

# The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1903.

Number 254.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

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

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

It is a good rule in the agitation of social reforms requiring legislation, to take one step at a time if you can't take two. For that reason a limited extension of the suffrage to women may properly be worked for as an advance toward suffrage unlimited. But, while partial measures are better than none if in the right direction, they are worse than none if in the wrong direction; and tried by this test the bill proposed by the Political Equality League of Illinois for enactment by the present legislature is distinctly bad.

That bill would allow officials who collect or distribute taxes to be voted for by women who own property which they do not earn, while it would withhold it from women who consume property which they do earn. Of course, among the property owning women would be included those who earn their property; but the distinction of the bill relates to owning and not to earning. The bill, that is to say, is based upon the familiar but false principle that the property owner is the tax payer, and that therefore taxation and representation go together when property owners are allowed to vote and the propertyless are not. Inasmuch as the bill is urged by such intelligent and sterling democrats as Catharine Waugh McCulloch, the widely known Chicago lawyer, who approve it not as sound in principle but as a step toward full suffrage, its merits in that regard are to be respected if it has any, and this necessitates a searching question as to its tendency.

Would such a law tend toward the extension of suffrage to all women, regardless of their accumulations of property, or would it tend toward the withdrawal of the suffrage from propertyless men? In other words, would it strengthen the democratic idea of manhood suffrage (including womanhood suffrage, of course), or would it strengthen the reactionary aristocratic and plutocratic idea of property suffrage? In our judgment it is the latter idea that would draw most strength from such a law. Wouldn't the whole influence and voting force of the propertied classes, both men and women, be attracted by it, not in the direction of extending the suffrage to propertyless women, but in the direction of withdrawing it from propertyless men.

We can even now almost hear in response to this objection, a swelling chorus of "why not?" And these "why nots" are fortified with arguments for the control of public expenditures by the tax paying class. Those arguments need not be discussed. It is enough to mention the fatally false assumption they rest upon, without even considering that broad question of human rights which is the only complete refutation of kingcraft. The false assumption is the notion that the property owning class is the tax-paying class. In truth the property owning class, as such, pays the least taxes. Most taxes are paid by the consuming class, as such; and that class includes everybody. Some among the propertyless do not earn what they consume, and are therefore not taxpayers strictly speaking. The wandering "hoboe" is the only type of this class. But by that test non-taxpayers are to be found also in the property class. The idle rich furnish a variety of types who consume without earning.

That consumers are the principal taxpayers is evident upon a little reflection. Take for illustration the proposition to make street car companies pay the city for franchises by a tax on gross receipts, instead of allowing a reduction in fares. Who would pay that tax? The street car passengers, of course. No one denies it. On the contrary, it is argued that they ought to do so, as that is the only way of taxing them. Now among those taxed passengers would be propertyless saleswomen; and they would pay into the city treasury, even if they rode but 600 times a year, about as much (at 1 cent tax on each passenger) as a propertied woman, who didn't "dodge," would pay on \$500 worth of property. Yet, under the proposed property-woman's suffrage bill, the latter could vote, while the former could not. Why? Because, forsooth, the \$500 woman would be a taxpayer, and the saleswoman would be a non-taxpayer! This is only an illustration. The propertyless classes are taxed on all hands. On their food, on their clothing, on their living rooms. On everything they eat or drink, or wear, or amuse themselves with, they pay a public tax in the private price. Yet they are not taxpayers! Each individual among the propertyless doubtless does pay over less than each individual among the propertied, for he consumes less. But taken as a whole, the poorest of those who would be disfranchised under a property suffrage law, bear the burden of a larger aggregate of public taxes than do the richest of those who would have voting rights.

When Alderman Foucek, of Chicago, offered in the city council this week a street car ordinance, which fixed maximum fares at 3 cents, the council disposed of the bill by referring it to the committee on local

transportation. This was proper, because that committee is now dealing with the general subject of street car transportation. But the majority of the council exhibited an animus against low fares which it will be well for voters to remember. According to one report, that of the Chicago Tribune of the 10th, the ordinance "was practically laughed out of court," the aldermen being so unwilling to "even listen to what the mover of the proposition had to say in its favor" that they "in a hurry sent it to the committee on local transportation for burial."

The true inwardness of this hostile attitude toward low fares may be inferred from a statement which Alderman Bennett is reported to have made recently, when explaining the traction situation. It should be noted that Alderman Bennett's evident disposition is to save taxes for real estate men at the expense of street car riders. He asserted on the occasion referred to that the legitimate cost for operating expenses in carrying each passenger is more than three cents, and that about another cent would be fair remuneration for invested capital, making a total cost of something over four cents per passenger. To this assertion he appended his opinion that the remaining fraction of a cent out of a five cent fare ought to go to the city. Of course he favors 5-cent fares. The very foundation of Alderman Bennett's scheme is rickety. It is not true that it costs more than 3 cents for operating expenses to carry each passenger. The operating expense is very much less than 3 cents.

In the course of the franchise negotiations now in progress in Chicago, it has been proposed that policemen and firemen be allowed to ride free, and the suggestion is advanced that the same privilege ought to be extended to postmen. That all these public servants should ride on street cars without expense to themselves, in aid of the performance of their public duties, is true. It is also true

that the expense ought to be borne by the locality—as much so regarding postmen as firemen or policemen, for the privilege for postmen would contribute to the efficiency of the mail service locally, rather than nationally. But there is no more reason why any public servant should be carried free back and forth between his home and his work, or to the theater, or the church, than there is for carrying mechanics and shop girls free. It would be a private service for which, if he didn't pay others would have to. Moreover, even when public servants on official business are carried free, it should be upon trip passes, so that no opportunity might be afforded the traction companies of throwing sand into the eyes of the public by pleading the burden of an indefinite amount of free transportation. Just at this time, if any extension of franchises must be made, especial care is necessary to avoid imposing obligations upon the companies which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. There ought to be no general provisions of any kind for free transportation for anybody. But between classes of public servants to be carried without personal expense to themselves, when on public duty, whatever system of keeping tally of their rides may be adopted, it is evident that postmen should not be discriminated against.

Whether we like it or not we shall all have to recognize, sooner or later, the fact regarding labor strikes which Henry D. Lloyd bluntly declared in summing up the case of the anthracite strikers before the arbitration commission at Philadelphia. To one of Chairman Gray's nagging questions, one of the kind that some of the labor leaders had dodged, Mr. Lloyd declared that the obloquy which falls upon "scabs" is analogous to that which the American patriots of 1776 visited upon Tories, because strikes are industrial wars. That is a statement of fact, not an expression of opinion, and it is the solemn truth. It is puerile, there-

fore, to condemn strikes because "scabs" are incidentally deprived of their natural rights by strikers. The question is not whether bad happenings occur in strikes, but whether strikes themselves are to be tolerated. And that question hinges upon another, one which men like Chairman Gray try deftly to avoid, namely, whether culpability for striking is attributable to strikers, or to the industrial institutions which are robbing the working class for the benefit of an idle or worse than idle privileged class. Our own view of this matter is that strikes are bad, but that strikers are not to blame for strikes. It is not necessarily the persons that deliver the first blow who break the peace. Those who drive them into a corner where they must either hit or suffer are the real offenders.

Tenants of some of the "sky-scrapers" of Chicago, 16 stories high and more, have been forced for several days either to abandon their offices or to climb laboriously up to them by stairways. After a test of endurance for a week, the dispute has now been submitted to arbitration, something that should have been done at first. The cause of the struggle originated in a disagreement between two labor unions—the union of elevator men and the union of building managers.

The building managers' union (called "association" because it represents "financial" instead of "labor" interests), resisted demands from the elevator men's union for a trifle higher pay, a slight degree of participation in "this wonderful American prosperity." In addition the elevator men wanted the privilege of sitting down at times during their long hours of monotonous work; they wanted their distinctive uniforms to be furnished by the building owners who require them to be worn, instead of being charged to themselves; and they wanted their union recognized. It was the wages question, however, that made the strike, buildings that conceded the scale of \$55 a month

experiencing no trouble. The building managers' union professed to regard these demands as outrageous enough to justify them in breaking their contracts with tenants and putting thousands of people — with whose rights and comforts they, and not the elevator men, were charged by contract—to the extreme of inconvenience and to serious risks of financial loss.

In those circumstances the merits of the conflict were of minor importance. It could make no difference to tenants of the buildings whether the elevator men were forcing extravagant demands or not. They do not appear to have done so, but that is beside the question. The important consideration is that building managers who had agreed to furnish their tenants with elevator service, arbitrarily refused to furnish it. This was not because they could not get the service; it was because they couldn't get it on their own terms. And they pride themselves upon being "business" men!

Serious as this indefensible breach of contract by the building managers' union was to the victimized tenants, it had its ridiculous aspects. One of them is the fact that many of the suffering tenants put the blame upon the union that represents labor interests, giving their sympathies to the union that represents financial interests. Could class prejudice go much further without becoming positively comical? Another of these ridiculous aspects of the situation was produced by the air of outraged innocence with which the walking delegates of the building managers' union condemned the exactions of the strikers; for a more exacting and arbitrary union could not be found in a year's journey than that of the building managers. The one-sided leases they require testify eloquently to the power of their union and the audacity of their walking delegates. They adapt to their peculiar requirements the same coercive methods to bring building managers into their union that the less

"financial" labor unions do, and they exert against tenants the same kind of combination to shut off competition. When a tenant deals with a building manager in Chicago, he finds himself in most cases "up against" the compactest kind of trade union. Yet this association of house renters turns cry baby when it faces a few slight exactions of an elevator men's union. In the vocabulary of expressive slang, "wouldn't that jar you?"

Congressman John S. Williams, of Mississippi, who will probably be the Democratic leader in the next House, a distinction he has richly earned and a place he would ably fill, pierced the trust question to the core in his speech on the trust publicity bill. A full report of his speech will be found at page 1924 of the Congressional Record of February 7. We call especial attention to this extract:

I do not suppose there is a man in this House that would deny the right to any individual in America to do all the business that is done in America in a given line provided he did it in free competition with the world, in an open and fair field, and with equal opportunity to all other men. Everybody knows that neither individual nor corporation can monopolize any business in that way. I defy the wisest Republican on the other side to give one single solitary instance of the successful operation of a monopolistic combination or a trust which has not rested upon special privileges granted either by law or by a corporation permitted by law to grant them. There is not one.

Whole volumes could not more clearly and truly diagnose the trust disease. In those few words all the complexities of the trust question, so baffling to the shacklers of cunning because they want to remedy the evil without disturbing its cause, are unraveled. Whoever reflects upon Mr. Williams's words with an open mind will conclude that there is nothing complex about the trust question except the financial interests of men who think it patriotic to earn their bread in the sweat of other men's faces.

We are not prepared to point out the cunning African in the wood pile

of the Livingston-Elkins-Nelson anti-trust legislation now before Congress, but we are sure that a particularly cunning one is working there. John D. Rockefeller's alleged demand upon the Senate to head off anti-trust legislation is proof positive. Mr. Rockefeller is reported to have sent this message to several senators:

We are opposed to any anti-trust legislation. Our counsel, Mr. —, will see you. It must be stopped.—John D. Rockefeller.

If Mr. Rockefeller did not send that message it is evident that some one wants it to appear that he did. Whoever that some one may have been he had one of two motives: anxiety to promote anti-trust legislation by making Congress believe that Rockefeller, the potentate of trustdom, is panic-struck; or anxiety to complicate and nullify anti-trust legislation by throwing Congressmen into a panic in which they will improvidently pass bad measures. The former motive is highly improbable. If Rockefeller had regarded the message as hostile he would have disclaimed it. The second motive is probable. Rockefeller may be willing to wink at the use of his name without authority, hoping that it will produce a panic. If he himself sent the message, as seems now to be generally believed, it is inconceivable that he did so with a view to preventing anti-trust legislation. Unless he has wholly lost his head he knows that nothing would be more likely to precipitate such legislation than impudent orders against it from him. His purpose, if he did send the message while clothed in his right (though not necessarily righteous) mind, could have been nothing else than to help rush through what looks like anti-trust legislation upon its face, but is within full of bad men's schemes and trust corruption. John D. Rockefeller is too "devilish sly" to make such a blunder as the trust organs accuse him of in connection with this most extraordinary message. The document smells rank of his dark and tricky ways, as Miss Tarbell de-

scribes them, in the earlier periods of his predatory career.

One of the possible virtues of the pending trust legislation, from the point of view of trust magnates, was pointed out by Congressman Sulzer on the floor of the House on the 6th. Mr. Littlefield, the President's chosen shackler of cunning, had introduced a bill which looked very much like a real shackle. But when he brought his bill out of committee it had been curiously worked over, apparently by unseen hands. Referring to this, Mr. Sulzer said:

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. Littlefield) seems to me to be in an embarrassing position. He changed the title to his bill—he gave up his original bill—and substituted for it a weak, apologetic makeshift that will accomplish nothing or do great harm. Now, I want the members of this House to see how cleverly the trust lawyers amended the title of the original bill. If you will take the title of the original bill introduced by my friend from Maine, you will find it required "all" corporations to make "true" returns, and the trust lawyers some way or other induced the great trust buster from Maine to amend his bill so that it leaves out entirely "all" corporations and "true" returns. The entire bill—I mean the new trust bill—now before us is a hollow sham.

Whatever Senator Hanna's motives may have been in fathering a bill for pensioning the liberated slaves, his bill offers an impressive lesson on the subject of compensation in connection with the abolition of institutional wrongs. It reminds one of the subterfuge of the hero of "No. 5 John Street." He designed to live in the slums—to actually live there and become a companion of their denizens instead of an inquisitive and benevolent overseer. But he dared not let his friends know his purpose. They would have laughed at him. So he accounted for his absence from his aristocratic haunts by letting it leak out that he had gone to the Caspian sea to hunt ducks. There was nothing comical to his set about his traversing the continent of Europe and penetrating far into Asia to kill

ducks; but it would have seemed inexpressibly comical to them if they had known he had gone a mile away from upper tendom to make companions of poor people. This incident in Whiteing's interesting novel has its parallel in connection with Senator Hanna's slave-pension bill. Everybody is laughing at Hanna's bill to compensate the slaves for the years of unrequited servitude which the government imposed upon them, while nobody would laugh at a bill to compensate the owners for refusing any longer to impose that servitude upon the slaves. How we do laugh about serious things and grow serious about comical ones! If anyone were to be compensated it should be the slave and not the master, for it was the slave whom the government wronged by standing between him and freedom. The master was not wronged by the government's refusal to continue wronging the slave.

But neither master nor slave should be compensated now. Let bygones be bygones, and look out for the future. We still have wrongs akin to slavery to remedy, without turning back to the wickedness of other generations. If existing institutional wrongs were righted, the old slave masters would not want compensation and the old slaves would not need it. Each would earn enough for himself and keep his earnings. Did Mr. Hanna really wish to serve the Negro, for whose vote in the next Republican convention he is now so undisguisedly angling, he would get into harness with Tom L. Johnson and devote the rest of his life and his fortune to abolishing the tariffs that rob American workers, black and white, and the monopoly land tenures that disinherit them.

It must be somewhat startling to our imperial patriots who have assumed that peace prevails in the Philippines, to read this week of a battle within seven miles of Manila. A force of 200 "insurgents"—Filipino patriots as history will call them

—engaged the foreign (American) constabulary and was defeated only after what the dispatches call a severe engagement. It now leaks out that the Filipino force was part of a little patriot army under Gen. San Miguel, who has refused to abandon his country to its alien conquerors. This event makes two things pretty clear: first, that the American reports of pacification have been deceptive; and, second, that there are Filipinos who, like ourselves, have a hatred of foreign dominion even unto death.

#### A BOUNTY-FED REPUBLIC.

Two of America's industrial monarchs—men who have waded to the thrones they occupy through the slaughter of their fellow men's opportunities—are just now scoring what our dramatic critics would call "a huge success" in the character of philanthropists. That lively competition which they have abolished in the industries they controlled, they have carried into the domain of charity, and according to the latest bulletin it is by no means clear whether the ex-iron despot who has turned book-buyer to the world at large has not been outrun in munificence by the man to whom so many collegestudents owe their midnight "oil," and so many college professors their ethical doctrines. So that it seems there is use for our arch-monopolists after all; under cover of all their elaborate schemes for the destruction of our liberties, they are really hatching deep-laid plans for our benefit, reminding us of Pope's lines:

But still the great have kindness in reserve,  
They helped to bury whom they helped to starve.

Whether the same people whose rights have perished in the upbuilding of the over-swollen wealth of Carnegie and Rockefeller are likely, through the overflow pipe of charity, to come by their own again—whether the gift of a library here and a college there is an adequate recompense for the hundreds of thousands of independent livelihoods that have been taken away, is not the question which now concerns us; the aspect of the case which overshadows every other is the fact that the richest Be

public the world ever saw is not ashamed to beg the necessities of life from its monopolist citizens. Who that cares for the nation's self-respect and independence can notice the way that representative bodies, church dignitaries, educational authorities, publicists and the people at large, fawn upon and coax these economic monstrosities without feeling that the manhood is going out of the American character? Would any self-respecting people allow Mr. Carnegie to choose their books, Mr. Rockefeller their teachers, or Mr. Baer to patronizingly undertake that they shall not have to pay more than five dollars a ton for their coal? Yet this is what we have come to.

Since when did this spirit of alms-taking and subserviency take root in the national character? It is obviously a recent growth; it has nothing in common with the fearless spirit of the men who revolted against foreign oppression and made it a thing of the past, or with the daring self-sufficient spirit of the pioneers who carried the torch of civilization westward and armed with an axe and an old gun compelled reluctant nature to yield them a living. It is the opposite of all this. It is the inevitable accompaniment of the social and economic forces which have in recent years dug the ground from under the American citizen and left him at the mercy of the monopolistic corporation. Even in old countries accustomed to the worship of rank and wealth there is no such toadying to wealth or such disposition to ignore the sources of its acquisition as is furnished by the present trend of events in this great Republic.

How would a really self-respecting Republic treat such gifts as those of Carnegie and Rockefeller? A New York clergyman speaking of such gifts recently said: "Let us take all the money we can from such sources." How like a clergyman, who preaches a Kingdom that is not of this world! And yet there are exceptions. Over in England, some years ago, a Mr. Hooley, a bubble-millionaire and company promoter made a magnificent present to St. Paul's Cathedral. Shortly afterwards, the Hooley smash came and then it was seen at whose expense he was enabled to be so gen-

erous. The clergy of St. Paul's had the decency to return the money to the estate. They did not think that paying Paul was a sufficient atonement for robbing Peter.

But charity we are told is "restitution." It is not restitution. It is, if rightfully interpreted, merely adding insult to injury, and it would be so regarded if men were as great sticklers for fair play in the game of life as they are in the game of football or cards. A man who plays foul when it is only the livelihoods of millions of people that are at stake, is honored and treated like a demigod, whereas if he had been detected using loaded dice or hiding an ace up his sleeve, he would be expelled from all honorable society. The man who, in order to grab more wealth than he can ever get through, sacrifices all considerations of public welfare, commercial morality, and even legal honesty, instead of being left, as he ought to be left, to stagger under the pile of filthy lucre as best he can, and to struggle unaided through the eye of the needle, is allowed to ease his back and his conscience through the channel of philanthropy.

That channel ought not to be open to anyone except those who were just before they became generous. That our tyrant monopolists are permitted to use it shows that the chains of economic slavery not only have crippled the body, but the spirit of the nation, and are sapping the foundations of its manly virtues. After that the descent is easy. Given an enslaved public opinion and there is no form of aggression upon popular liberty that will not, henceforth, be safe, easy and even popular.

T. SCANLON.

#### DIRECT LEGISLATION FOR LOS ANGELES.

"Ad astra per aspera." Literally, "to the stars through roughness;" freely, "expect difficulties if you want success." It is the counterpart of that good English proverb, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." Either of these will describe how Los Angeles got direct legislation.

It only happened on December 1, 1902, that the people of that thriving Pacific city by a vote of 12,846 in favor, to 1,942 against, or more than

six to one, adopted a charter amendment for direct legislation. Really it is not fully assured yet, as the legislature must ratify or reject the amendment as a whole; but the legislature has never been known to reject a charter amendment that local feeling in a city wanted, and there is no probability that they will reject this one.

Three things are needed for a successful change in economic or political methods. First, an educated public sentiment; second, propitious circumstances; and third, a few determined and tactful men. The last is more than all the others put together; as the determined and tactful man, or men, educate the public and make propitious circumstances.

Los Angeles, the metropolis of southern California, the Mecca of the winter tourist, is inhabited by a people restless, energetic, pleasure-loving and open-minded. Its rapid growth has drawn the freer, more daring spirits to it. Its balmy climate, suitable for invalids and consumptives, has drawn many leisured rich to it, and there is about it an air of cultured ease contrasting strongly with its spirit of Western drive. This ample margin of time and money and the knowledge how to use the two is badly absent from many Western cities, and differentiates Los Angeles from them. Then the brilliant sunshine—they claim the sun shines 360 days out of the 365—and the crisp air, invigorating like champagne, have given a mercurial liveliness to the people of this city of Los Angeles, not seen elsewhere. Such is the soil.

The propitious circumstances were the fact that Los Angeles had long ago outgrown its charter and badly needed a new one, and secondly, that the constitution of California permits a city to make or amend its own charter, subject to ratification by the legislature. On the initiative petition signed by a certain number of the voters, the question of whether the city shall have a new charter is submitted to the voters. If they say Yes, a little later they elect a charter commission, which draws up the new charter or amendments to the old one, and after a suitable time for discussion, they are voted on by the people, and if accepted, go to the legislature, who cannot change but only accept or

reject as a whole. They always accept. Last, but by far the most important, are the men. Four, five, six years ago, efforts were made to get direct legislation, headed by Henry C. Dillon, Fred S. Baker, and others. I know of at least two determined efforts to get direct legislation into the city charter, and spoke to audiences in Los Angeles for these people. They were beaten, and at least one leader was so discouraged that he said Los Angeles was not fit to have direct legislation, and he retired from the work. He had worked hard and could see no results, but there were results. Every effort had produced an education of the public mind, which was needed for final success. The public were educated by defeats, and what some people called apathy was only a fit conservatism in taking up a new method. And this conservatism has justified itself. It has educated the leaders. The first charter amendments drawn up were crude and would have worked badly. The amendment just adopted is the best in any city—it is far stronger, clearer and better drawn than that adopted in San Francisco three or four years ago.

Among the men converted by the earlier movements and active in the one before this, was Dr. John R. Haynes, a wealthy, cultured, tactful, popular and very busy physician. He had been on the previous charter commission and had been defeated in his efforts to get direct legislation then. "Ad astra per aspera." "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." He did. He made the time among the multifarious duties and pleasures of a very busy and full life to write and speak for direct legislation, to gather friends around him, and to organize a local Direct Legislation League with the names of prominent bankers, clergymen, politicians, etc., on its list of officers; and some of the young men he enthused were most efficient writers and workers.

In this work he was greatly aided by Joseph Asbury Johnson, of the editorial staff of The Los Angeles Herald. Mr. Johnson was one of the committee of one hundred, which drew up the San Francisco charter, and he was the original direct legis-

lation man there. Of course he knew all about it. The editorial and news columns of the Herald give a full history of the movement. Thus, on

July 5th it said in part editorially:

The committee on charter revision have revived fresh interest in their work by the adoption of the principles of direct legislation, which, it will be recalled, were recommended by the last board of freeholders. Briefly, the principles recommended for embodiment in the new city charter, the instrument for which Los Angeles has so long been pining, are as follows:

**The Initiative**—Upon presentation of a petition signed by 15 per cent. of the voters, asking that an ordinance be submitted to the people at a special election, the council may pass the ordinance, or must call a special election within 15 days from the presentation of the petition. It will require a petition of only five per cent. for a request that an ordinance be submitted at the next municipal election.

**The Referendum**—No ordinance, except in certain contingencies duly provided for, shall go into effect before 30 days from the time of its final passage, and if during that interim a petition signed by seven per cent. of the voters be presented, the ordinance shall be suspended until repealed by the council or acted upon by the people at a special or general election, as the council may see fit.

**The Recall**—The holder of any elective office may be removed after a petition has been signed by 25 per cent. of electors by a special election held not less than 30 days after a certificate of the qualifications of the petitioner has been filed. In any such removal election the officer sought to be removed shall be a candidate to succeed himself, unless he requests otherwise, and the candidate receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected.

It is satisfactory to note that five out of the nine councilmen were present and voted in favor of the report. There is nothing in the proposed legislation as outlined that any honest official need fear or that any thoughtful citizen will seriously object to. The majority of the people are given the right to initiate reforms, to veto objectionable ordinances and to remove a dishonest official. If the people are given the responsibilities of a more direct hand in municipal affairs, they may be trusted to use it faithfully and wisely, and the result should be a much more satisfactory condition of city affairs.

But why go into the details of the petition, letters, newspaper articles, meetings, tracts and various forms of propaganda. There are numberless methods and many ought also to be mentioned, but space forbids.

Perhaps almost the best propaganda were the cartoons in the Herald. These struck the eye vividly and were remembered by the average man. They contain the best arguments for direct legislation.

"Ad astra per aspera." "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." "Go thou and do likewise."

ELTWEED POMEROY.

## NEWS

Venezuela war news is confined this week chiefly to the diplomatic negotiations. Our last report on that phase of the war (p. 694) ended with the submission by Mr. Bowen to the blockading powers of what was virtually an ultimatum. Taking the ground that the question of preferring debts had come now to be the only issue (p. 695), and positively refusing a preferential arrangement, he proposed that the dispute be submitted to the international arbitration tribunal at The Hague. To this proposal replies were then (Feb 4th) hourly expected.

If they came they have not been published. It is possible, of course, that the news dispatches were in error, or merely gossip transmuted into news, and that no such formal ultimatum as was then reported had been made. At any rate it now appears that on the 5th Mr. Bowen submitted to the representatives of the blockading powers a series of proposals which are summarized by the Associated Press as follows:

(1) Venezuela to make a cash payment of \$27,500 to each of the three blockading powers. (2) The blockading powers to have preferential treatment for three months, in the division of 30 per cent. of the customs receipts of Puerto Cabello and La Guayra, after which all creditor powers to be on equal footing. (3) A number of mixed commissions to adjust the claims of the blockading and non-blockading powers. Each government interested to appoint a representative, the government of Venezuela to appoint the second, and if they are unable to agree the king of Spain, or President of France, to appoint the third member, who will act as umpire. (4) A protocol to be drafted in which all conditions will be included, and the blockade to be raised. (5) The king of Belgium to take charge of the customhouses at Puerto Cabello and La Guayra and administer the finances until all claims have been paid, if Venezuela fails to make payments as agreed.

Some unpleasant incident or other had meanwhile occurred. It is reported to have originated in a statement to the foreign representatives by Mr. Bowen, which he was accused of making public, wherein he broadly intimated that the powers were trying to force Venezuela into a position that would result in maintaining the Anglo-German alliance for years to come. This is said to have aroused

British sentiment, already disgusted with the debt collecting alliance with Germany, to a dangerous pitch of hostility to the British ministry, and consequently to have culminated in the utter ignoring of Mr. Bowen by the European representatives. The British minister promptly announced that the alliance would end immediately upon the signing of treaties of arbitration, and that the blockade would be thereupon raised. Whatever the origin and character of the unpleasantness may have been, it is certain that on the 6th the British ambassador communicated directly with Secretary Hay without notifying Mr. Bowen. His communication proposed that President Roosevelt sit in judgment upon the demand of the blockading allies for preferential treatment. Secretary Hay submitted the proposal at once to the President, who, after a cabinet discussion, declined to act. Thereupon, so say the Washington dispatches of the 9th, the allies agreed to leave the question of preferential treatment to The Hague tribunal, and the British ambassador submitted to Mr. Bowen Great Britain's proposed protocol, which Mr. Bowen promptly accepted. Following are the terms of the British protocol, so accepted, as summarized by the Associated Press:

The British protocol provides that the blockade shall be raised; that the dispute over the preferential treatment question shall be referred to The Hague court; that Venezuela shall immediately pay Great Britain \$27,500 in cash; that 30 per cent. of the customs receipts of the ports of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello shall be set aside as a fund to liquidate Venezuela's foreign indebtedness, the scheme of distribution among the creditor nations to be determined by The Hague court; that a British-Venezuelan commission shall adjust the claims of Great Britain against Venezuela and if unable to agree upon the amount due British subjects the ruler of a European country shall be asked to serve as umpire; that if Venezuela fails to begin the payment of British claims agreed upon within a fixed period the government of Belgium shall appoint commissions to administer the customs at La Guayra and Puerto Cabello, and that new treaties of amity, commerce, and navigation shall be negotiated between Great Britain and Venezuela.

Italy has agreed to similar terms, but Germany holds out for better. According to the Washington dispatches of the 11th she has made a demand for a cash payment of \$340,-

000, accompanied by an offer to accept in lieu thereof the exclusive possession of a Venezuelan port indefinitely. This is regarded as a disclosure of the German emperor's supreme desire to get a foothold on Venezuelan territory, it being suspected that he supposed Venezuela would be unable to raise so large a sum and would gladly compromise upon the surrender of a port. Mr. Bowen promptly declined the offer, notifying the German ambassador that rather than consider it for an instant Venezuela would pay the whole demand of \$340,000 in cash.

The only other news of the week bearing upon this subject has to do with the revolution, which President Castro appears to be holding in check in spite of the encouragement it has received from the European blockade. On the 9th his minister of war, Gen. Ferrer, captured Guatire from the revolutionists and was marching to the relief of Rio Chico, about 50 miles from Caracas.

But little regarding the revolution in Honduras (p. 695) can be added to last week's report. It has since been explained from Managua, Nicaragua, that the election of Gen. Bonilla to the presidency having failed of confirmation by the Hondurian congress, President Sierra placed the administration of the government in the hands of the cabinet, and accepted from them a commission as commander-in-chief of the military forces to resist the insurrection which Gen. Bonilla began on the 1st by proclaiming himself provisional president. The island of Amapala, which lies in the Pacific bay of Fonseca, about three days' journey from Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras, is the only part of the country of which Bonilla has secured possession, and the government has decreed that this island be blockaded.

Pursuant to the naval orders reported last week (p. 695). Rear Admiral Glass, of Rear Admiral Casey's Pacific fleet, left his station at San Francisco on the 10th with the New York, the Boston, the Marblehead and the Ranger, all the ships in his squadron, bound for Honduras.

Other considerations than an insurrection in Honduras have doubtless caused the sending of this large American squadron to that region. It is highly probable that all the Central American states will soon be em-

broiled in war. This has been expected for some time, and on the 10th it was reported from Guatamala that war had been proclaimed between that country on one side and Salvador and Honduras on the other. Although this report lacks confirmation it is well known that the Guatemala government sympathizes with Bonilla, the insurrection leader in Honduras, and it is suspected that Costa Rica will follow Guatemala's lead. Salvador and Nicaragua on the other hand are believed to be acting in conjunction with the hold-over government of Honduras. These complications are said to have grown out of the efforts of the presidents of Salvador, Nicaragua and Honduras to establish a federated republic of Central American states. The scheme was considered at a conference of the Central American republics held at Corinto, Nicaragua, last year, where it was opposed by Guatemala.

The possibility of another war between republics to the south of us, a war between Bolivia and Brazil, is averted by the dominance of Brazil, which has delivered an ultimatum that Bolivia accepts. The dispute was over the course of a boundary line which determines the sovereignty over the rich rubber territory known as the Acre country. Vague reports of this dispute have come northward at intervals for several years, until they indicated late last year (p. 599) that war between Bolivia and Brazil was imminent.

The Acre country comprises 80,000 square miles. Its resources for rubber production are said to have been discovered by the celebrated mountain climber, Sir Martin Conway, an Englishman, who procured from Bolivia a grant of the land, with vast powers of government, in which American capitalists are now deeply interested. The region is described as lying far inland, 2,500 miles or more from the mouth of the Amazon, a wild section of South America, untraversed by any railroad, without telegraph lines, and a three weeks' journey by the uncertain river boats from Para. It is watered by three great tributaries of the Amazon—the Javary, Jurua and Purus—and their affluents, deriving its name from one of the latter, the river "Aquiry" or "Acre." It is bounded on the north and east by the Brazilian States of Amazonas and Matto Grosso, on the south by Bolivia and on the west by Peru. When the original boundary

treaty between Brazil and Bolivia was signed, in 1867, the population consisted entirely of nomadic and hostile Indians, and the dangers of exploration were augmented by the prevalence of fevers and reptiles and insects of the most deadly description. Not until the rubber industry at Manaos and Para became of value and the prospectors pushed westward into the wilderness to locate new lands suitable for this tree did the district receive special attention. It had been in undisputed possession of Brazil, and only in 1894 did both countries realize the necessity for a more definite boundary line at this point. In 1895 a joint commission of the two governments agreed to adopt a provisional line running from the point at latitude 7 degrees 1 minute 17 seconds south of the equator, on the Javary river, agreed on by the treaty of 1874, to the junction of the rivers Beni and Guapore with the Madeira river. This survey did not receive the final approval of the Brazilian government, the minister for foreign affairs objecting that the only just way to decide the frontier was by determining the true source of the Javary as stipulated in the first treaty. A further examination under the direction of the Brazilian commission fixed the head-waters of the Javary three degrees north of the earlier suppositions. This would result in an additional loss of territory to Brazil, and, as Bolivia did not cooperate in the expedition, a protocol was signed stipulating that a mixed commission be appointed to investigate the disputed question more thoroughly. The original treaty fixed the starting point of the boundary line on the left bank of the Madeira river at its juncture with the Beni, thence along parallel 10 degrees 20 minutes south to meet the Javary. If the source of the terminal river should be north of the east and west line, the treaty stipulated that the boundary should follow in a straight line until meeting the source of the Javary. As there is no misunderstanding regarding the starting point at the confluence of the Beni and Madeira rivers, the whole question rests on the clause stating that if the source of the Javary should prove to be north of the parallel 10 degrees 20 minutes south the frontier should follow from the parallel in a straight line to meet the main source of the Javary. Whether this line should start from the initial point at the juncture of the Beni and Madeira and run diagonally to the source of the Javary,

as maintained by Bolivia, or should extend west to the intersection of the Brazilian and Peruvian boundaries and thence northwest to the source of the Javary, as claimed by Brazil, is the mooted point. The Brazilian government claims that it was the intention of the original treaty to make the parallel 10 degrees 20 minutes the boundary line as far as possible, and from its termination, in Brazilian territory, should the true source of the Javary be farther north, straight from the intersection to the river's headwaters.

Along the frontier as claimed by Bolivia, the government of that country established forts and sent troops to support their custom houses in the collection of export tariffs on rubber. Against these reactions the Brazilians engaged in rubber raising there rose in rebellion; and they met with such success that on the 24th of last month, under Placido Castro, they captured Porto Acre, the last point in the Acre territory on which the Bolivian troops held out against them. So, at any rate, says the Brazilian minister to the United States, who made this further statement in an interview on the 8th:

Castro has been proclaimed governor by the victorious revolutionists and is ready to acknowledge Brazilian authority, I am advised. With the fall of Porto Acre there are no Bolivians left in the whole territory, and 300 Bolivian prisoners, including Governor Romero and Colonels Consecro and Ibanez, the latter two wounded, have been sent by the revolutionists to the Brazilian city of Manaos, capital of the state of Amazonas.

In consequence of the success of this revolution, which Brazil had evidently fostered, her government sent an ultimatum to Bolivia early in February. It was in effect a notice that if Bolivia should attempt to re-occupy the disputed territory, Brazil would pacify and administer it by military force until a settlement of the whole dispute had been reached. Bolivia thereupon agreed to Brazilian military occupation and administration of all the disputed country to the west of the Yaco river, at the same time advising Brazil that she was sending to Rio Janeiro a minister specially authorized to negotiate a satisfactory agreement, or failing that to arrange for arbitration.

The only news of the week from the civil war in Morocco (p. 695) re-

ports another bloody battle. This discredits the previous report of the annihilation of the revolutionary army, for not only was it severe, but it was fought up to the very gates of Fez; where, however, the rebels were driven back. The report came from Tangier on the 5th, and is as yet unconfirmed.

Still following the flight of the sanguinary angel of war, we are taken to the Balkans, whence come ugly rumors of the mobilization of troops by Turkey, Austria and Russia, and report of a probable Macedonian uprising. But these exciting reports, apparently inspired by European state departments, seem less to forebode a Balkan war than some secret movement of the continental powers for which rumors of Balkan difficulties are a mask.

In the Philippines there are evidences of a continuance of resistance to the American occupation. According to Associated Press reports from Manila, a force of 100 constabulary under Inspector Keithly defeated a body of 200 insurgents on Sunday, the 8th, near Mariquina, a small town seven miles from Manila. This victory of the armed American constabulary followed a severe engagement in which Inspector Harris and one man of the constabulary were killed and two other men of the constabulary wounded. The Filipinos left 15 dead and 3 wounded. Their little army formed the main force of Gen. San Miguel, who claims that he succeeded to the command of the Filipino forces when the other generals surrendered. His headquarters were captured, and, after seizure of his records, were burned. This dispatch of the following day from the same source, which cautiously phrased, is significant of a more irreconcilable condition in the Philippines than previous reports have indicated:

The government is preparing to round up the disorderly elements in the provinces of Bulacan and Rizal, where the constabulary will be reinforced by several companies of native scouts. The rumors from the disaffected provinces are believed to exaggerate the number of hostiles, of whom it is said there are 2,000 in the field. More trustworthy reports say there are not over 500 natives under arms, and that the bulk of these scattered after Sunday's fight. There is little doubt that the hostiles will speedily be suppressed.



Another part of the same dispatch is even more significant. We quote it with the suggestion that the word "ladrones" is used in dispatches to lend color to the charge that the Filipino irreconcilables are only bands of thieves. Too much confidence ought not to be given to this indiscriminating characterization. Following is the quotation:

General Allen has hurried reinforcements to the north, and has taken advantage of the Congressional action by placing the Filipino scouts in the field. Numerous commands are now patrolling the province of Bulacan. They have frequent skirmishes with the ladrones, but it is not likely that they will capture the principal leaders, who will probably escape to the hills of the neighboring provinces. The present outbreak is the gravest on the island of Luzon since the outbreak of the original revolution. Alarmists claim that it is the beginning of a second insurrection, because the movement is so widespread, and the armed men are carrying the flags of the Katipunan society. This is common, however, as all the ladrones when they are captured claim that they are insurrectos, hoping that in that way they will escape the severe laws against bandits.

Legislation in the United States Congress on the subject of trusts has culminated in measures which are described by the Republicans as "preliminary," and by the Democrats as "ineffective." There are four bills. One, known as the Elkins bill, amends the inter-State commerce law so as to punish the giving or taking of freight rebates by pecuniary fines, instead of fine and imprisonment. It lessens the penalty upon the plea of making the law more effective. This bill was passed in the Senate on the 3d. A second bill is known as the Hoar bill. It provides for hurrying on the trial in the Federal courts of cases under anti-trust laws. It passed the Senate on the 4th and the House on the 5th. The third bill is an amendment offered by Senator Nelson to the House bill for establishing a department of commerce and labor. It provides for enabling a bureau in that department to investigate the affairs of corporations doing an inter-State business (except common carriers). It was adopted in conference committee of the two Houses on the 7th, and was passed by the lower House on the 10th. This bill gives substantially the same powers respecting inter-State corporations in general that the inter-State commerce commission has re-

specting common carriers. The Littlefield bill is the fourth of the lot. It is more comprehensive, dealing with trusts at length. The House passed it on the 7th. But on the 9th a conference on trust legislation was held at the White House between the President and certain members of both Houses of Congress, at which all the trust bills were considered. It is understood that at this conference an agreement was reached to abandon the Littlefield bill, and to enact only the Nelson amendment to the department of commerce and labor bill, the Hoar bill for expediting trials and the Elkins rebate bill. That idea was confirmed on the 10th by Mr. Littlefield's bolting from the Republicans. Complaining that the President, after encouraging him to lead a fight for the suppression of trusts, had notified Congressmen that he would not sign a comprehensive bill on the trust subject, Mr. Littlefield voted against the conference report on the department of commerce and labor bill, which inserted the Nelson amendment. His "insurrectionary" act was evidently dictated by his belief that the Nelson amendment, which now goes to the President as part of the commerce and labor bill, is designed to displace the Littlefield bill.

Almost the proceedings of the anthracite arbitration commission are at an end. Evidence in rebuttal was closed on the 5th, when an adjournment was taken to the 9th. Upon re-assembling on the latter day arguments for the strikers were made by Daniel J. McCarthy and Henry Demarest Lloyd. On the 10th John T. Lenahan spoke for the nonunion miners, and on the 11th Samuel Dickinson, Simon P. Wolverton, Ira H. Burns and Francis I. Gowen spoke for the operators and the railroads.

While the anthracite arbitration has been going on, the bituminous miners and operators have been negotiating at Indianapolis with reference to an increase of wages. The conference ended on the 8th with an agreement for an increase of 14 per cent. The agreement affects mining only in the Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and the Pittsburgh district of Pennsylvania, but it will be urged as the basis for agreements in all the bituminous fields. The increase is to be paid to union miners only.

A unique labor strike in Chicago

terminated on the 10th after nearly a week's duration. It was a strike of elevator men, in the tall office buildings. The principal question in dispute related to wages. The men had formed unions and fixed the scale at \$55 a month, an increase of from 10 to 20 per cent. The privilege of sitting down while at work during slack hours was also demanded, and the buildings were asked to pay the expense of working uniforms. According to the managers' association a further demand was made that non-union men should not be employed. These demands being refused, the men struck work, and some 15 "skyscrapers" were deprived of elevator service for the greater part of a week. Buildings that conceded the increase in wages were not disturbed, which would indicate that the principal issue was over wages. On the 7th the teamsters' union took advantage of the elevator strike to institute one of their own against the managers who were resisting, and it became impossible for these to get coal. In heating and lighting as well as elevator service they were almost completely "tied up," and their tenants had to climb stairways to rooms 15 and 16 stories high. The struggle came to its end on the 10th, when all parties agreed to submit the questions in dispute to arbitration before the joint arbitration board of the Chicago teamsters and their employers. The strikers proposed the arbitration and the building managers' association accepted. Work in the buildings was immediately resumed.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—The Alaskan boundary treaty (p. 680) was ratified by the United States Senate on the 11th.

—By a vote of 46 to 19 the city council of Chicago refused on the 9th to increase the salaries of councilmen from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

—A woman suffrage bill before the Montana Senate was defeated on the 5th upon a motion for indefinite postponement, the vote standing 16 to 10.

—On the 6th the La Follette primary election bill for the reformation of voting at primaries, passed the lower House of the Wisconsin legislature.

—Gen. Uribe-Urbe, one of the famous military leaders of the recent revolution in Colombia, committed suicide on the 30th. The first reports, no details being given, came from Kingston, Jamaica, on the 8th.

—Twenty-six hours before the ocean liner Minneapolis arrived on

the 10th at London from New York, a brief summary of the news of the world was received on board through the Marconi system of wireless telegraphy.

—The State Senate of Illinois adopted a joint resolution on the 10th applying to Congress to call a convention for proposing an amendment to the constitution requiring United States senators to be elected by popular vote. A similar resolution was adopted on the 11th by the Kansas Senate.

—The famous Vine Street Congregational church, of Cincinnati, of which Herbert L. Bigelow is pastor, is organizing a press bureau, with a view to furnishing to all newspapers willing to publish them advance copies of Mr. Bigelow's Sunday sermons, and is soliciting contributions of funds for that purpose.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department for January shows on hand January 31, 1903:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash.....	218,346,963 42

Total.....	\$368,346,963 42
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1902.....	358,574,115 85

Increase.....	\$ 9,771,847 57
---------------	-----------------

—Louis F. Post, editor of The Public, is to speak in the large hall of Cooper Union, New York, on the 22d, at eight o'clock, under the auspices of the People's Institute, his subject being "The Art of Making a Living." On the preceding evening, the 21st, he is to attend an informal reception at the Brooklyn Single Tax League, 77 New York avenue, Brooklyn; and on the evening before that, the 20th, he is to debate the single tax theory at Cooper Union large hall with Prof. John B. Clark, of Columbia University.

### PRESS OPINIONS.

#### THE RIGHT KIND OF ENEMIES.

Columbus (O.) Press (Dem.), Feb. 6.—Tom L. Johnson has climbed the ladder of success, as any other man has done. While he was obtaining for himself a competency, he was regarded with special favor by the "captains of industry." But when he reached that point where he felt that his family was safely provided for, instead of pitting himself against the Morgan, Carnegie, Rockefeller forces in a mad scramble to conquer the marts of the world, as Alexander once fought for imperial power, Tom Johnson turned his attention to public questions of moment to the masses with a view to correcting some of the evils of predatory wealth, if he could, and to devote his energies to popular movements designed to ameliorate unjust conditions imposed upon the people. Then the minions of Mammon began to revile Tom Johnson. That is why the people are growing more and more to believe in Tom Johnson. He has made the right kind of enemies.

#### THE BATTLE OF SAN CARLOS.

London Speaker (Lib.) Jan. 24.—Some of the earlier excesses of the "malded fist" in Venezuela may have been the work

of over-zealous German officers, but this latest act of war, the most barbarous and vindictive of them all, was apparently inspired by the Kaiser's government. Whether Lord Lansdowne has given his approval of this policy of aggression is not known. There is no reason to suppose that he has even been consulted. These incidents have naturally excited grave indignation in the United States, and their effect on the progress of the negotiations for arbitration can hardly have been favorable, unless, indeed, they either incite President Roosevelt to use his influence with some decision, or else arouse in our own government a determination to terminate a discreditable muddle with all possible speed.

#### THE OREGON SENATORSHIP.

Salem (Ore.) Journal (Rep.)—The Democrats are acting consistently in voting for Hon. C. E. S. Wood for United States senator. He was openly nominated in their State convention, and voted for by the people as the Democratic party candidate. . . . He is a gentleman of the highest ideals, and, as a senator from Oregon, he would shed a luster of renown on our State that would make it in many ways distinguished among Western commonwealths. . . . If the Democrats stand by him to the end, they will find that more than one Republican vote will come to Col. Wood. The Journal did not support Col. Wood at the regular election, but does not hesitate to class him among the eligibles and desirables as a public man and a private citizen.

#### WORKINGMAN'S HAPPINESS.

Pendleton (Ore.) East Oregonian (Dem.), Feb. 5.—The workingman, whose very existence, whose family's education, training and care depends upon the tiny thread of the daily task, cannot be happy, no matter how many delights there may be in the home. The specter of need stands at his threshold hourly; let but a slight accident interpose, and the income stops, the little saving begins to leak, the substance melts away, and the family stands face to face with want. When the man stops the pay stops. Life and comfort depend upon the "job."

### IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 33 of that publication.

Washington, Feb. 2-8, 1903.

#### Senate.

Further discussion of the Rawlins resolution regarding Philippine court-martials (p. 1632) occurred on the 2d, followed by appropriations work and further consideration of the Statehood bill (pp. 1639-40). On the 3d an effort to agree upon a day for voting on the statehood bill was made, but without result (p. 1745); and on the 4th a bill to expedite suits against trusts was passed (p. 1788), while the public lands question in Alaska (p. 1789) and the Statehood bill (p. 1791) were discussed. A pure food bill (p. 1848), and the Statehood bill occupied most of the attention of the Senate on the 5th, and on the 6th a resolution calling for information regarding the circumstances of the signing of the Panama canal treaty was urged (pp. 1885-1890), consideration of the Statehood bill (pp. 1890-1893) practically closing the work of the day. Its consideration was continued on the 7th, after the Panama resolution of the day before had been referred to the committee on naval affairs. (p. 1920).

#### House.

No business of general interest was done on the 2d, and only private bills were considered and appropriations work done on the 3d and 4th. But on the 5th the House passed the bill to expedite suits against trusts (pp. 1867-70-71), and entered upon the discussion of the committee's substitute for House bill No. 17 (p. 1871), known as the Littlefield trust bill. This discussion continued on the 6th (p. 1897) and on the 7th

(p. 1849), and on the latter day the bill was passed (p. 1907) by a vote of 246, 99 not voting. Sunday, the 8th, was devoted to memorial speeches in honor of the late Senator Sewell and the late Representative Salmon, of New Jersey.

**Record Notes.**—Speeches of Reps. Bant (p. 1617), Burnham (p. 1696) and Quarles (p. 1971) on Statehood bill. Hoar's bill to establish in the department of justice a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper and defective classes (p. 1669). Text of Senate's substitute pure food bill (p. 1848). Text of bill proposed by House judiciary committee for House substitute bill No. 17, known as Littlefield bill (p. 1871). Documents regarding Panama canal treaty (pp. 1885-87). Text of bill No. 17, the original Littlefield bill (p. 1875), and minority amendments (p. 1896). Speeches of Reps. Gilbert (p. 1921), John S. Williams (p. 1924), and Powers (p. 1933) on trust question.

## MISCELLANY

### THE UNCONDEMNED.

For The Public.

"Considerable money has been made by Americans by subdividing and platting acre property in the growing cities."—W. J. Bryan, on Mexico, in The Commoner of January 30.

All clever, shrewd Americans with eager eyes survey

The various avenues to wealth that intersect their way;

Pursuing fame and honor, they well know the means by which

These are made surest is to be not wise or good, but rich.

The road of honest work is broad, and fully advertised,

To stimulate such work by hopes not often realized;

These bright Americans perceive a trick worth two of that

And pick up acre property to subdivide and plat.

While general agriculture oft is lauded to the skies

By men who from a distance safe commend such enterprise,

And cows and hogs and poultry all are praised as specialties,

There is a branch of "farming" much more lucrative than these.

And while the common herd toll on not seeing where they're at,

The knowing buy suburban lands, to subdivide and plat.

The state of future markets is too hazardous to guess,

And many things may chance to make farm labor profitless;

Anthrax may strike the cattle or cholera the hogs,

And hailstorms send the growing crops completely to the dogs.

But safe and happy is the man who firmly plants him down

With land to subdivide and plat around a growing town.

One of life's prime necessities—our homes' and houses' rent—

Is by this sort of enterprise forever skyward sent,

For limiting production and restricting useful trade

It throws the very worst of trusts completely in the shade;

While such business combines only can with confidence stand pat

As hold mines, roads or other lands to subdivide and plat.

And yet this kind of business, besides its profits great,  
Has one advantage really surprising to relate,  
Since valiant, honest warriors against monopoly  
Apparently regard it as a useful industry!  
And those who for the praise of men would gladly take much pains,  
Nor would be known to soil their hands with aught but honest gains,  
Find in the grabbing of the earth—that unwhipped social sin—  
A tempting chance to not play false and yet to wrongly win.

While through the wilderness of wrong the blind conduct the blind,  
What region good intentions pave is often brought to mind,  
When leaders look to tyrants' laws our tyrants to defeat  
And see without a pang the earth snatched from beneath our feet.

JAY HAWKINS.

THE FILIPINO LABORER.

Between 1852 and 1888 I spent more than 20 years in the Philippines. During those years all the agricultural labor was done by Filipinos. . . .

I got once a good lesson in manners from an old Filipino. I was overseeing some work which went slowly and not to my liking. I slung out at the men the word "Brutos!" (brutes). The old fellow approached me politely, and said: "I beg your worship's pardon; we are not 'brutos,' but we do not understand the language your worship uses." I apologized, and I hope never so failed in sense and politeness again.—Ogden E. Edwards, in New York Nation of Jan. 8.

CHARACTER.

Character is a by-product.—Woodrow Wilson.

Mankind have always been more or less busy, it is likely.

What have they wrought?

Nothing permanent, except character.

So fleet the works of men, back to their earth again,  
Ancient and holy things fade like a dream.—

The Tower of Babel has vanished. The Pyramids are vanishing. But whatsoever of character the Babylonians and the Egyptians built remains and will remain.

The saying that character is a by-product is smart. A successful pork-packer saying it would be voted clever. But a president of Princeton—

This is truly an era of remarkable things.—Life.

TAXATION BY "AGREEMENT."

Editorial in New York World of February 1.

The farce of personal-property taxation in this city is not shown more clearly in the discovery of a success-

ful scheme to swear off assessments by dummies, or perjury by proxy, than it is by the custom of accepting the unsupported statements of rich men as to how much personal assessments they are willing to "stand for."

On Friday Messrs. J. Pierpont Morgan, Jacob H. Schiff, George W. Vanderbilt and other men of large wealth appeared before the tax commissioners to secure a reduction of their personal assessments. Mr. Morgan was assessed for \$600,000, but claimed that the value of his taxable securities is "largely exceeded by the indebtedness against them." He explained: "I borrow a great deal of money, in fact millions." As reported in the Sun Mr. Morgan further said:

In point of actual fact I cannot legally be required to pay any personal tax, because, as I have stated, my investments and holdings are non-assessable for personal taxation. But I don't want to be looked upon as a tax-dodger. I think that every man doing a large volume of business in this city ought to pay something in personal taxation. If I am required to take an oath to this effect, I will pay nothing, but if you are willing to accept my personal statement, I will pay on \$400,000 assessment.

Mr. Morgan's statement was accepted, and he was not sworn. In like manner and upon similar grounds the assessment of Mr. Schiff was reduced to \$200,000, and that of George W. Vanderbilt to \$50,000.

The first reflection of the average citizen upon this transaction is likely to take form in the pertinent question: Why is the unsupported statement of very rich men as to their taxable property accepted by the tax commissioners, while the ordinary citizen is required to swear off or to pay?

Without questioning the veracity of any of these multi-millionaires, is it not a fact that the pictures and furnishings alone in any of their mansions—not to mention the jewels—are worth many times the sum of the personal assessment which they are permitted to fix for themselves?

If personal property cannot be more fully and equitably taxed it is time to repeal the law altogether.

ENGLISH COMMENTS ON OUR COAL FAMINE.

Editorial notes in the London Spectator of January 17.

The pictures of the prosperity, happiness, and comfort of the working population of the United States which are so frequently drawn by the American millionaire are not confirmed by the accounts which reach us of their sufferings during the present winter. A Reuter's telegram from Chicago

(January 12) stated that "extremely cold weather prevails in the Western States, and a number of persons have been frozen to death." This is attributed to the extreme price of coal, which is still in some places as high as three pounds sterling per ton. Now, the coal owners of the United States are protected by a tariff against foreign competition, and this duty is evidently held to be responsible for the acute misery of the situation, for both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate action has been taken with a view to the removal or suspension of the duty. But if the American has so large a margin of comfort, how is it that a rise in the price of fuel involving an additional expenditure of, say, three or four shillings a week for a month or two, results in "a number of persons being frozen to death?" And if, as Mr. Carnegie has argued in print, protection lowers prices, why do protectionist assemblies seek to lower prices by removing a protective duty? Providence seems determined to prove that even the richest and largest free trade area in the world cannot afford to defy the laws of political economy.

The seriousness of the crisis in America is shown by the extraordinary proceedings at Washington on Wednesday, when a bill for a rebate equal to the duty on all kinds of coal coming from all countries for a year passed the House by 258 votes to 5. Therefore the bill went up to the Senate, which passed it immediately on receiving it from the House. An amendment was adopted by the Senate adding a section to prevent the imposition of a duty on anthracite coal after the expiration of time provided in the act. We cannot help being reminded that the death knell of protection was sounded in England by the Irish famine, which was the proximate cause of the conversion of Sir Robert Peel and half the conservative party to free trade.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY. CIVIL SERVICE UPHELD.

Theodore Wensink, a prominent member of the Buckeye club, and one of the select coterie of Salenite leaders, was discharged from his position of waterworks assessor by Superintendent Bemis yesterday morning. Wensink did not take his dismissal with good grace. Instead of kissing the hand that smote him, he proceeded to call down imprecations upon the devoted head of the learned superintendent. Incidentally he said mean things about Mayor Johnson for allowing the professor to remain at the head of the waterworks department,

and pervert it from its function as a part and parcel of the municipal political machine. Then he vowed vengeance both against the professor and against the mayor.

"Where Johnson camps with his tent this spring, there will I be," exclaimed Wensink. "Where Johnson camps with his tent I will camp in the dooryards of every man of the ward. I will tell them my tale of ingratitude and unrequited benefits conferred. I will tell them of Johnson, who knows not his friends, and of Johnson's evil genius, the professor, who has turned the waterworks department from its proper function, so that it is now little more than a place where political services are counted as naught. No rest will I take until this professor is driven from the city, and until the proud head of Johnson is brought to the dust."

Prof. Bemis told of Wensink's bitter mood to Mayor Johnson.

"It may defeat us," said the mayor. "But," he added, "I would rather be defeated and stand for principle, than win by truckling to schemers."

"It was in this fashion," said Prof. Bemis, in explaining the removal of Wensink. "Since the establishment of so many water meters there has not been need for as many assessors as formerly. There was the necessity that one be discharged; so I ordered two employes to make an examination of the reports of all the assessors to find out which was the most incompetent. The balance of incompetency was largely in favor of Wensink. It was found that out of 11 assessments reported in three days, three were absolutely wrong. When I confronted Wensink with these facts he admitted that he had not examined the houses in question.

"They were the houses of poor women," he said, "and I shall not assess them up as high as others in better circumstances."

"Of course I admired Wensink's benevolent motives, but the waterworks department is not authorized by the city council to make any distinction in assessment on account of the material prosperity of the person to be assessed. If this were the case we could save assessors entirely by merely charging each consumer in accordance with his wealth. And if it were to be a matter of charity, we ought to turn it over to Director Cooley."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

#### LET THE TUNNELS ALONE.

For The Public.

With something of the pertinacious insistence with which the elder Cato

declared that Carthage must be destroyed, and the almost forgotten Nasby used to "Pulverize the Rum Power," the newspapers of Chicago have long been demanding that we "lower the tunnels."

For years they have had an acute attack of this malady just before the opening of navigation. During the past year or two, however, the senseless clamor has become chronic or constant; and, what is worse, high-priced "experts" and grave scientific men have devoted columns to the serious discussion of the "tunnel problem." This shows how great a matter a little fire kindleth. While confined to the funny paragraphers of the daily press these frequent and latterly almost constant gibes might be lightly passed over, though it did jar one's sense of propriety that they should appear in staid and serious protection papers. However, the recent serious discussion and grave editorial advocacy of the lowering of the tunnels in these same protection papers, shows that all sense of the incongruity is lost, and is one of the enigmas of progress.

It would almost seem that the tunnels are without a single defender. Yet the very arguments that are used against the tunnels show that to them, in part at least, must be due Chicago's marvelous growth.

The progress of lake shipping and ship building has made these much abused tunnels better than a custom house to prevent Chicago from becoming a "dumping ground" for goods produced elsewhere. Even under the Dingley tariff law, though most of its schedules are intentionally prohibitory, there is some importation; and in proportion as goods are "dumped" here, domestic enterprise is discouraged and the development of home industry retarded.

That such must be the result is at once apparent to any mind capable of logical processes. But we are not driven to abstract reasoning to support this view. Many concrete examples establish it. Two of Chicago's Michigan suburbs furnish a perfect illustration. Fifteen years ago Grand Haven, with its magnificent harbor at the mouth of the Grand river (as its very name indicates), had about twice the population of its neighboring city of Holland (also a significant name). Moreover, Holland was at a disadvantage in that a much larger proportion of its people were foreigners, and, though of most worthy and sturdy character, were withal weighted down by European

conservatism. But Holland had one tremendous advantage over its sister city of Grand Haven, 20 miles to the north; it did enjoy the protection of a shallow harbor—Black lake—more recently called Macatawa bay. Even the comparatively shallow-draught boats of that day dared not attempt to "dump" goods into Holland. The result has been that local industry has developed until Holland has become a thriving manufacturing city, with twice the population of Grand Haven, which has barely held its own in population, and has actually gone backward so far as business enterprise is concerned.

Do we Chicagoans need any plainer lesson—any further warning—not to disturb the tunnels under our noble river, which has in the past furnished such efficient and beneficent "protection," and made us one of the greatest commercial and manufacturing centers in the world? What is it to us if a few rat harboring elevators have been built along the Calumet? And even if we cared a rap, let us be candid enough to admit that the real reason is because the land to build them on is cheaper, and that it is not at all due to the presence of the beneficent tunnels in our noble river.

In conclusion, candor requires me to say that I am not a protectionist. To me, even revenue tariffs are an abomination, and custom houses a curse. But if I were a protectionist, I should have to run in debt for the hardihood to seriously propose the lowering of the tunnels which have so long and effectually served to keep Chicago from becoming a "dumping ground for the pauper-made goods of Europe."

WILEY WRIGHT MILLS.

Chicago, Feb. 8, 1903.

#### THE OPPORTUNITY OF DEMOCRACY.

For The Public.

I believe it is true of parties as of individuals, that if they decline the burden that seems naturally offered to them, they lose the opportunity of the service, and have to give place to others who are willing to take up the burden.

This is the history of the birth of new parties. To go no farther back than the fifties, we find an example in the anti-slavery problem. Neither of the old parties would assume the task. Fortune pointed especially to the Whig party as the one to which the burden should fall—not so much because of its inherent principles as because the Democrats were hopelessly hampered. The opportunity was

declined. Compromise could not go on forever, and we know the result.

Evidently the country is now being confronted with a problem even more vital and far reaching than the abolition of negro slavery. It is more vital and far reaching, because it involves a wider emancipation. This is the social problem of modern times, involving the various phases of the concentration of wealth, and of the growth and power of monopoly and privilege.

Now again the party at present dominant is hopelessly hampered by its connections. And so fortune points this time to the Democrats, as it once pointed to the Whigs, as the party to take up the new burden of the real abolition of privilege and of the equalizing of opportunity.

This time it happens that the new burden is but the fuller and clearer recognition and acknowledgment of the long-professed principles of the party to which fortune points. Equal rights to all, and special privilege to none, has been the professed principle of the party from its noble beginning. The supreme question now is, will it translate this principle into honest action? Will it make the applications which the times demand? Too long has it been giving a half-hearted meaning to its profession of faith.

The above remarks are introductory to a comment I wish to make upon the leading article in the North American Review for February, entitled "The Political Opportunity of the South." I cannot here outline the article, but will only say that it is an appeal to Southern Democrats to bring the party back, as the author says, to the principles which it held during the long period of its ascendancy. Now upon these principles, as proclaimed by the best leaders of the party in that period—including its strong stand for local self-government and States' rights—democratic Democrats of to-day are of course ready to stand. But the tone of the article shows that the writer intends that we shall go no farther in the application of these principles than our fathers did.

The statement of a principle may be eternal; its application grows with the times. This I take to be the essential meaning of Lowell's thought about keeping abreast of Truth:

New occasions teach new duties; time makes ancient good uncouth;  
They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of truth.  
This is the thought which some

really earnest Democrats, like the writer of the article in question, seem to fail altogether to appreciate. They seem to lose sight of the evident fact that the America of to-day is not the America of 50 years ago.

I have recently seen the statement, that whereas ten per cent. of the people then owned only about 35 per cent. of the wealth of the country, now ten per cent. own about 90 per cent. I know that such definite estimates are difficult and may be somewhat erroneous; but that such a statement could be seriously made is an indication of the tremendous change that has come over the nation. Where then were the multi-millionaires on the one hand, and on the other the terrible indications of poverty that may be seen in every city? Poverty there certainly was, but not in such hordes as city slums now hold. Where then were the numberless strikes, and the unions of laborers bent upon ever increasing concessions—an evidence, in the last analysis, of the growth as well as of the need of true democracy? Where then was there any thought in America of an open and aggressive propaganda of socialism? Add to such evidences as these the increase in the power of production and the decrease in the opportunities of self-employment, and it would seem that no one could fail to see the tremendous change of conditions within the half century.

Here therefore, to repeat, is the mistake of writers like Mr. Ryan in the North American. They do not take account of modern conditions. They ignore the modern social problem, which is annually becoming less easy of peaceful solution, and will not be much longer postponed.

If the Democratic party declines the task of attempting this solution, and has only mild-tempered conservatism to offer, according to Mr. Ryan's advice, it will quite surely go the way of the Whig party and give place to a worthier heir. The time and the opportunity call for positiveness, and an aggressive application of economic principles truly democratic. No special privilege must mean no special privilege; equal opportunity must mean equal opportunity.

J. H. DILLARD.

Why not seek our taxes (public revenue) where the speculator gathers his riches—namely, from land values?—City and State, of Philadelphia.

## A TRUST THAT WAS NOT SOLD TO THE TRUSTFUL.

For The Public.

The following dialogue is reported by the man from nowhere.

Smith—I hear, Brown, that you're forming a trust in spite of the dreadful threats of the administration.

Brown—Yes; it's the spirit of the age, and it seemed to me that all the other trusts sort o' made this necessary.

Smith—Indeed?

Brown—Yes; you see all the other trusts are children of the Republican party, and all "chips o' the old block," at that. This party, you know, has a main tent, and a side show called the "Reorganized Democracy;" and a single pass from any trust admits you to both shows. Now, I propose to form a trust that is not merely Democratic for publication only, but genuinely democratic—"all wool and a yard wide," you know.

Smith—But aren't you afraid the sentiment against trusts may get you into trouble? Now if Knox should—he might, you know, the thing is thinkable—isn't it well to consider what might happen if—

Brown—If a mouse should run in here with a cat in its mouth?

Smith—Don't you think the attorney general can be trusted to—

Brown—Leave off the "to."

Smith—I accept the amendment. But what are you to monopolize?

Brown—I'm going to corner misery—

Smith—Man, you're crazy! The coal trust, oil trust, beef trust and a score of other leeches are ahead of you.

Brown—Stop a bit. You're missing a distinction. They are spreading misery broadcast, not cornering it. That is the one thing they don't produce a scarcity of. I'm going to form it into a trust—incorporate it, by hokey, under the laws of New Jersey with a regular partnership name.

Smith—What name?

Brown—Grinn & Barrett. Won't that be great on an embossed letter-head, with a coat-of-arms showing a full dinner pail rampant and an empty coalhod couchant on a field of expansion?

Smith—Won't it be a bit too realistic for good art? You know art is for art's sake, and mustn't have either use or motif. But never mind that now. Tell me, is the corporation to be limited?

Brown—Not under the present expansive administration. If the people

send anyone to the white house by and by to represent them, we may contract a bit.

Smith—Brown, I think the sentiment against trusts will cause your scheme to fail.

Brown—We've thought of that, and have a way to fix sentiment all right. We've been studying the regulation thing. You see, we corner all the misery there is. Very well. Then we permit the people—the happy public in this case who want to be miserable, instead of the miserable public who want to be happy—to purchase shares; see? This makes them behave, because they are one of us, don't you see—particeps criminis, as it were; that is to say, they occasionally get a distant smell of the viands whereon we "feed fat" three times a day. Of course that part of it is mostly sentiment, but we keep referring to them as "brother stockholders;" and when we elect ourselves to office we mention them as "our constituency," and thank them for the "distinguished honor" we permit them to think they have conferred upon us, just as if we were a senator or president, you know.

Smith—Cumulative voting, I trust?

Brown—Certainly, certainly. We accumulate whatever is necessary to elect us. Oh! the dividends—I mustn't forget the dividends. Every quarter each shareholder in good and regular standing gets a little nip of misery, and then we promise also, if his behavior is such as we approve (this is perfectly safe because we can disapprove of anything we please), to keep him miserable during his old age. Of course we may vote any moment to condemn the whole lot to everlasting happiness, but in the meantime the promise looks as big as fulfillment, and each one enjoys in advance the pangs that are to come later.

Smith—That's all very pretty, but there's one thing you have not taken into account.

Brown—What is that?

Smith—The Socialists. You'll no sooner get fairly started than they'll come along and say the government should make and distribute all the misery.

Brown—Huh! That's just what it does now through its constituents, the magnates. See here, Smith, don't you know that if we call ourselves the government's agents and the people's servants with sufficient humility and frequency, we can make the masses our slaves, and they will never know it? Why, under Socialism the government has got to have agents—even Provi-

dence, you know, has coal agents—well, we'll simply be agents, Grinn & Barrett, Government Agents, Department of Misery; "God Help Us" on the door.

Smith—But what gets me is this: Misery, you know, comes from prosperity—a "second Daniel" has said it, and the present administration has proved it. Now, the other trusts and the political organizations they support, make this misery out of materials and with machinery they exclusively control—as, for example, a miserable financial system, a miserable legislative system, untold taxing and tariff engines of misery, a whole inquisition of them, etc. Now, they can turn out misery in supplies that would horrify an American water-cure general; and their record shows that there hasn't been a single moment during the present administration when there has been the slightest shortage of this commodity, in proof of which I have only to point to the fact that the very poorest—the bottomest rungs of the social ladder, who always are the first to feel shortages—have right along had more of this commodity than they knew what to do with. I couldn't begin to tell you the number I have heard speak of the wasteful overproduction of this article, while calling attention to the fact that it is almost the only thing the poor get that is not taxed out of their reach. Now you, representing the Reformed Democracy in contradistinction to the Deformed Democracy of Cleveland, Hill & Co., while utterly destitute of the finished product in question—the monopolistic raw material, and the legislative machinery for fabricating it—and it would be long ere you could ever learn to fabricate as the Republicans do, even if you had the machinery and the "dough" to "cook" another census—even you, I say, propose to try to corner misery. Why, man, you couldn't do it under such conditions, even if the Standard Oil endowed you.

Brown—You really think so? It hadn't struck me just that way.

Smith—Think so? I know so! Why, bless you! you can't corner a thing or throttle competition without you have some monopoly—usually traceable back to land. Now, misery comes from lack of land, that is, lack of its use. Now, if it were transported by freight like kerosene, and you could bribe the roads into differential rates and rebates, you'd still have to control the Republican machinery for making your misery. It would take

the Democracy years to replace their plant, and to train so efficient a corps in its use.

Brown—You spoke of "differential rates." I know what differential calculus is, what differential thermometers are, and what a differential coefficient is; but you have me on differential rates.

Smith—I should have been more explicit. A differential rate—the word comes from the word "difference," you know, is where one man gets the rate, and the other don't know the difference—till he's ruined. I hope I have shown you the impracticability of your scheme.

Brown—Alas, yes! It looks as if my bubble were broken. I prided myself on that's being a sound proposition. It's a pretty hard blow, old man.

Smith—Upon my soul, I'm sorry for you.

Brown—By Jove, though, it isn't so bad after all! The inchoate Grinn & Barrett will—

Smith—Will what?

Brown—Save the New Jersey corporation tax!

MELVIN L. SEVERY.  
Arlington Heights, Mass.

#### PROMETHEUS REBOUND.

Prometheus, the friend of man; the Titan  
Who was first to pity and to lighten  
The beasthood of us with his gift of fire—  
Fire which he filched from Heaven, rousing  
the ire

Of Jove, who bound him to a peak,  
Whereto a vulture nightly came and fished  
its beak

Upon the heart of him who dared the odds  
Of fate, and gave his hand to man against  
the gods!

Yet was Prometheus from his tortured  
height

Not wholly comfortless. He saw the light  
Which he had kindled on the savage earth  
Bring forth the home, which grew about  
the hearth.

Home wed to home and formed the tribal  
state,

Whence sprung each nation, howsoever  
great.

When, too, Prometheus came to die, he  
laid

His Titan form beneath the mountain  
shade,

Pulled down the hills upon his grave,  
and by

Some subtle alchemy contrived his form  
should lie

An aeon's length till blood and bone should  
turn

Into strange, black stone, which yet should  
burn,

Thus to achieve his constant chief desire  
And still to bless his favorite, man, with  
fire.

Ah, giant-hearted Titan! well for thee  
The sequel of thy generous plan thou  
couldst not see.

For through the centuries wherein thy  
will

Labored to its fulfillment, hovered still

The vulture, naked necked and hideous,  
above,

Vengefully waiting to undo thy love.

Again the talons clutch thee, as of old,  
Again the carrion tainted wings enfold;  
Again, O Titan! must we mourn for thee,  
Torn by the vulture of monopoly,  
Which shrieks its fetid insolence to Heaven  
And filches back from man the fire which  
thou hast given.

—Edmund Vance Cooke, in N. Y. Herald.

In the olden time a certain man,  
being stricken with grief, consulted  
the oracle at Delphi.

"Go bury thy sorrow!" said the  
oracle.

The man was not a little perplexed  
by the advice, but concluded that  
about the first thing to do was to dig  
a hole. Now this was not easily to be  
achieved in the rocky soil of Hellas;  
and, whereas, when he began to dig  
the man thought a very large hole  
would be necessary, his idea was  
modified as he proceeded until, in  
some 15 minutes, it seemed clear that  
a real moderate hole would suffice.

Having dug such, the man looked  
around for his sorrow, but it was  
nowhere to be seen. Turning upon  
himself, he searched his bosom care-  
fully.

"There's no heartache here!" he  
said.

In fact, the only ache in sight was  
a backache, and this did not matter,  
for the man was well supplied with  
liniment.—Puck.

When a brutish, insolent fellow re-  
marked that it cost more to live now  
than it had cost eight years ago, the  
trust president lost his temper.

"Isn't it worth more to live in a time  
of prosperity than in a time of depres-  
sion?" he roared.

The boor made no reply, but slunk  
away like a whipped cur.—Life.

A small girl who has just begun to  
attend school recently brought home  
a pumpkin seed and told her mother  
that the teacher said that although  
the seed was white, the pumpkin  
would be yellow.

"And what will the color of the  
vines be?" asked the mother.

The little girl replied that the teach-  
er had not taught her that.

"But," said her mother, "you know,  
dear, for we have pumpkin vines in our  
garden."

"Of course I do, but we ain't ex-  
pected to know anything until we are  
taught."—Morning Oregonian.

"No, sir," declared Gazzen, as he  
warmed up to his subject. "You'll  
never be happy so long as you are in

debt. Pay your debts, Swayback, pay  
your debts."

"But I have no money," said Sway-  
back.

"Then borrow it."—Detroit Free  
Press.

## BOOKS

### COLOUR IN SONG AND PROSE.

A delight to all who love colour  
—we keep the English spelling in  
deference—is the little pamphlet is-  
sued by the class of 1905 of the Chi-  
cago Kindergarten College under the  
above title. What the poets in song  
or prose have said about red, yel-  
low, blue, and other colours, has  
been brought together by patient  
search into a collection worthy of  
some beautiful setting of illustration  
in the themes here celebrated.

This little booklet may be a re-  
minder to teachers and parents of  
the service and happiness they may  
render to young folks by even the  
suggestion of colour. The young eye  
often needs only a suggestive word  
to open up for its lasting delight the  
perpetual panorama of the earth's  
many schemes of colouring. Say to  
the child looking over a country  
landscape or a city park, Count the  
greens you see. What a surprise!  
They all looked alike before. So the  
yellows, the reds, the browns, and  
the rest, in endless variety. Happy  
the child whose heart and eyes are  
early opened to the beauty of every  
shade of colour under the sun; and  
so we beg to congratulate the com-  
ing kindergartners upon this colour-  
thought of theirs.

J. H. DILLARD.

### THE ANARCHISM OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

So many references have been  
made to the great revolution in  
France as an exemplification of an-  
archism in the concrete, that a His-  
tory of the French Revolution (Chi-  
cago: Abe Isaak, Jr., 331 Walnut  
street) by an anarchist, and with a  
view to distinguishing what anar-  
chists would call its "archist" from  
its "anarchist" characteristics, may  
surely be regarded as a desirable  
contribution to the literature of this  
political and social upheaval.

The anarchist in this instance is  
C. L. James, son of that G. P. R.  
James whose name was familiar to  
an earlier generation of book read-  
ers. Mr. James names Condorcet as  
the only noted Frenchman of the  
revolution who "was what we call  
now an anarchist;" and with Condor-  
cet he associates Thomas Paine.  
The period which he regards as most  
nearly anarchistic ran from the  
Spring of 1790 to the Autumn of 1792;  
for then "France was as near as any  
great nation ever has been to having

no government at all." Nor does he  
think it to have been very different  
between September, 1792, and March,  
1793. "There was, indeed, a king,"  
he explains, "from 1791 until August,  
1792, and a legislature; but these  
coordinate branches blocked each  
other's wheels so effectually that an-  
archy on the whole continued." Hav-  
ing thus delimited the period of an-  
archy, he characterizes it as "the  
revolution's halcyon days." Despite  
constant provocation and bound-  
less opportunity, there was scarce  
more crime in France then than in the  
best governed countries during the  
quietest times. It is not this period,  
writes Mr. James, but the one that  
immediately followed, which "will  
be remembered by our latest poster-  
ity as the reign of terror;" and that  
one, so far from being a period of  
anarchy, was distinguished by an ex-  
traordinarily strong government.

Mr. James's history is so closely  
condensed, yet deals so liberally with  
details, that it is not in all places  
easy reading. But it presents a point  
of view which entitles it to more  
than passing consideration.

### LITERARY NOTES.

The editor of The New Christianity  
(Yonkers, N. Y.) has entered seriously upon  
the study of socialism and is printing his im-  
pressions editorially as he proceeds. The  
first installment, which appears in the issue  
for January, is entirely judicial in spirit and  
gives promise of a series of articles that  
may be read with profit by men of all shades  
of sociological opinion.

The winter number of the Single Tax  
Quarterly (11 Frankfort street, New York)  
is the best that has yet appeared. For its  
principal article it has an account of the  
Boston single tax banquet, at which six  
college professors of economics discussed  
the subject of ground rent. The portraits,  
excellent half-tones from photographs, in-  
clude one of the late Father McLaughlin  
and one of Congressman Robert Baker.

The last Bulletin of Charities and Cor-  
rection makes special announcement of  
the next national conference, which is to  
be held in Atlanta in May. Child labor in  
the Southern cotton mills will doubtless  
force itself as a subject, though it is not  
announced. A contributor from Georgia in  
this number says: "Cotton factories are  
being built all over the State and for the  
past 20 years the number of children under  
12 years of age working in factories has in-  
creased nearly 300 per cent. Owners of  
mills have their agents all through the  
country persuading parents to come to  
town and put their children to work in the  
factories." J. H. D.

The second contribution of Agatha's im-  
pressions in the Nation is a disappointment.  
The most serious weakness of the modern  
college or university is not touched. This  
is, that false ideals are predominant. We  
say predominant; because, while false  
ideals prevail, there are still in the back-  
ground truer ideals which we cannot believe  
to be permanently quiescent. But the now  
prevailing ideals are false. They magnify  
loudness and show and any kind of suc-  
cess. The invasion of the newspaper re-  
porter into the college has so far been a de-  
cided evil. He naturally sees, hears, and  
reports what is loudest. In this way he  
fosters the very side of college life which  
is unhappily predominant. The man who is  
willing to be a quiet, thorough student in  
the modern undergraduate ranks has many  
forces against him. J. H. D.

If you are a fatalist with a socialistic  
trend and enjoy breezy egotism, you ought  
by all means to read Wilshire's Magazine.  
Mr. Wilshire's egotism is as delicious as it  
is innocuous, and its flavor is in every num-  
ber and almost every page. In the earlier  
days of his demand for a hearing it made



**DEVIL-WORSHIP.**

Gen. MacArthur at his devotions.

him appear very Barnumistic, but as with Barnum himself it has mellowed with the lapse of time. And the Wilshire fatalism is quite as interesting. It is as breezily sincere as the egotism; and if not so entertaining, even more amazing. But let no one imagine that either Wilshire or his magazine—comic though both may seem at times, from sheer deficiency in the sense of humor—is not serious. Both are so single-minded in devotion to the socialism that "is coming whether you want it or not," simply because materialistic Fate so decreed in the protoplasmic stages of social evolution, that their mountain-moving faith cannot but excite admiration in friend and foe alike. The February number opens with a controversy, as good as many a serio-comic play, between the editor and Ernest Crosby, whom the editor, evidently without malice, describes as "a thinker without the 'H.'" The controversy is instructive as well as amusing. In another article some interesting things about Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, of whom Mr. Wilshire hopes to make a socialist, are good naturedly told.

**ATTORNEYS.**

Chicago.

**CHARLES H. ROBERTS,**

ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
613 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Houston.

**EWING & RING,**

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,  
HOUSTON, TEXAS.  
Frederic K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**

COUNSELLOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.,  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 4094 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.  
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 Subscription . . . . .	.50
Trial Subscription (4 weeks) . . . . .	.13
Single Copies . . . . .	.06

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.

**Clubs of Three**

To extend the circulation of **The Public** among new readers, and at the same time to relieve of expense such regular readers, or others, as take the trouble to procure us new subscriptions, we will supply three subscriptions for the price of two, on the following terms:

- A Club of Three Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new) . . . . . \$4.00
- A Club of Three Semi-Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new) . . . . . \$3.00
- A Club of Three Quarterly Subscriptions (at least two of them new) . . . . . \$1.00

Any person soliciting new subscribers will be allowed the same terms. For every two new subscriptions for which he forwards us cash at regular rates we will honor his order for a third subscription free.

Make all Checks, Money Orders, etc., payable to  
**THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.,**  
Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

**Progressive Religious Literature** free. Apply Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Avenue Chicago.

**SINGLE TAX LITERATURE**

Mailed FREE on request, address F. H. MONROE, President Henry George Association, 206 Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Chicago.

**RESIST  
NOT  
EVIL**



**CLARENCE S. DARROW'S  
NEW BOOK**

**"Resist Not Evil"**

is original, startling, unique. He, like Tolstoy, whom he admires, indicts the existing State, but he does this on grounds that are rational and economic, not sentimental. He proves beyond a doubt that the State as it exists is a machine to keep the laborers in subjection to the parasitic class, and that its coercive features are productive of harm rather than good. Handsomely bound in cloth, price 75 cents. A copy of this book will be mailed free to any one sending one dollar before February 1st for a new subscription to the **International Socialist Review.**

**CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY  
PUBLISHERS**

56 Fifth Avenue, CHICAGO