisingly opposed to the Kansas City platform, was nominated for governor.

Nahum J. Batchelder was nominated by the Republicans of New Hampshire, on the 17th, for governor, upon a platform condemning trusts in a general way and favoring the nomination of Roosevelt for the presidency.

The Republican convention of Colorado, meeting at Denver on the 12th, nominated James H. Peabody for governor. The platform pledges the party to the nomination of President Roosevelt in 1904, and on the question of trusts declares:

The Republican party of Colorado recognizes in the growth of centralized power an evolution in business conditions which is the result of economic laws, but we recognize also that out of such consolidations are arising questions of great moment, which must be faced and dealt with. We believe these questions should be solved along lines of regulation against abuses and not by radical legislation destructive of business interests.

In this State the long campaign for the adoption of the Bucklin amendment to the tax laws (p. 211), mod-

eled upon the tax laws of New Zealand and some of the Australian states, and providing for home rule in taxation, is in the final stages. The burden of it rests upon the labor organizations and the immediate friends of the measure, the Democratic convention having refused to endorse it. John Sherwin Crosby has just returned to New York from a speaking tour of the State in behalf of the amendment, and Senator Bucklin himself has now begun a speaking campaign which he will carry on all over Colorado until election day. While the friends of the Bucklin measure are still hopeful of its success at the polls, they have been so hampered in their work of education, by extreme lack of funds, that impartial observers report the probable defeat of the measure unless funds are speedily supplied.

Prior to leaving home to continue his speaking campaign (p. 360), President Roosevelt gave a reception on the 15th, in his grounds near Oyster Bay, to the residents of that region. The news dispatches report an attendance of about 8,000 people.

Tom L. Johnson's speaking campaign in Ohio (p. 360), is being conducted with the same energy, and, judging by the Ohio papers, with even greater success, than at first. After the meeting at Fremont on the 10th, the large tent in which his meetings are held was transported to Port Clinton, Ottawa county (Democratic), where Bigelow, Peter Witt and Johnson were the speakers. The population of Port Clinton is about 3,000, and from 1,500 to 2,000 people were in the tent. At Oak Harbor, in the same county, on the 12th, a severe storm reduced the attendance to 350; but at Toledo, Lucas county (Republican), on the 13th, the tent was packed within and surrounded without by a crowd aggregating from 6,000 to 8,000 people. Wm. J. Bryan was the principal speaker at this meeting, the other speakers being Johnson, Bigelow, and Mayor Jones. An incident, both interesting and characteristic, regarding Jones's speaking is told by the Cleveland Plain Dealer of the 15th, which says:

The Democratic committee of Toledo tried to work a little game of "knock" in connection with the Johnson meeting in that city on Saturday night, but the members reckoned without the mayor, and came to grief. An attempt was made to throw discredit upon Mayor Jones at the big

gathering. But Mayor Johnson soon became aware of the plan and spoiled the plot. During the meeting Mayor Johnson asked the chairman of the meeting to introduce Mayor Jones. The chairman refused to do so. The mayor of Cleveland did not take kindly to this slight upon the mayor of Toledo, and he unexpectedly got up and introduced Mr. Jones on his own hook. The chairman afterward admitted to Mr. Johnson that he had received instructions to keep Mayor Jones from speaking. "However," said he to the mayor of Cleveland, "you've introduced him, and it's all right." Mayor Johnson was seen last night regarding the incident. "I'm too good a friend of Mayor Jones to allow him to be slighted at a Democratic meeting," he said. "There was an evident object to put a slight upon him, and I could not stand that. The reception that was given the mayor when I introduced him was enough to prove that he still has a few friends in Lucas county."

Johnson's next meeting was held on the 15th at Bowling Green, Wood county (Republican). It was impossible here to find enough local Democrats to take charge of the meeting, and a vacant lot for the tent could not be found in the town, all that kind of property belonging to Republican partisans; but on the outskirts a lot was finally obtained, and at night the tent held 2,000 people, who came from curiosity but applauded with enthusiasm. At all these meetings the subjects of the speeches are the home rule question and the question of favoritism in taxation.

The former of these questions—municipal home rule—has disorganized the State administration's forces in the Ohio legislature during the week. Both houses are separately considering the municipal code bill prepared by Governor Nash (p. 346) to re-establish legal municipal government in the State. On the 15th a caucus of the Republican senators adopted the Nash code, the prominent feature of which is known as the "board plan," the boards to be locally elected by their respective cities. This action was opposed by three Republican senators, who protested against binding the party to the "board plan." Only these votes in opposition were cast, however, though the affirmative vote of 12 made only a majority of 2 in the whole Republican representation in the Senate, which is 21. There were 6 absentees. In the code committee of the lower house the governor's code did not fare even so well. At

a meeting of that committee, also on the 15th, a motion to adopt the "board plan" was defeated by a vote of 3 to 20. The "federal plan" in use for 12 years in Cleveland, had already been defeated by a vote of 11 to 12. The committee then proceeded to amend the bill along the lines of a "single head" plan—mayors, presidents of council, auditors, treasurers, and solicitors to be heads of departments respectively and to be elective.

In connection with the anthracite coal strike (p. 361) no change in the situation, of any note, is indicated by the press reports.

The possible clash between Colombia and Great Britain (p. 311), growing out of the rebellion in the former country, seems to have passed over; but now the United States has become involved in the South American disturbance. On the 11th word was received at Washington that the Colombian rebels were advancing upon the city of Panama, at the Pacific terminus of the Panama railway. The United States battleship Wisconsin was at once ordered to Panama, and the Cincinnati to Colon (Aspinwall) at the Atlantic terminus of the railway. The latter arrived on the 15th. On the day preceding, the United States auxiliary cruiser Panther had been hurried from League Island to Colon. On the 16th Commander McLean, of the Cincinnati, complained to the navy department that Colombian government troops had placed obstructions on the railway when his train was passing over it. His message was as follows:

Yesterday I went to Panama. Train stopped twice by obstructions—plate iron, etc.—placed on track. After train passed saw government soldiers replace obstructions. Accompanied by consul and Commander Potter, of Ranger, called on governor. Friendly conversation. Returning to Colon this morning stopped by obstructions. Soldiers were compelled to remove them. Soldiers then stood on track. By my directions train moved on and soldiers jumped away. Will guard trains. No revolutionists in sight, but rumored coming toward railroad.

Instructions were forthwith sent from Washington to the American minister to Colombia, at Bogota, requesting him to call for an explanation from the Colombian government.

On the 17th a detachment of Unit-

ed States marines from the Cincinnati was landed at Colon, and distributed in groups to act as guards upon the trains running between Colon and Panama. Every train is reported as now in charge of marines. It was at the same time given out that on the 18th American sailors would be landed from the Ranger, at Panama, to protect the Pacific terminal. The Colombian authorities have protested to the American consul at Colon against the landing of American marines in a body upon Colombian soil.

At the time of our last report of the progress of the Colombian revolution a battle had been fought at Agua Dulce (p. 311), about 75 miles from Panama, and both sides claimed a victory. It became evident late in August that the rebels had won the battle, and that their leader, Gen. Herrera, was moving upon Panama. By the 9th of September no doubt remained that Agua Dulce had fallen into the hands of the rebels, that other advantages had been gained by them, and that Panama was in danger. Rebel gunboats could be seen beyond the Panama harbor on the 10th, and the Colombian government had no warships with which to defend, the rebels having captured their only gunboat on the Panama side of the Isthmus. This exposed condition of the railroad terminus was the cause for sending American ships to guard Panama and the railway from injury. The American commanders are instructed to enforce treaty stipulations with Colombia strictly by preventing any interference with traffic across the Isthmus, and also prevent a bombardment of Panama from the sea, on the ground that this in itself would constitute a menace to traffic.

Our last report from Venezuela (p. 311) indicated that President Castro's position was serious, and it now appears to have grown more so. He is reported to be retreating from Ocumare, in Bolivar, before the insurgent troops, after a defeat of government troops in a severe battle at Tinaquillo which began on the 11th and lasted four days.

NEWS NOTES.

—McKinley memorial services were held in many churches on the 15th.

—Queen Wilhelmina opened the Dutch parliament in person on the 16th.

—Gen. Nelson A. Miles passed through Chicago on the 12th on his way to the Philippines.

—The American prison congress met this week at Philadelphia. Louisville is the next place of meeting.

—The Sovereign Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows of the United States has been in session this week at Des Moines.

—Horace Gray, who recently resigned as Justice of the United States Supreme Court (p. 296), died at Nahant, near Boston, on the 15th.

—Alexander R. Shepherd, known in the early 70's as the "Boss Tweed" of Washington, the District of Columbia, of which he was governor, died in Mexico on the 12th.

—Russia has ordered a fleet of three gunboats into Behring sea, under orders to capture all American and Japanese vessels engaged in seal fishing within the Russian maritime jurisdiction.

—An official investigation discloses the fact that the landslide on Mount Kasbek, Russia (p. 346), in August last, destroyed 20 villages, killed 700 persons, and damaged property to the amount of \$30,000,000.

—The hearing of the claim of the United States against Mexico growing out of the Pius fund of California began at The Hague on the 15th before the international court of arbitration. This is the first contest that court has been called upon to adjudicate.

—Terrible forest fires are reported from the far Northwest. Scores of villages in Oregon, Washington and British Columbia have been destroyed by the flames and thousands of people made homeless. Some 50 lives are believed to have been lost. Wyoming and Colorado, also, are suffering from forest fires.

—Lieut. R. E. Peary, the Arctic explorer, who sailed for the north polar regions July 2, 1898, is on his way home. He was heard from on the 15th at Chateau bay, on the coast of Labrador. All on board his vessel, the Windward, were reported as well, but no intimation was given of the success of the expedition.

—At a meeting of the Corporation of Dublin, Ireland, on the 12th, a resolution was adopted protesting against the "outrage and insult offered the citizens of Dublin in proclaiming the city, in which, in proportion to the size of its population, there was less crime than in any other city in the world." "Proclaiming" means suspending the ordinary course and safeguards of criminal procedure.

—It was decided by the Teachers' Federation of Chicago at their meeting on the 13th that, in view of the fact that under the present system of taxation it would be impossible to obtain money enough to pay increased salaries, they work to bring about a re-

vision of the tax laws of Illinois and to refuse to accept any substitute plan that might be proposed by the board of education.

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

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M.....	\$188,480,138	\$157,881,591	\$25,008,547 exp.
G.....	9,976,222	2,864,335	7,111,887 exp.
S.....	8,413,782	4,219,681	4,194,101 exp.
	\$201,880,142	\$164,965,607	\$36,914,535 exp.

—The town council of Glasgow, Scotland, during the past Summer (so says one of its members, Bailie John Ferguson, in the Glasgow Evening News of August 29), has carried by an overwhelming majority a resolution to invite the municipalities of Great Britain and Ireland to meet in conference to consider how best to formulate a public bill, on the lines of the Glasgow bill now pending in Parliament, for levying taxes on land values. Over 100 public corporations had responded on August 29, and arrangements are being made for a convention. The Glasgow bill is what would be known in this country as a "single tax" bill.

PRESS OPINIONS.

SPEAKER HENDERSON'S DECLINATION.

Chicago American (Dem.), Sept. 18.—No comment.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Sept. 18.—No comment.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Sept. 17.—Honor to Speaker Henderson for recognizing this [the Republican demand for tariff revision] and bowing to the inevitable. He is entitled to his convictions (and errors), but the people of Iowa are likewise entitled to their convictions—and to real and honest representation and advocacy of those convictions in Congress.

Chicago Chronicle (Ind.), Sept. 18.—Of the fact that the Iowa Republicans are split wide open on the tariff issue there can be no doubt whatever. It remains to be seen whether the schism will get beyond control and spread to other important States. It remains to be seen also if this surprising circumstance is not the prelude to another "tariff scare" of prodigious proportions. The speeches of the President himself will furnish the solution of the problem in a few days.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Sept. 18.—The Tribune is constrained to believe that the Speaker was impulsive, if not petulant, when he issued his now famous letter. He ought to think better of it. . . . It is impossible to explain his action except upon the theory that dyspepsia had induced a desperate fit of the blues and brought on a condition of pessimism in the Speaker's mind. The Tribune looks forward confidently to his recovery and believes that when his normal condition returns and his nerves are again in order he will reconsider his hasty step.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Sept. 18.—For many months, in accordance with its duty as an independent newspaper, the Record-Herald has printed much matter concerning the growing impatience in the

central West at the dilatory or hostile spirit shown by the Republican leaders in Congress in modifying the tariff so that it might not act as a means by which unfair profits were extorted by monopolies. Every Republican member of Congress from this section has found, on getting in touch with his constituents, the extent of this feeling, and most of them have bowed to it. It is to be regretted from a national standpoint that Mr. Henderson has not found it possible to agree with his constituents on this point and has preferred to refuse the nomination tendered him.

HORACE BOIES.

Dubuque Telegraph Herald (Dem.), Sept. 12.—Mr. Boies is a Democrat whose sincerity and whose devotion to the interests of the masses as against the classes has never been questioned. He is fundamentally a democrat and is instinctively opposed to those policies and laws which tend to destroy equality and build up class government in the republic. Mr. Boies is in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. He is not and never has been a gold standard man, and all the perversion of the opposition press will not cause the people to believe him a monometallist.

OHIO POLITICS.

Johnstown Democrat (Dem.), Sept. 12.—The Cincinnati Times-Star is very much afraid of Tom Johnson. It calls him "dangerous." Well, that is what the rats say of the ferret.

Woonsocket (R. I.) Evening Call (Ind.), Sept. 11.—Mr. Johnson made his money honestly enough in the street car business, but during the process of his accumulation he learned to despise the ordinary scramble for riches and the means men adopt to line their pockets with the coin of the republic. He says so, and because he has taken that position men who are making fortunes by hook or crook fear and detest him.

The (Salem, O.) American Worker (lab.), Sept. 11.—The editor of The Worker assumes the personal responsibility of congratulating the industrial people of Ohio and the whole nation, upon the significant fact that the Sandusky State convention, with Mayor Tom Johnson at its head, adopted a progressive platform, and nominated for secretary of state, Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, who, as a staunch tried and true friend of the workingman, has few peers in the state of Ohio.

Kansas City World (Dem.), Sept. 9.—Keep your eye on Tom Johnson, of Cleveland, or, to put it more properly, Tom Johnson, of Ohio; for he has moved the political capital of that state from Cincinnati to Cleveland. . . . He is a tall twister, but usually gets hold of the tall that needs twisting and thus secures the applause of the audience. Cleveland's popular mayor is a man of ideas, a millionaire who cares little for money as such, a man of fine physique, genial, hearty, able to control his temper, a strong debater and has the saving quality of humor.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), Sept. 12.—The Cincinnati preacher who has been nominated by the Democrats for secretary of state is evidently worrying the Republicans very much. He strikes from the shoulder and he has plenty to say which hurts. Herbert S. Bigelow is one of the best orators in the State, if not the best, and the real thing about him is that he has something to say all the while. He feels the importance of his message. He does not pettifog. He is all the while in dead earnest. He is making a tremendous impression on the people who hear him.

Oregon (Portland) Daily Journal (Ind.), Sept. 8.—There is not a more honest man, free from even taint of demagoguery and deception, bold and defiant, cool and capable, with the love of freedom in his breast! He is a democrat, earnestly and forever a believer in equal rights to all men, frank and outspoken as a boy, resourceful as one

can be possessed of honest and natural inclinations. The Journal has no fear of Tom Johnson. He will prove to be the defender of the common people, of those who carry burdens. The battle that he will wage in their defense will be fast and furious, though with justice to all and malice toward none.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Sept. 12.—The Tom Johnson circus has started out for the Ohio season and the big tent has been filled to overflowing at every stand. Its fame has gone out to the remotest corners, and the announcement that it would appear at a town on the circuit on a given night lines the roads for miles with farmers' wagons headed towards the tent. The success of the performance is testified to by the tumultuous applause that increases as the evening wears on, and when the farmers hitch up for the homeward journey they are full of the good things they heard in the tent and go home to spread the fame of the circus and repeat what they heard there.

WISCONSIN POLITICS.

Springfield (Mass.) Republican (Ind.), Sept. 12 (weekly ed.)—The Democratic reorganizers of the extreme Cleveland faction appear at least to have won control of one state Democratic convention—that of Wisconsin. There the party presents a platform which ignores all other national questions except the trust-tariff issue, and for state issues indulges simply in indiscriminating and extravagant abuse of the La Follette administration which has had to fight its way against the open hostility of the plutocratic element in the Republican party of Wisconsin, and which is probably more truly democratic than the party behind this Democratic platform. Moreover, the candidate for governor, Mayor Rose, of Milwaukee, is not an official with a record to appeal to the anti-monopoly vote which the Democrats must have to carry the state. It is not a particularly inspiring or hopeful start that has been made there. The business of "reorganizing" has been overdone.

OHIO AND WISCONSIN.

Farmers' Voice and National Rural (agr'l.), Sept. 13.—It may be said that Gov. La Follette in Wisconsin, Republican, and Tom Johnson, in Ohio, Democrat, are fighting for the same thing, and that the machines of both parties in both states are organized against them in the interest of tax-eating corporations and landlords.

MAYOR JONES.

Columbus Daily Press (Dem.), Sept. 15.—The ovation given Mayor Jones when he appeared on the platform at Tom Johnson's tent meeting in Toledo Saturday evening again demonstrated that though he may be a man without a party he is not without honor in his own country.

BRYAN AND TRUSTS.

Milwaukee Daily News (Ind.), Sept. 15.—Mr. Bryan says that if he had been elected President, some of the trust magrutes should be wearing stripes now. That is one of the reasons, it is suspected, that Mr. Bryan is not President.

MISCELLANY

A PRAYER.

For The Public.

Father, we are faring ill.
Dark oppression o'er us still
Casts a black and angry cloud,
Till Thy children cry aloud,
But, our Father, 'tis to Thee
We must look for liberty.

Thou hast given us the earth,
Here to prove our manhood's worth,
Cultivate the generous land,

Bringing forth with brain and hand.
But, O God, we are forlorn.
From Thy sons the earth is torn!

On the land which Thou didst give
We have not the right to live;
Save by permit, may not toil
On Thy rich and fertile soil.
For, O God, Thy land is sold
For a price of sordid gold.

Grant, we pray Thee, open minds.
Dissipate the mist that blinds.
Show to man his highest right—
That 'tis good in heaven's sight.
Speak to man in thunder call:
"I have given the earth to all!"

STEPHEN BELL.

IF IN THE PHILIPPINES, WHY
NOT IN WASHINGTON?

From editorial columns of City and State,
of Philadelphia, for August 28.

Mr. Boardman's letter explains very clearly our view of why our military authorities in the Philippines used Spanish torture as a military means. He puts the case in a nutshell: "We give them the water cure, they give us the guns." We had to get the guns to win the campaign, and so get peace and all its manifold blessings,—and the friars' lands for corporate exploitation,—and so, of course, we had to use the torture. How simple it all is when Mr. Boardman explains it! So simple that even Judge Taft must be persuaded to abandon his attractive theory of "a few weak or bad men" retaliating upon a cruel enemy; and Secretary Root to let go his fond belief that General Order 100 has been the controlling prohibition and guide of our troops; and the President, that only a few of our soldier boys have gone astray under the maddening temptation of a tropic campaign. Surely the pithy epigram of Mr. Boardman must make these practical, clear-sighted men understand the matter: "We give them the water cure, they give us the guns." Mr. Boardman is the man of the hour. He has expressed the truth so tersely, so neatly, that even a way-faring man cannot help understanding it.

But a word more—a question for moralists that is suggested by Mr. Boardman's reasoning. The water cure, he reasons, was justified because the Filipinos lied about their hidden guns. But if the water cure is a punishment deserved by a man who tells an untruth when he has a military secret that he can keep in no other way, would not its application to the heads of our War Department be permissible, for they did just what Mr. Boardman says the Filipinos did? They denied the use of the torture explicitly and emphatically when they had abundant proof to the contrary.

No doubt they felt justified in so doing on the ground of military or political necessity. But the fact that they made use of deceit is a clearly proved fact. Now, if they deceive the people in this way, who have a right to know just what their servants have been doing, would the people be justified in applying torture to them when they suspect that these public officials are hiding the truth or making false statements?

The Filipino tells the falsehood to aid him in expelling a foreign invader. There would seem to be stronger moral justification for his course than for that of those who employ such methods to conceal a truth that it can scarcely be claimed that they are justified in concealing. Now, if it is not right to use torture on United States officials when they make use of the weapon of prevarication or actual false statement (which we hold to be true), then how can the use of this means be justified as a military weapon in effecting an Oriental conquest? And yet it is an undoubted fact that large numbers of army officers justify this use of torture. This is an interesting question for casuists.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN
BULL.

HE DICTATES A SPEECH TO THE
PRESIDENT.

Printed from the Original MS.

Dear John: I'm gettin' aout of all patience with Theodore. He's not strenuous enough for me. Of course his tongue is out on the skirmish line; but—

"See here, Theodore!" says I; "stop th'is speech makin', it's gettin' flat; and do somethin'! Act once! If you'll have a little backbone and do somethin' for the people they'll put you in again all right. There is the finest kind of a chanet to fight right now. You can make a speech, too. Don't make it to the people; they'll catch on. Make it to the coal trust. Call 'em up and talk to 'em like this:

"Feller Stewards of Providence, controllin' all the heat: I've got my eye on you, and I don't approve of you. Stoppin' coal on the people means anarchy. It must be stamped out, and mine's the foot to do it. If the sheriff can't stop the riotin' he calls on the Governor. If the Governor can't stop it he calls on the President. That's the regular order. Now, if I have to call out the regular troops, it's martial law, and martial law don't mean killin' miners when it's up to me. I'll make a speech to the soldiers first thing. "Boys," I'll say, "black powder or white—no miner is to be hurt! No good ever

comes of killin' the workin' bees—except to swell the Carnegie library fund, and that's no good. They make the honey, and we need 'em in our business. Do you twig me? No man is a good American soldier until he can shoot straight enough to miss a workin' man! Do you get it?" And I'll say to you: Dig coal in ten days, or, by the Eternal, I'll seize the mines and dig it myself and run 'em for the people! You can't furnish me cars? Oh, I know you can't; not a car! That's what I'm a-complainin' of; but don't worry! I'll seize the cars, too. Martial law is just as martial to a railroad company as it is to a tailor—or a miner. Your Uncle Sam did lots of business that way in '61, and he did it express, too. There is no trouble about cars under martial law. But the price? I'll make the price five dollars a ton delivered, till you can figure out to my satisfaction it's worth more. But this is anarchy? No; not in a cold winter. It's comfort and warmth; and when you can figure out you are capable of doin' business, can pay your miners livin' wages, find cars to haul coal, and can sell at a reasonable rate, I'll call off my soldiers and you may resume; but, beware of martial law! Now, play ball!"

"Say it that way, Theodore, and you are it," says I. "You can do as you please about sayin', 'by the Eternal!' I'm afraid that's swearin', but it'll waken up a lot of dead Democrats if you do; and we would hear in about twenty-four hours that, owing to the earnest efforts of the eminent J. P. Morgan, the great coal strike was settled at last."

But the President glanced at me with a far away fishy look in his eye.

"Sam," he says, "I'm really a peace man at heart; and, besides, Baer and the other poor fellows have their money invested in those mines."

UNCLE SAM.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

A SPEECH TO THE LEGISLATURE.

Staff special dispatch from Columbus, Ohio, under date of September 10, to Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Senator Hanna some time since came to Columbus and in an interview proposed perpetual franchises as a solution of the franchise problem. To-day Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, came to Columbus. The Republicans of the legislature and of the state administration welcomed Senator Hanna to Columbus. In one interview he gave them more trouble than has the difficulty of a special session of the legislature on the eve of an election. His statement favoring perpetual franchises so complicated the situation that the Re-

publican leaders had to appeal to the state administration to end the special session in almost any old way by passing almost any kind of a code before the opening of the Republican campaign in order that they might then go before an excited public and assure them that their streets were in no danger of being taken from them in perpetuity and given to street railway companies.

Chairman Comings, when he announced Mayor Johnson and Newton D. Baker as the speakers of the morning, nervously supplemented his announcement with the statement that the franchise question had been practically settled and that no franchise legislation would be taken up at the special session. All the lightning rods were up and every Republican was safely ensconced in his cyclone cellar.

Mayor Johnson disappointed them. He came among them fresh from his campaign, but he left his politics behind him.

The critical and cynically scornful expression that set on faces of Republican lawmakers when Mayor Johnson mounted the platform softened gradually into plain ordinary interest. They came out of their cyclone cellars. And when he finished his talk in each house he was greeted with a hail of questions and a storm of honest applause, not confined to the minority side of the chambers. And when his talk was done he was the center of a throng composed of Republicans and Democrats alike who pressed forward to shake his hand. The former chaffed him pleasantly upon his "circus" campaign and he gave the invitation right and left to attend his tent meetings and use his platform to refute, if they cared to, what he said. The latter poured out congratulations and invitations to bring his tent down into their counties.

Of the two visits, that of Senator Hanna and of Mr. Johnson to Columbus, it is a question to-night whether the Republicans do not look back more pleasantly upon the call the mayor made them. And in their ranks it is a question whether his proffered solution of the franchise problem has not to-night as many advocates and more than that offered by Senator Hanna. At least there is a feeling among the members that they could adopt the former without running any danger from mob law enforced by wrathful constituents.

Mayor Johnson said in part:

"You are about to pass a municipal code bill. I wish you every success in

passing one that will last and that will be satisfactory to all. The greatest monument this legislature could leave behind it would be a code bill that could receive the support of every voter in both houses when it came up for passage. No party lines should be drawn in your work and no party questions should find a place in the code you draft.

"For myself, I believe in home rule; in the proposition of giving to each locality the local direction of its own affairs; the right to formulate its own government and to conduct it without interference; and I believe this idea is universally popular. But it is said that this cannot be done. If it can be done it will be the most satisfactory solution of your problem. It would give to Cleveland the kind of government she wants, and to Cincinnati the kind of government she wants. If you should give that degree of home rule to the state you would afford an opportunity for progress and development in municipal government. And municipal government is the greatest problem America has to face. We have come almost to be the United cities of America instead of the United States of America. The darkest blots on our civilization have been placed by the governments of our cities. From them will come the Goths and Vandals and the Huns to sweep over and destroy our civilization, if ever it is destroyed.

"But you may make mistakes in this section of your code. You may enact a board system of municipal government that time will condemn. I believe personally in the federal plan, but any plan you make should have a fair trial. However, a mistake here can be corrected. I believe in civil service. Extend it to all departments of the city government. Place the waterworks department under its rules as well as the departments of fire and police. Remove politics entirely from the question of filling positions in any and all of these departments. But you may leave this civil service provision out of your code and your mistake can still be cured.

"But, gentlemen, on franchises you may make a blunder you can't cure; you may make a mistake it will be impossible to correct. Perpetual franchises have been suggested and in support of this proposition it has been said that the gas companies all over the state hold perpetual grants. This is not true. The law of Ohio limits gas franchises to ten years. At the end of that time the council fixes a rate for a new term of ten years. If no price is fixed the company can

charge no rate for its product. This is different from a provision for a ten-year revision on terms to which the company must agree. Again there is no limit to the number of pipes a gas company or any other company can put in the street. But with street railways, when you have placed two tracks, or at the most four, in the street you can put down no more. And you can't put street car tracks in all streets. The cases are not parallel. The ten-year gas grants are in no sense perpetual.

"On these propositions the Nash code is more vicious than the present law. There are in the Nash code amendments that make it easier than at present for the old companies to extend their tracks into new territory. Now, the consents of the property owners to such extensions are required before the ordinance is passed to extend the tracks into new territory. This code provides that the ordinance shall be passed first and the consents be secured sometime afterward. Ninety per cent. of the street railway lines are built under this extension provision and not under new grants requiring competitive bidding. Of 200 miles of existing street railway lines in Cleveland not 20 miles were bid on.

"It is made harder for competing lines to get in. Propose to establish a three-cent fare line and you will find out how difficult it is. The present law is so strict that not a competing company has succeeded in 20 years. Not a grant given in that time to a competitive company that has not been contested. Possibly there is one exception. A line in Toledo that fought its way forward for a long time, but was at last absorbed by the old company. It is hard for the competitor under the present law. The Nash code makes it harder. The men who drafted that code know this and they drafted it for this purpose. It ought to be entitled: An act to prevent the building of competing street railway lines in the cities of Ohio.

"There seems to be a feeling in the air that but for the long time grants there would be no feeling of security among investors, that no street car lines would be built. That is not true. The best street railways in the United States exist under grants that can be terminated in a moment at pleasure. Every grant in the city of Washington is that way, and there is no trouble about selling 50-year four per cent. bonds on this property. Brooklyn bridge has the best street railway property in the United States, but the grant of that company can be termin-

ated by the superintendent of the bridge at a moment's notice. If a street railway is careful it lives because it is so. If it is good it will live; if it is bad it ought to die. Only a few years ago every railway in Massachusetts was living on franchises terminable at 90 days' notice. It is not true that capital will feel insecure under such conditions. Capital feels insecure when trying to hang on to antiquated schemes of horse cars when the public demands electricity, of five-cent fares when the public demands lower ones. The best franchise is that with the shortest life because it will live if the people want it to live, and if not, not.

"Under the present law it is almost impossible to build competing lines. With a friendly administration in Cleveland an attempt to introduce a three-cent fare line was knocked out in the courts. We went back and did it over again. It stied up again. Now all the municipalities in Ohio and all of their governments are equally unconstitutional. There is but one, and that, Cleveland, that could not grant a franchise for three-cent fare, for two-cent fare, for one-cent fare to any company to enjoy ten minutes. There are pages of restrictions in the present law for new grants. It is almost impossible to get a new grant. It is easy to extend existing lines, but renewals—that provision can be found in a line. No competition is provided for, no property owners' consents are required. When the interests of these powerful corporations are at stake, a way has been found to protect them. In Cincinnati a renewal was even granted for 50 years, and the law says 25. To secure a renewal they have merely to win one council and they have won their fight. They don't have to wait for their grant to expire. They can get the renewal at any time. They can pick the time to make their fight. You would not allow a little city to be placed in debt by its council without making the people say whether or not they approved of this burden.

"The expiring franchises in Cleveland and Cincinnati could be sold for 25 years for more than the combined debts of those cities, in addition to paying the present owners the full value of their property.

"Make no grant valid until it has been ratified by popular vote. The council can't sell out the people then. This is safe and wise. With that one provision you can leave the rest to the city. If citizens vote to grant franchises on a five-cent fare basis

that will be their concern. You require a two-thirds vote to make valid the bonding of a community, but you will give away 50 to 75 millions of the people's money without their consent if you leave the law as it is now. Don't let men ask for perpetual franchises and then come in and say: 'Leave the law as it is.' Don't let men come in and ask to perpetuate a 50-year franchise in Cincinnati that men tell me was granted through fraud. I believe it was. You need not waste sympathy on the men who hold that franchise. They took it as men buy a stolen horse, on their own risk.

"This curative act that has been proposed goes further than the present law. It gives the right of renewal before the expiration of the franchise. With a 20-year franchise a corporation under this proposed law could ask and receive an extension from the date of the expiration of its franchise for 25 years more. Or, in other words, it would be possible to obtain a 45-year franchise at any time. You have the brightest minds among the politicians to deal with. They are trying to get 45-year franchises if not franchises in perpetuity.

"Provide that in addition to the franchise becoming valid only when approved by the vote of the people that also when a grant is renewed the company shall secure the renewal that will carry passengers for the lowest rate of fare. I would treat the old companies much more fairly than their heads would treat tenants of theirs. If you should lease land of one of them for 25 years and build a house upon it, he would take the house when your lease expired. But I don't think that is right. I would do better by them than that. I would provide that the old companies should be paid a fair price on the valuation of its tracks and cars and power houses, plus some. If you provide in your code for the facilitating of the giving away of property of people you will leave behind you a code that will still be a monument to you, but anything but an enviable one."

Henry Thomas Buckle's thoughts and conversation were always on a high level. Once he remarked: "Men and women range themselves into three classes or orders of intelligence; you can tell the lowest class by their habit of always talking about persons; the next by the fact that their habit is always to converse about things; the highest by their preference for the discussion of ideas."—Chicago Chronicle.

SENATOR BUCKLIN'S REPLY TO AUSTRALASIAN TAX CRITICS.

Hon. J. W. Bucklin, in the Denver Daily News, of August 24.

At the special session of the legislature held this year the privileged classes of Colorado made a most strenuous effort to induce the legislature to repeal the Australian tax amendment. Those who were leading in that campaign denounced the amendment and its author in the most violent manner. They charged that the amendment was a fraud and freak, that it had passed the legislature and been submitted by dishonest methods and arguments, and was unworthy of respect or even decent consideration. Through the newspapers I was told the State was getting too hot for me, and I would have to skip out. It was said that the bill was an anarchist bill, and that "we do not agree with anarchists, we kill them."

This style of campaign, however, proved unsuccessful. The legislature did not pass the repeal bill, the courts would not take the question away from the voters, and for the first time the privileged classes began to realize that there was some vitality in the measure which would require respectful treatment and intelligent opposition. They, therefore, began to call out their reserved forces. Corporation lawyers and professors of political economy are now appearing in the fray, anxious to defend the owners of social values from their just burden of taxation.

OUR OPPONENTS.

The two ablest gentlemen who have yet appeared against the amendment are Hon. L. F. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol. As a rule their arguments are similar, and I shall treat them jointly.

Mr. Twitchell says that the amendment "has none of the fiscal economical or philosophical features of the Henry George theory," while Prof. Rossignol says that "it is about half single tax." Mr. Twitchell says it is "the peculiar product of its author," and bears "no resemblance to the Australasian land tax law," while the professor says that it is "similar to the system in operation in New Zealand, and to some extent an imitation of it."

Both gentlemen studiously ignore the fact that a similar law is in force in South Australia, another in New Wales, and still another in Queensland. The existence and character of the laws in these other colonies is a complete answer to the argument that the Colorado amendment is not similar to the Australasian tax laws. Messrs. Twitchell and Rossignol assert correctly that the New Zealand state tax

has exemptions of small landholders, and a graduated tax on large holders. The Australasian tax laws of South Australia and Queensland, however, do not exempt any landholders whatever, nor do the laws of New South Wales or Queensland have any graduations of any kind. Yet these laws have worked just as successfully as have the laws of New Zealand—in fact, the graduations and exemptions are generally admitted to be a blemish. If the laws in other states were the only ones which had no exemptions or graduations, however, I might have thought that a careless examination was a sufficient explanation of their incorrect position. But when we consider the fact that any examination at all of the New Zealand home rule or local option laws discloses the fact that such laws have no land exemptions or graduations there seems to be no excuse for the misrepresentations which have been made. The local option or home rule part of the Colorado law is the chief portion of it, more important by far than the other section. What the motives are of those who claim that the Colorado law differs in principle from the Australasian laws I leave it to the public to imagine. Certain it is that such allegations have no foundation in fact. These gentlemen concede that the Australasian tax has worked well in the colonies, and there is no logical reason for thinking that it will work otherwise in Colorado.

These gentlemen utterly misconceive and misunderstand the chief object and purpose in the adoption of the Australasian tax. They assume, without argument, that the main object and purpose of the amendment is to reform our land laws. Mr. Twitchell particularly does not seem to understand that we propose a tax reform, but thinks our whole object is a reform in land tenure. For this reason he does not discuss the tax question, and neither gentleman seems to understand that this amendment opens the only way in which any tax reform at all is possible. The principal tax reforms which the professor advocates could be adopted under this amendment, otherwise they would be unconstitutional.

In New Zealand the Australasian tax was adopted at two different times, for state purposes in 1891, and for local purposes in 1896. The former tax was adopted to take the place of the general property tax, and to supply the revenue needed because of the repeal of that tax. The general property tax exempted small property holders, so the new tax made a like ex-

emption. The land question at this time did not enter into the discussions, although the chief discussions centered around the fiscal question. The graduated portion of the law was passed with the idea of breaking up the large landed estates, but being unjust, it has not produced the desired effect so much as has the ordinary tax which contains no graduations. In 1896, however, New Zealand adopted the local option tax, similar to the Colorado amendment, purely as a fiscal measure, with almost no discussion of land tenures.

In Queensland the Australasian tax was adopted in 1890 by the conservative party purely as a fiscal reform, and without any discussion of the question of land tenures.

South Australia in 1884 adopted the Australasian tax without any exemptions or graduations, for the purpose of supplying a deficiency in revenues. There was at this time but little discussion of the land question.

New South Wales in 1895 adopted the Australasian tax without any graduations as a tax reform, to supply the deficiency caused by a reduction of tariff duties. The land question was only incidentally considered.

Nowhere in any of the colonies was the Australasian local tax adopted as a land reform, but always as a fiscal reform. Nor do such local tax laws anywhere contain graduations or exemptions. The Australasian tax is at the present time being rapidly adopted throughout New Zealand by the local governments, always as a fiscal reform. All these facts concerning the Australasian tax in the colonies, both Mr. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol ignore. Their misconception of the reasons for adopting the laws in Australasia, as well as the purpose of this amendment, colors their whole consideration of the question. It makes them call the measure revolutionary, when, in fact, it is very conservative. To change land tenures might be called revolutionary, but not so a reform in taxation which merely makes it possible for the people to more equitably tax the few who own the earth. Reform in taxation is the main object we are striving for, all other objects being beneficial but secondary. Let our opponents, therefore, drop their hysterics, get down to business and discuss this question in a rational manner.

LAND MONOPOLY IN COLORADO.

Mr. Twitchell says that there is no land monopoly in Colorado. There is a large number of Spanish land grants in Colorado, some of which are as

large as the largest estates in New Zealand.

There are no estates in New Zealand as large as the land ownership of the Colorado Fuel and Iron company, which owns more soft coal land, according to the statements of its officers, than exists in the entire state of Pennsylvania. In some of the counties of the state the Colorado Fuel and Iron company is in absolute control, and it owns land in a large portion of the counties.

The land grants to the Union Pacific railroad surpass any made in New Zealand.

Nor has New Zealand any landed estates or corporations which begin to compare in value with the value of rights of way and franchises of the railroads of Colorado.

In truth, Colorado is worse cursed with the monopoly of social values than is New Zealand. It is therefore time to let up on such statements as that there is no land monopoly in Colorado. It is the monopoly of land that makes the Denver Republican fight us so bitterly, and that causes it to refuse us a hearing in reply. If the privileged classes of Colorado are wise they will not force us to, expose the extent to which land monopoly has already gone, especially in Denver.

But suppose there was no land monopoly in Colorado, what of it? Should we wait until the horse is stolen before we lock the stable door? Would it not be wiser to prevent land monopoly in its beginnings rather than to promise a cure for the disease after it has a firm hold on our system? Such relief would then surely be denounced as dangerous and revolutionary. If there is no land monopoly now, let us adopt this amendment so that there never will be any.

NOT SO RADICAL.

Both Mr. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol mistake the extent to which the amendment goes in local taxation. They say that it is the single tax in local taxation, and collects all local revenue by this system. This is not correct. It is not a tax system, nor does it authorize the adoption of a tax system, but only authorizes the people to make certain exemptions from direct taxation. It does not, therefore, authorize the people to abolish saloon or other licenses, which are a large part of town and city revenues. Nor does it authorize the people to abolish fees which are a large part of the receipts of coun-

ty offices. Many other local revenues are also left untouched by this measure.

These gentlemen are also inaccurate in saying that the amendment provides for a two-mill increase of state tax, on social values. It provides for not to exceeding two mills tax, but of course, no such tax would be adopted without a corresponding reduction of tax on general property.

There are so many inaccurate statements made by these gentlemen that it is not possible within moderate space to mention them all.

THE MAIN POINT.

The most noticeable thing about their arguments, however, is not their inaccuracies or misstatements, gross as these are, but the points they fail to consider. I have already mentioned their failure to consider the question as a tax reform. More noticeable still is their failure to consider or hardly mention the chief feature of the amendment.

There is one thing about the Australasian tax amendment that is so prominent that no fair consideration of the matter can ignore it, and that is the fact that it does not establish any change of any kind whatever, but merely places power in the hands of the people to make changes in the future should they so desire. This is in reality the whole question. Not whether the Australasian tax is just or unjust, but whether the people should have control of the subject; whether they are capable of local self-government. Even if all the arguments of Mr. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol are correct in every particular, yet they have not touched the real question at issue, which is whether the people can be safely trusted with power. If they can be, then there is no good reason for opposing the amendment. Underneath all opposition to this amendment will be found a complete distrust of the American idea of self-government. Disguise it as they will, our opponents oppose this measure because they fear the people. They think or profess to think that if the people are given power they will drive capital out of the state; that they will destroy uniformity in taxation; that they will place the just burdens of the many on the few; that they will entirely exempt the cattle companies and other property on the public domain; that they will place all taxes on farmers in agricultural counties, where farmers are

in the majority; that, in short, if the people of any county are given power over local taxation, they will do everything that is bad, and nothing that is good. This is their fundamental reason for opposing this amendment, not that the amendment is bad, but the people are bad. Our opponents do not discuss this feature of the question, and dare not discuss it. They know that if this feature of the measure is once understood the amendment will carry by a vote of ten to one, as was the case recently on a similar proposition in Oregon. For this reason our opponents do not discuss the initiative and referendum in taxation, which is all that is involved in the main proposition.

Already signs of rational consideration of the amendment are appearing among the privileged classes themselves. Let the amendment once be fully understood and all disinterested opposition to it will disappear like mist before the morning sun. There was a time when I thought it possible that the measure might not be fully understood, and might, therefore, be defeated. I do not fear any longer. The light that is beginning to appear absolutely insures its success. By election day few intelligent persons will be found in the ranks of its opponents. I move that the vote in its favor be made unanimous.

Now, if Plain Duty were only stylish or chic, or if she had tact or aplomb or something like that, we might brace up and pay attentions to her; but if she is merely plain, she must not be surprised if a good many of us give her the cold shake.—Puck.

When the Aryans declared in set terms that their purpose was benevolent assimilation, the savages were much struck.

"Assimilation!" exclaimed these simple people. "And does this mean that we shall be fair-skinned, too?"

"Well, skinned, at any rate!" said the Arvans, being very careful not to promise too much.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

"THE NEW BOOK OF KINGS."

The announcement comes from London of a new edition of Mr. J. Morrison Davidson's little book with the above title. This new edition was doubtless called forth by the tempestuous noises of the coronation. Its subtitle is "A Republican Counterblast." The present reviewer counts among a few choice book treasures a copy of the first edition, given him by the author's brother,

Thomas Davidson, the great scholar, who died about a year ago in this country. The book has been out of print for several years, and this new edition will be gladly welcomed by lovers of the principles of republican democracy.

The "New Book of Kings" takes up the lines of English sovereigns and tells simply what manner of men they really were. A black list it makes. The author tells fact upon fact—such facts as polite historians feel called upon to omit—and so

The Colorado Home Rule Fight.

The following letter from the Hon. John Sherwin Crosby, of New York, speaks for itself. Mr. Crosby has been "stumping" the State of Colorado in behalf of the Bucklin home rule amendment to the State Constitution, under which every county would be at liberty to exempt personal property and improvements in the discretion of its own voters. He writes:

I am on my way home from a brief sojourn in Colorado. Perhaps nothing could have added to the strength of my already fixed and firm belief in the vital importance to the whole country of carrying what is known as the Bucklin, or Australasian Tax Amendment to the Constitution of that State, providing as it does for local option and the initiative and referendum in taxation.

Participation in the active campaign there going on in that behalf has, however, convinced me that a larger fund than has yet been raised, or can be raised in the State, is absolutely necessary to the work in hand. So immediate and urgent is the need that I write on train, and would if possible impress upon all who read my letter the importance of making their contributions at once.

Senator Bucklin is making a most laborious tour of the 57 great counties of the State, speaking once or more than once every day until November 4, and paying, and preferring to pay, his own expenses, which are exceptionally heavy owing to the long distances he has to travel. He is ably and faithfully supported by as earnest and energetic a band of workers as ever championed the right. What they lack is money, comparatively little of which has as yet been received from outside the State.

There is a vast territory to be covered, but it is inhabited by a people of superior intelligence, keenly alive to questions of public welfare. If they could be provided with literature in time to be read before election day, I should feel comparatively little anxiety as to the result.

As I have already stated, money is what is needed. It is needed now—at once. It will soon be too late, and I respectfully but earnestly urge everyone interested to send whatever amount he can by next mail to Hon. James W. Bucklin, in care of the Australasian Tax League, 610 Charles Block, Denver, Col. If everyone will immediately send at least one dollar, the necessary fund will be secured in time for effective use, and success will be reasonably assured.

I write without the consent or knowledge of Senator Bucklin, whose self-reliance and modesty are equalled only by his economic wisdom, his rare political sagacity and his sincere and untiring devotion to the cause he espouses. He should receive the moral and material support of us all in this crowning effort of his long and arduous struggle to open the way to equitable taxation, and to righteous revenues, public and private.

JOHN SHERWIN CROSBY.

September 18, 1902.

This letter is published and its suggestion approved by the National Committee for the Promotion of the Australasian Tax System.

LAWSON PURDY, Secretary.
111 Broadway, New York.



DOGS, FACTORIES AND OTHER NUISANCES !

Mr. Common Sense, of Colorado—You tax critters like this to reduce their number, on the principle that they contribute nothing of value to the county; then why don't you tax land speculators and monopolists on the same ground, and take the taxes off workers?

Taxing Authority—Very well reasoned; but, you see, we haven't got the power. Pass the Tax Amendment and then come and talk to me.

his book has a real value as a "counterblast" in the interest of truth. To some people it is, of course, "a horrid book."

Mr. Algernon Charles Swinburne, the distinguished English poet, writing recently in the Quarterly Review about Charles Dickens, expressed regret that Dickens should have written such a book as his "Child's History of England," since it would tend to diminish the child's reverence. What would Mr. Swinburne say of "The New Book of Kings!" And yet, may we not ask, in all sincerity, whether there is any gain in character in misplaced reverence? Are there not enough beautiful things, beautiful deeds, and beautiful lives in the world which we may revere, without having our spirit of reverence injured by withholding it from such a swashbuckler, for example, as Scott's hero, Richard I? Why do not our critics plead for reverence to be shown to men like John Ball, that noble priest who died in behalf of England's oppressed working men? What life of any English king furnishes such food for reverence as the life of this true hero? English history is full of men and deeds worthy of all reverence, but these have not often proceeded from the throne. Why then should a book be condemned simply because it tells some plain truths about men who came by accident to be surrounded with pomp and power?

Perhaps the best part of Mr. Davidson's book is the introductory chapter, in which he pleads for "democratic" history. Nowhere else have we seen the importance and need of the re-writing of history so clearly stated.

J. H. DILLARD.

PERIODICALS.

—In the September Harper Mr. T. E. Blakely has an interesting and valuable article on "Macaulay's English." The article is especially valuable, because of its definiteness. In telling of Macaulay's extreme patience and care, he gives specific examples of the hundreds of changes made in late editions of the great history. Mr. Blakely's manner of writing about style

cannot be too highly commended. He would be doing good service if he would take in hand some of our present Americans and show how "awfully slovenly" they often do write. Here is a sentence, for example, from Rev. Edward Everett Hale's article in the Outlook of August 23: "I afterwards met Mr. Adams, who was always very kind to me, when he was easily the first member of the House of Representatives, in the year 1845." The first impression of the reader is that the clause "when he was easily the first member" modifies the words "very kind to me," the idea being that of graciousness on the part of a great man toward a then obscure one. But of course the relative clause is merely parenthetical. It would have been an improvement to have omitted the "who" clause from the sentence. Furthermore, the sentence following this is illy joined. It begins, "For, the moment he was proposed as a member of Congress in his own district," etc. The connection is bad, both in logic and in grammar. Logically, the fact of the election and reelection of Mr. Adams in his own district did not necessarily make him the first member of the House. Grammatically, the connection is faulty, because the causal sentence, "For, etc.," relates not to the principal preceding sentence, but to a subordinate clause. A clear and careful writer, like Macaulay, would have made this subordinate clause a leading sentence, and would not have made it subordinate to the fact of his meeting the great man. Such criticism doubtless seems hypercritical; but after all, it lies in such nice points, consciously or unconsciously regarded, that the superiority of a first-rate writer is maintained.—J. H. D.

Four Perfect Food Products

Fruit Muffins, Fig Crisps, Peanut Wafers, Dates, contain all the food elements. Keep indefinitely. Samples by mail, 10c. **ZWIMACO**: A delicious and healthful drink. Sample box by mail, 10 cents. **STRAIGHT EDGE KITCHEN**, 1 Seventh Ave., New York. Makers of good things to eat and students of health.

THE STRAIGHT EDGE: Published to explore row way that is said to lead unto "Life." Subscription Price: "Nothing but love and good will." Ask for a small handful of "Squibs and Things." Enclose 10c if you happen to have it. 1 Seventh Avenue, New York.

The Public

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

TERMS.

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

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

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
1641 UNITY BUILDING
CHICAGO, ILL.

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

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

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

POST OFFICE ADDRESS :

THE PUBLIC, BOX 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

CHARLES H. ROBERTS,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,

618 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

EWING & RING,

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,

HOUSTON, TEXAS.

Presley K. Ewing.

Henry F. Ring.

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,

COUNSELLOR AT LAW,

BENNETT BLDG.,

90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan, Tel. Call, 1253 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012. NEW YORK.

THE VANGUARD

is the latest exponent of pure democracy. It discusses live issues in a vigorous and independent fashion. To introduce this bright up-to-date magazine the publishers will send it for four months for 10c. Address, **THE VANGUARD PRESS**, Box F, Green Bay, Wis.

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