

The Public

Fifth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1903.

Number 255.

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.

As if almost in response to our assertion of last week (p. 706) that the operating expenses of street car companies average much less than three cents per passenger, comes the report of the Chicago City Railway company, one of the corporations that has recently been negotiating with the Chicago councilmen with a view to an extension of franchises on the basis of a five-cent fare.

Upon the face of the report, it appears that the street railway in question carried, during the past year, 128,097,799 passengers, and that the operating expenses were \$4,336,504. This is at the rate of 3.38 cents per passenger. Before accepting that report as conclusive, however, we should like to see an itemized statement of the "operating expenses," with the "experts" on oath and an opportunity for cross-examination.

It is not at all probable that the average cost per passenger in Chicago is heavier than in small cities. On the contrary, it is highly probable that it is lighter; for the volume of business is larger in proportion to necessary expense. Yet an investigation of traction service in small cities reveals the fact that the average cost is not more than three cents. As an example, we may refer to a statement by Calvin Elliott, of Millersburg, O., in his recent work on "Usury." At page 164 of that book Mr. Elliott declares that after making a careful estimate of the accounts of a car line in a small city where the number of riders is small in comparison with those of our large cities, he is con-

vinced that the average cost of operation, per passenger, is less than two cents.

If we turn to the accounts for Glasgow, which are unquestionably veracious, we find this conclusion confirmed. According to the Glasgow street car statement for the year ending May 31, 1902, the number of passengers carried was 170,000,000, and the operating expense—power, traffic, and general expenses, repairs, sinking fund for renewal of permanent equipment, and depreciation—amounted (in dollars, at \$5 to the £1) to \$2,025,515. This gives an average cost per passenger of 1.19 cents. Operating expenses are somewhat dearer there than in Chicago, but it is probable that they are almost three times as much for every passenger carried?

Come, now, to a city nearer home—Toronto. The report of the street car system of that city for the past year is before us. This system is owned by the city. Its property includes the right of way, but does not include sleepers and rails; and one of the items of the report is \$255,551.07 paid to the city in rentals for the current year. The rates of fare are six tickets for 25 cents, eight tickets for 25 cents for early hours, seven tickets for 25 cents for Sundays, and 25 tickets for one dollar. According to this Toronto report, the number of passengers carried in the year 1902 was 44,437,678; while the operating expenses, including taxes, but not including rentals, was \$1,015,361.32. This is at the rate of less than 2.29 cents per passenger.

Other facts of interest to American cities appear in this report of the Toronto Street Railway company. It shows that the service could be furnished at a profit upon a

straight three-cent fare. As the number of passengers carried was 44,437,678, the gross earnings at three cents straight, without considering the increased patronage in consequence of the lower fare, would have been \$1,333,130. Against this the operating expenses, as reported, were \$1,015,361.32, which leaves a balance of \$317,769 as gross profits. No payment to the city should be required, for such payments tax street car passengers per capita for the benefit of landed proprietors, whose tax burdens are to that degree diminished. There would be nothing to pay, therefore, out of the gross profits of \$317,769, but interest on bonds, dividends on stock, and a contribution to a sinking fund for replacement of capital. The outstanding bonds amount to \$3,473,373.33, over two-thirds of which bear 4½ per cent. interest, and the remainder 6 per cent. The interest is accordingly about \$170,000. This would reduce the net profits to \$147,769, which, without any provision for sinking fund, would allow only 2 1-3 per cent. on the stock as reported. But the stock as reported is understood in Toronto to be fictitious. The bonds—\$3,473,373—are said to have paid for the road. Upon that assumption, there would be no necessity for dividends, and the whole \$147,769 could be put into a sinking fund for paying off the bonds. At that rate this would take less than 25 years, without considering the interest-earning power of the sinking fund. With the augmented business that a straight three-cent fare would bring, these calculations point to the probability that an interest in a three-cent fare street railway would be highly profitable.

Further evidence of the extreme probability that a straight three-cent

fare would be profitable, is offered by the street car situation in Cleveland. As is pretty well known, Mayor Tom L. Johnson, one of the best street car experts in the country, undertook two years ago to establish a three-cent fare system in Cleveland. In this he was supported by the city council, not only after it became Democratic but while it had a Republican majority. The franchise was offered for bids. Only one bidder responded, but he deposited \$50,000 cash as a guarantee of good faith, and when the franchise was awarded him, he promptly began the work of construction. Now, if he could not have made the road profitable at a three-cent fare, what could have been better for the old street car interests than to keep quiet and allow him to go on to his own destruction? Nothing could have been more convincing of the impracticability of the three-cent fare idea. But they did not keep quiet, except as burglars do. They pulled wires and fought under cover in the courts until they had succeeded in overturning the whole municipal system of the State—all for the purpose of heading off the three-cent fare railway. In that they have thus far been successful. But now they must meet the people of Cleveland, squarely upon the three-cent fare issue, and as the people decide so it will be. The old franchises are beginning to expire, and the issue is between Senator Hanna, the head of the street car ring of Cleveland, who seeks a renewal of franchises on the old terms, and Mayor Johnson, who advocates three-cent fares immediately and municipal ownership at the earliest possible opportunity.

While this issue was taking shape a significant thing occurred. The central organization of labor unions of Cleveland had appointed a committee on low fares, and this committee reported a few weeks ago, with studied elaboration of detail, that upon investigation they had found that it costs more than three cents per passenger to operate the street cars. Wherefore they advised

against the three-cent fare movement and in favor of extending all franchises to 1914, when the last one expires. As soon as that report became public Mayor Johnson declared that it bore internal evidence of having been prepared in the office of Senator Hanna's lawyers. This characterization was denounced by the committee, whose members, however, opposed a motion to invite Mayor Johnson to explain his charge before the central body. The invitation was extended, nevertheless, and the result proved disastrous to the street car ring.

When he appeared before the central body of the labor meeting in response to their invitation, Mayor Johnson read a carefully prepared paper in which he exposed the bad faith of the report. Referring to the advice to extend the franchises to 1914, he said:

This proposition to extend the franchises to the date of the expiration of the last is exactly the street railroad contention. It is what has been the most frequently suggested to me in the last year as a solution of the question. It is the plan of greatest advantage to the companies. This stifles any competition for new lines and postpones the settlement to such a distance that the railroads will very gladly take the chance of getting a favorable administration and city council any time within the next ten years to settle this question as they have attempted to in Cincinnati by a 44-year grant, made directly by the legislature.

He then proceeded to describe the report, taken as a whole, as—

an able brief presenting the street railroad side of the question in the strongest way for their interest. It is the ability and cunning in its preparation that first impressed me with the belief that it was prepared by street railroad attorneys, and I naturally came to the conclusion that their principal advisers, Messrs. Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, had written, directed, or in some way inspired the arguments found on its pages. I did not see them do it. I do not know that they did, but there are not many street railroad lawyers who could produce a better piece of work. I think a careful reading of the report, in view of the ingenuity and cunning I have pointed out, will convince you gentlemen that no member of your committee is sufficiently skilled in such work to produce so able a brief. If in this

I am mistaken, I would advise him to change his occupation, as the privileged classes pay exceedingly well for high-grade work of this kind.

Turning to the facts connected with the making of this extraordinarily able labor report, Mayor Johnson went on:

Now as to the facts connected with the making of this report: I have no desire to reflect upon the private character of any one. I repeat, that I have no facts that would warrant my going before a grand jury with charges, but there are some questions that I think would have weight. In this case we must at the outset admit that there is a powerful interest anxious to perpetuate franchises in the streets of the city, in which they think at least millions are at stake. And there is sufficient incentive on that side to warrant an attempt to influence directly or indirectly, either by argument or payment, those having in charge the preparation of this report to so shape it that it will amount to an indorsement at the hands of the labor organizations of their arguments and contentions, and will discredit as much as possible the people's side of the question. I believe that I have shown you this report does that very thing, and you will admit that there is sufficient at stake from the side of the railroads to warrant the disposing of large sums to accomplish their end. Now the point is, whether any members of this committee, directly or indirectly, have been deceived, unduly influenced, or corrupted in this work. I propose to show you some circumstances that I think, if unexplained, will, to say the least, cast doubt upon the sincerity of one or more members of this committee.

Here Mayor Johnson turned from his paper to say he would like to ask one member of the committee whose report was before the body one or two questions. "I would like to ask this member of the committee," he said, "whether he has lately had any large sum of money paid him?" Without waiting for an answer the mayor then suddenly faced the member to whom he had alluded and exclaimed: "Michael Goldsmith, have you had any large sum of money paid to you recently, either \$500, \$1,500 or \$2,500?" "Yes," came the reply from Goldsmith. The question and the answer are reported to have caused the most intense excitement among the delegates. Those present in the hall were fairly overwhelmed and the stillness that followed the

asking and the answering of the question was almost painful. A second later the mayor continued: "Where did you get the money and what were you doing so often during the holidays around the offices of the president of the Little Consolidated?" "None of your business," responded Goldsmith. Amidst the oppressive silence that followed this virtual confession, the mayor concluded:

I want to state that in what I am about to say, if it is not so, I deserve more than your contempt, and Mr. Goldsmith has right of action against me for personal damages. I charge that near the end of last July Mr. Goldsmith made a deposit in the Cleveland national bank of \$500 and that two days after the report of your low fare committee was made he made a deposit in the same bank of \$1,250. I believe myself that these deposits are in some way related to the report of the committee, although I am not attempting to cast reflections on the members of that committee. Now, gentlemen, you have my whole case.

When Mayor Johnson had finished, the central labor body hotly discussed the subject and ended with throwing out the report of their committee. They adopted as a substitute for it a resolution saying nothing of fares, but indorsing municipal ownership. Thus did Senator Hanna's effort to line up the labor vote of Cleveland in support of his expiring street car franchises come to grief.

The negotiations in Chicago between the city council and the street car interests (p. 695) have reached the stage of a deadlock. From all the circumstances it is now evident that the representatives of the street car interests have simply been trying to get an extension of franchises under agreements that would carry over to the next expiration the unsettled legal questions which they are using to force a compromise now. The 99-year act is their principal weapon. This infamous grant, purporting to extend franchises from 1865 to 1964, would probably give them sufficient standing in court to keep the question in litigation for years, and an offer to surrender all claims under that grant in consideration of an extension was consequently most favorably

received. But now they refuse to make the surrender. They ask that the question of the validity and value of the grant be postponed. This is the very trick they played 20 years ago. It is fast becoming evident that the best way, if not the only way, to fight these tricksters is to fight them; and the time may not be far off when aldermen and citizens alike, who urge a compromise, will fall under reasonable suspicion. With \$60,000,000 of watered stock of the traction companies upon the market and in the hands of "widows and orphans," worthless if the franchises are not extended but good for their face if they are extended, blind confidence in the integrity even of "our best citizens" is indicative of some kind of weakness.

The hearings before the anthracite arbitration committee were made memorable by the extraordinarily able closing speech of Clarence S. Darrow. Aided by Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Darrow had presented the case of the miners with consummate ability. All the elements of a great tragic drama, not founded on fact merely, but made up altogether of facts, were evolved from the daily lives of the coal miners of eastern Pennsylvania; and in his summing up Mr. Darrow marshaled and massed these facts so skillfully yet so simply that the drama seemed to unfold itself. It was the tragedy, rather than the speaker who described it, that for two days engrossed the attention of the commission and entranced the fortunate auditors.

Among the many striking things that Mr. Darrow said, one is especially worth remembering. It was in reply to the advice of the lawyers on the other side that trade unions ought to get themselves incorporated. We quote him:

I am not willing to admit for a single moment that anything can be gained for manhood, for righteousness, for the good of all by going into some petty legislature and asking to merge the individual flesh and blood man into a corporation created by the state.

Why, we were told in the argument that the State of New Jersey—of all the places on earth, the State of New Jersey!—had introduced a law to compel labor organizations to incorporate. New Jersey has been busy with the corporation business. New Jersey has issued its bogus charters and sent them broadcast over the United States, its charters which have been simply letters of marque and reprisal for every pirate that sails the high seas of commerce to capture what he can get, until New Jersey has become a stench and a byword in the minds of all people who believe in fair dealing and justice between man and man.

Senator Campbell, of Illinois, has won an unpleasant distinction by proposing in the State senate a peculiar bill for the nomination of judges. Had this bill become a law the judgeships of the State would have been appointive offices, and party bosses would have been invested with authority to make the appointments. For it provided that—

The central or managing committee or executive committee of any political party authorized to make nominations of, in or for any judicial district, judicial circuit, or county, may itself make any and all nominations for judge or judges of any court of record without holding any primary election or convention.

Senator Campbell heard a rumbling when the news about his bill got abroad, and he promptly moved to strike out the enacting clause. His motion was adopted. He explained, however—and his explanation was more unpleasantly significant than anything else about the whole matter—that he had offered the bill at the request of "a committee of the judges of Cook county, who claimed to represent all the judges." Would it not be fair to the people of Chicago to let them know the names of that committee of judges?

The magnificent Lincoln day banquet at Columbus, Ohio, of the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln league, was marred by the speech of ex-Gov. Budd, of California. Though the lawyer in California of William R. Hearst, proprietor of the New York, Chicago and San Francisco papers that go by his name, Mr. Budd had the bad taste to announce his client,

Mr. Hearst, as a candidate for the next Democratic nomination for President.

It is inconceivable, almost, that Mr. Hearst should have authorized such an impertinence. Doubtless he would like to be President, or even a presidential candidate, as who would not; but unless he is without all sense of the eternal fitness of things Mr. Hearst must know that no one who leads the life that he notoriously does, can go before the people of this country as a presidential candidate without meeting overwhelming defeat and bringing humiliation and shame upon his party.

Even if that insuperable objection to so much as the mere consideration of Mr. Hearst as a candidate did not exist, his journalistic record in politics would be a bar to his nomination. Thousands of Democratic voters all over the country will not easily forget how, after his New York paper had "boomed" Henry George for first mayor of Greater New York, he suddenly turned it about face and supported Tammany hall with the evident purpose of swinging the George vote over into the Tammany lines. This action so closely resembled treachery to a principle and a candidate that Willis J. Abbot and Arthur McEwen resigned from the staff of the paper, and all George's supporters who knew the facts put Hearst's name upon a black list from which it cannot be without good reason erased.

That act, however, might be pleaded as proof of fidelity to party organization. But not so with Hearst's political performance in the California election last Fall. He used his San Francisco paper then to defeat Franklin K. Lane before the Democratic convention. To this there is no objection except that he opposed Lane for no other reason than that Lane could not be bossed either by Hearst or by the Pacific railroad interests with which

Hearst's paper in California is in collusion. But after Lane had been nominated by the convention, defeating Hearst's candidate overwhelmingly, Hearst's paper joined hands with the Republicans and the railroad ring to defeat him at the polls. That is one of the unforgivable things in party politics. They succeeded, but the vote showed that the man whom they thus conspired against possessed the confidence of the community. He carried San Francisco, where he had served as city solicitor and was well known, by 9,600—an extraordinary result. He carried the Republican city of Sacramento by 2,300. And though he lost in the State, it was by only 2,500. The rest of the ticket, supported by Hearst's paper, was defeated by majorities ranging from 20,000 to 65,000. After the election Mr. Hearst still pursued Lane, endeavoring even to deprive him of the complimentary vote of his party in the legislature for United States Senator. Here again Hearst was disappointed. Lane received the vote of nearly every Democratic member of the two Houses. While it is almost inconceivable that Mr. Hearst should hope to get even a complimentary vote from even one State in the Democratic national convention, the fact that he has thus opposed one of the best and strongest men of the party in California, does raise a fair suspicion that ex-Gov. Budd's impertinence in nominating his client at the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln banquet may have been committed under orders from Hearst himself.

It is not pleasant to write in this way of a man whose newspapers have published much that is good, even if along with a great deal that is bad. But if Mr. Hearst is simply grinding an axe of his own, it is better that the radicals of the country should know it, and the amazing act of his lawyer at Columbus calls for plain speaking. It is not so very difficult for a rich and selfish man owning newspapers, to hire good and honest editorial writers, and, while giving them full freedom to write in harmony with

their convictions, be ready at a moment's notice to utilize the popularity which they secure for him, to serve his own personal and indefensible ends. It may be that Mr. Hearst is not that kind of man. But evidence to the contrary accumulates.

The appointment by the Michigan governor of Thomas J. Navin as a member of the prison board of the State, may not commend itself to those righteous people who abhor criminals only after they have got into the penitentiary, but religiously despise them then and thenceforth. For Mr. Navin, once mayor of Adrian, has served a five-years' term in the Michigan State prison for forgery. But what better selection could be made for membership upon a prison board than a man of good character who has endured the prison life? Gov. Bliss is to be heartily commended for this appointment; provided, of course, that it has been made in good faith, and not to reward a copartisan regardless of his character.

THE ISSUE AT WATERBURY.

The facts are generally known: eighty strikers; twelve hundred militiamen called out. Why the need of so much force? Because eight thousand union men in the town, as is commonly reported, were joined with the strikers to prevent non-union men from taking their places. It is further said that thirty thousand people, out of a population of thirty-five thousand, were in sympathy with the strikers. Now it may well be that some of this sympathy "has been due to intimidation, or selfish and cowardly interest, as has been alleged; but no one denies that a large part of the people, in spite of the inconvenience to which they have been subjected, have been in sympathy with the strikers and with the attempt to prevent non-union men from stepping into the strikers' jobs.

We should like to ask the New York Commercial Advertiser to state what it thinks may be the cause of this queer state of affairs. Let us see again clearly what the queer state

of affairs is: simply this—a large number of people go so far as to aid and abet a certain set of men in keeping other men, who are willing, from working. Put boldly thus, this fact, common enough nowadays, has made the blood of indignation boil in many a well-meaning breast. It is not surprising that this strange attitude should astound people, especially such as are imbued with the democratic spirit. But we should like to ask the Commercial Advertiser to give its candid views as to the question, Why so many people seem willing to stand against the “freedom to work?”

In a recent article on the Waterbury issue the editor closed with these words:

Is local sentiment throughout the land, willing and intimidated, on the side of the cause of the labor union sustained by riot and violence, and against individual freedom and the right to work? If it is, and the constant necessity of calling upon the militia to uphold law and order seems to indicate that it is, something needs to be done to restore public sentiment to a healthy condition, to revive from one end of the land to the other the old American spirit, the old American sense of justice and right and of fair play for every man.

Why should public sentiment be against “the old American spirit”? For, with a proviso, we agree with the above writer that indications point that way. We do not think that public sentiment sustains riot and violence; but there is little doubt that public sentiment is strongly opposed to the so-called “scab,” that is, in plain terms, to the non-union man who is willing to take the union man’s job. We believe that a large majority of the American people have a “sort of feeling” that the non-union man has no right to the union man’s job, and sympathize with every effort, short of absolute violence, to prevent his doing so.

Such being the case, we agree with the Commercial Advertiser that “something needs to be done to restore public sentiment to a healthy condition.” What this something should be, certainly depends upon what is the cause of the sentiment. So, again, we ask why the sentiment exists. And we venture to assert that among all social questions there is

no more important “why” that we can ask.

It seems to us that it behooves anyone who has an earnest thought on the subject to give it utterance; and it is for this reason that we have asked the Commercial Advertiser what it thinks may be the cause. Our own belief is as follows:

In the first place, we do not believe that the public sentiment is due to any loss of the old American spirit of fair play. We believe that the belief in fair play is as strong as ever. We believe that it is due to a feeling—or perhaps we had better call it a subconscious conviction—that “free competition” among workmen to-day does not really bring fair play. People feel that the dispossessed union man has not enough chance for other employment or for self-employment to make his competition for the job in any true sense free and fair. They feel that it is a squabble for place, with lack of free space, and that if the outs get in, the ins go down. Furthermore, they feel that the advantage to those who get in over their fellows is perhaps a lowering of general conditions for all.

But in the second place, and to go farther back, we believe that these feelings, or sub-conscious reasonings, are due to actual conditions, the evils of which we have just hinted at. The free competition of laborers is no longer, to say the least, as fair as it once was in America; for the reason that there is no longer the same opportunity of self-employment. And this is due to the fact that while population has increased, natural opportunities have become more and more confined within the possession of private owners.

If our analysis of the cause of sympathy for strikers be correct, clearly the proper means to adopt for restoring public sentiment to a healthy condition is to go to the root of the matter, and attempt really to equalize opportunity. The only sane method of accomplishing this that we have ever seen advanced, is that of taxation. Lay a proper tax upon natural opportunities that have been monopolized and are yet not used. Do this in the interest “of justice and right

and fair play for every man,” and then there will be no warrant for the warping of public sentiment against any man who is willing to work.

J. H. DILLARD.

DEMOCRACY AND MONOPOLY.

I.

Man is not a creator; he is an exchanger, a converter. He originates nothing; he simply changes the form of things. He can create neither air, nor land, nor water, nor anything that is contained within them. He can, however, change the form and utility of matter by a million devices and contrivances of his hand and brain. He can convert the trees of the forest and the minerals of the earth into such forms as to make them serve uncountable uses for himself and fellows. Out of water he can draw forth steam power and out of the air electricity; quarries he can convert into stately palaces, immense bridges, great cities; the wool of the sheep he can convert into the clothing of his kind, and by the application of his labor to the soil he can supply the food of the entire community. In short, he can give value to, or put to profitable use, through conversion or exchange, almost every conceivable element of matter which he can get within his grasp.

But it is only through conversion or exchange that he can do these things. Alone and singly men can do but little. By working in unison with his fellows, man accomplishes almost superhuman tasks; alone, unaided, he accomplishes little or nothing. The best that man alone and unaided can do is to keep himself alive.

In modern civilization, however, all are aided, to a degree, directly or indirectly. It is only in the savage state that man must depend entirely upon himself. Then he must feed and clothe and house himself directly, and, unlike the more civilized being, he cannot buy his bread ready baked, nor his meat prepared for use. He can accumulate nothing and he can exchange nothing. The modern being, through a system of cooperation with his fellows, can exchange his labor (or the result of his labor) for the result of other labor; but the savage or primitive man must consume the result of

his labor, there being no system whereby he can exchange it for other labor. Neither can he store it up. And even if he could "store it up" it would be of no use to him; for the results of his labor, beyond an amount sufficient to provide for the necessities of his own existence, would, of course, be of no profit or value in a condition of society where there was no system of exchange or cooperation.

Thus, simply stated, we find that "society" itself is merely a process of conversion or exchange. Civilization is the logical outcome of collective industry; the development of the inherent power and tendency in man to gratify his desires (both small and great) through cooperation and exchange, with the least possible exertion.

II.

At the basis of man's industry is ambition or desire. He inherently has ambitions and desires which distinguish him from every other form of being in the animal world. Hence, he is a moving, progressive animal. But, constituted as he is, he could be neither moving nor progressive, in any large sense, were it not for the fact that he instinctively seeks to gratify his wishes or ambitions with the least possible labor or effort on his own part. It is this characteristic in man which makes for progress. He taxes his resources to accomplish his purposes swiftly, cheaply, simply. This is at least the tendency, and the degree in which he does it (in a free state of society) is measured by the intelligence he possesses. Early in the life of the race, he discovered that collectively he could accomplish more than singly, and thus society was formed. He became a social being because he could not progress in any other way.

But man is individual, as well as social. In but few stages of life have all his faculties been normally developed. In all history we find man more enlightened and further developed in some respects than in others. For instance, in primitive times he learned the lesson of saving and exchanging labor through cooperation with his fellows; but as social life expanded and became more complex, some men began to employ shorter and apparently simpler meth-

ods of achieving their ends. For example, many quickly lost sight of the principle of justice, and found that through the use of superior brute strength and force they could frequently accomplish their purposes more swiftly and advantageously than by the more peaceful methods of cooperation and exchange.

Thus, as the world grew, strength rather than justice, might rather than right, became one of the guiding stars of men. And hence, one of the inherent characteristics in man which normally makes for progress (self-interest) became the cause of much suffering and injustice in the world. The desire for selfish gratification grew so strong, that the other and higher attributes, justice, the true balance wheel, as it were, of progress, was largely overshadowed or forgotten. To this fact, that men have in the past lost sight of or forgotten justice, and have concentrated their energies to gain supremacy or power over their fellows, can be traced nearly all the darkness and trouble and misery that has ever appeared in this world. All the wars, unjust and despotic governments, oppressive and unequal laws, religious, social and mental superstitions, and unequal privileges of this or of other ages, are traceable to this one cause.

But man in his normal state, inherently loves justice, and even in the darkest of the world's days of injustice and oppression, the truth has never been entirely extinguished from his mind. For in every age we read of those who fought and bled in the struggle against the particular injustice or superstition of their time, and for the enlightenment or betterment of mankind. All down the pages of history we find leaders of liberty, who, in their own time, were reviled and condemned by the established order as traitors, rebels or fanatics. Such men were Savanarola, Columbus, Luther, Cromwell, Jefferson. It was in the hearts of such men as these that justice was kept alive and the seeds sown for its greater growth in modern times.

III.

Notwithstanding that the spirit of justice and equality has in our times gained great strength and power, her victory has never been complete. Co-

incident with the development of the broader civilization and more democratic spirit of the last centuries, many ancient customs have been retained and still further strengthened which have their basis in the doctrines of the darker ages. Among these are many of the old laws and customs whereby, through the protection of government, some still wrest from others that to which they have no right. In other words, although man has in many ways advanced since the days of Savanarola and of Columbus, yet he is in many other ways, in his relationship to his fellows, still far from the principle of equality and justice which is summed up in the word "democracy."

Democracy, correctly defined, is the embodiment of liberty and justice. In its greatest purity it means simply "equal rights to all; special privileges to none." A democracy is a state of society, therefore, where men actually have guaranteed to them both equality and freedom. Equality in the sense that the social and political rights are equal before the law; freedom in the sense that none are fettered or limited in their social life for the benefit of others. Unless these conditions exist, then real democracy is not present.

As I said before, man inherently seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion, and he does this quite naturally by taking advantage of those conditions which involve the least resistance. In a free state of society, such as is found in a truly democratic realm, where every man's opportunity is primarily equal, competition serves to retain equality between the production and the consumption of wealth, and also to greatly further the general development of progress. We find, however, in our own country, and in fact in all civilized lands, that in the development of modern industry a point is quickly reached where competition itself becomes so keen that disaster follows; and then a new factor, combination, sets in, and eliminates competition.

Now why is it that competition grows so keen in modern times that it ends in disaster? Why is it that "overproduction" ensues, with poverty and depression in its train, if (as is always true) there are thousands upon thousands of men ready and waiting to ex-

change their labor for their needs or their wishes? Why is it that so many men are trying with their hands and heads to exchange their labor for its equivalent and yet are unable to do so? Surely it would seem illogical that there should be such a thing as "over-production" as long as there are men standing idle and waiting for a chance to give their wealth (that is, their labor), in exchange for the products of others. Why should consumption ever fall behind production in a condition of society where probably 80 per cent. of the community are living from hand to mouth and are never able to store up their labor or accumulate wealth in any degree; where, in fact, they all consume as fast as they produce, and where there is always the keenest competition to consume even more?

In the answer to this question will be found the kernel of the whole modern social and industrial problem.

IV.

As we come to examine modern industrial conditions closely we find that there is an outside element which enters into and affects the social being of us all. We find that some men enjoy advantages which others do not. I do not mean merely the differences or advantages of hand and brain, or even association. These are natural and will never be apart from man. Such differences are more largely inherent and a part of the man himself. It is these that give him his individuality, and, of course, without such there could be no progress. But there are certain outside, artificial advantages which some enjoy to the exclusion of others. There are many of them, but they may all be summed up under one head—that of privilege, or monopoly.

Monopoly consists in the exclusive possession by some of certain legal or other rights, privileges and advantages which are not accessible to all. In other words, it is the artificial handicapping of one portion of the race for the benefit of the other. It is not only unjust, but it is pernicious in its influence in every walk of life. Man being a social being, he produces to exchange and he exchanges only to satisfy his wants, being unable to gratify them in any other way. In an

equitable state of society he has a free field to exchange his labor for its full equivalent in the products of other labor, and the equilibrium of society is maintained through the competition of both the selling and the purchasing of labor. Under such conditions there could be neither reason nor excuse for scarcity of labor or the "over-production" of the results of labor; for production and consumption should and perforce would continuously tend to balance each other. Every producer would be able to exchange his labor for its equivalent without let or hindrance.

But as modern society is constituted this is not the case. The producer of wealth in whatever form does not find a fair and equal field for the disposal of his labor. Instead, he quickly finds himself hemmed in by monopoly. He finds that, instead of being able to exchange his product for its equivalent, he must, continuously, his whole life through, set aside a certain portion of it as a tribute to others. Like the villeins of old, he must pay royalty to his master. Every stroke of the hammer, the chisel or the pen made by the worker in our land to-day involves a contribution of some kind to this modern robber baron. In a certain degree no work is possible, no wealth can be produced, without at the same time contributing to the strength and comfort of this great non-producing, all-consuming maw of society.

V.

The honest and unbiased thinker should have little difficulty in recognizing monopoly at any time. It is only because men are constantly confused by specious or superficial arguments, hearsay, and conscious or unconscious intimidation that they do not readily distinguish monopoly when they see it. Some monopolies are so old and seem so thoroughly a part of our daily surroundings that at first thought it seems, indeed, difficult for us to realize how they can ever be separated from the involved complexity of modern society. Like the creeping vines which intertwine and wind themselves in and about a lattice work, and seemingly cannot be separated from it, so monopoly, in one form or another, intertwines itself throughout the entire strata of mod-

ern society and appears in many ways to be a vital and necessary part of it.

But, like many other things, monopoly has its earmarks whereby it can always be recognized. It is essentially a "short cut," and, as I have already stated, it had its origin among men in the discovery that there was a way for them to gratify their desires which was easier and simpler than that of mere cooperation and exchange. In abandoning the path of justice they took a short route to "success" by appropriating the property (wealth or labor) of others. When the ancient savage discovered that he possessed the strength and power to control, through threat or intimidation, the life and labor of his weaker neighbor, then monopoly was born; and it has flourished from that day to this. All through the centuries we may trace the spirit of monopoly in one form or another. We see it as the underlying motive and principle in nearly all the wars of ancient or modern times; the annals of both dead and living empires display it on every hand, and in our own time and in our own land it is as fully alive as at any other time or in any other land.

VI.

The enemy of labor is not capital. There is no conflict between capital and labor, and essentially never can be. Labor's enemy, and capital's enemy, in the last analysis, is this monopoly of which we speak. Labor, unrestricted, unhindered, leads unerringly and directly to democracy, and is itself the evidence of democracy. Wherever you find labor free, in its broadest sense, there only will you find true democracy. Where labor is not free, there you will find monopoly.

The conflict, then, is not between labor and capital, but between free labor (or democracy) and monopoly. Thus monopoly is not merely the foe to one class, but to all classes (except the class of monopolists); it is not merely the foe to the poor, as such, but also to the well-to-do. It is not only the foe to manual labor, but the foe to the producer in every form. It is the real antagonist of true business interests, of enterprise, of ambition, and the enemy of justice, liberty and equality.

JOHN MOODY.

NEWS

The debt-collecting war of the European allies against Venezuela (p. 711) has come now to an end, all the protocols having been formally signed at the British embassy in Washington on the 13th. A separate agreement was made with each of the allies.

As reported by the Washington dispatches, the allies agreed to raise the blockade on the 14th, and return to Venezuela her captured ships; Venezuela making no claim, however, for the two ships that were sunk by the Germans. It was stipulated also that the question of preferential payment of the Venezuelan debts shall be submitted to The Hague tribunal, and that the non-combatant creditor nations shall have rights of representation at the hearings. Great Britain received \$27,500 in cash, upon the signing of the protocol; Italy and Germany are to receive the same amount in two payments, one at 30 and the other at 60 days; and Germany is to receive immediately, in five monthly payments, enough to bring the grand total up to \$340,000. All claims not already adjusted are to be referred to tribunals composed equally of representatives of the claimants and Venezuela, umpires to be appointed by President Roosevelt. As a guarantee for the payment of claims that are or shall be allowed, Venezuela pledges 30 per cent. of the customs receipts of La Guayra and Porto Cabello, from March 1, to be deposited with the representatives of the Bank of England at Caracas and there retained until The Hague tribunal decides upon the question of preferential treatment, after which the accumulated sums are to be paid over according to the various adjustments. In case of default on the part of Venezuela it is agreed that Belgium shall appoint an administrator of the Venezuelan customs houses at the two ports named above.

Pursuant to their agreement, the allies raised the blockade on the 14th. All their war vessels had sailed away on the 15th, and accumulations of goods began to flow through the Venezuelan customs houses. Of the duties on these goods the allies will get no share, as the 30 per cent. agreement does not go into effect until the 1st of March.

The United States has agreed with Venezuela upon a tribunal to adjust the American claims. It is to consist of two commissioners, one representing each country; the queen of the Netherlands is to be umpire; and the tribunal is to meet at Caracas on the 1st of June.

To provide for the obligations imposed by the protocols of peace, President Castro issued a presidential decree on the 17th by which he increased all import duties 30 per cent. and added specific duties on exports of coffee, cocoa and hides.

Rumors of war in the Balkans (p. 712) have multiplied while the war upon Venezuela has been drawing to its close. As reports from the Balkan region have it, there is great unrest in Macedonia, and open rebellion of the Macedonians against Turkey is almost certainly set for the opening of Spring. This would not signify the probability of a general European war, as it is said to do, but for the "Near Eastern" question—namely, the problem of driving the Turk out of Europe and administering upon his European estate. Otherwise Europe's interest would be slight in a Macedonian uprising. As it is, however, anything that threatens disturbance in Turkey forebodes a general continental conflict. Each nation is anxious to extend its own jurisdiction, yet is "committed" to maintaining a "balance of power," lest it may lose some of its own importance through such extensions by its neighbors. For that reason, all the Powers other than Turkey are forbidden by treaty to sail warships through the Bosphorus. But in September Russia asked permission of Turkey to sail four unarmed torpedo destroyers through that strait into the Black sea, whereupon Great Britain promptly addressed a note to the Sultan protesting against the proposed violation of treaty, and gave notice that if Russian vessels were allowed to pass Great Britain reserved the right to the same privilege. Turkey took the subject under advisement, but finally allowed the Russian vessels to pass. This incident supplements the Macedonian question. As one of the correspondents writes, all sorts of dry tinder are littered along the slopes of the Balkans and only a little spark may make a great flame.

Macedonia is a collection of more or less Christian districts in Turkey,

where maladministration is reported to be extreme. By the treaty of 1878, made at Berlin in settlement of the war between Russia and Turkey, Turkey was bound to introduce immediate reforms in Macedonia, establishing religious liberty. But this has not been done. A committee of Macedonians has consequently established headquarters at Sofia, in Bulgaria, for the purpose of agitating for these reforms and with the view of ultimately securing annexation of the Macedonian districts to Bulgaria. Roumania and Serbia are understood to disapprove the operations of the committee, fearing they may result in an extension of Bulgarian power and influence. The committee works secretly, of course, fearing on one hand the authority of Turkey, which is suzerain over Bulgaria, and on the other the interference of the Bulgarian government itself, which dare not openly countenance the annexation movement. Recently Bulgaria has taken steps, though her good faith is questioned, to suppress the committee.

Reports of uprisings have been gathering in volume for two years, and latterly they have been supplemented by reports of military activity on the part of the large powers affected. Diplomatic movements are also afoot. On the 10th of January it was reported from London that Russia and Austria, acting in concert, were about to submit to the other European Powers a scheme for the amelioration of the condition of the Christians in Macedonia; and that if the Powers approved their plan, it would be pressed upon Turkey by Austro-Russian diplomacy, coupled with representations that, if the Sultan did not acquiesce, Austria-Hungary would occupy the sphere of interest assigned to them by the Berlin treaty, while Russia would keep the Balkan principalities in restraint pending the perfection of the new regime. Later dispatches, also from London, stated that Italy had been consulted about these joint proceedings and had promised her support; and that the contemplated arrangements included the assembling of an international congress to be supported by a demonstration of European warships in the Gulf of Salonica. On the 17th a Paris dispatch announced that the Austrian ambassador to Constantinople was then about to present to the Sultan the Austrian note demand-

ing the proposed reforms, and that the Russian note, identical in terms, would soon follow. The terms of the notes were declared by the same dispatch to have been submitted to France, Great Britain, Italy and Germany, and to have been approved in principle by all except Germany. A similar dispatch emanated on the same day from Vienna. It differed only in stating that the Austrian note would be presented on the 19th, and in its more abundant details. The reform proposals, according to the Vienna dispatch, are chiefly of an administrative and financial nature, such as Turkey heretofore has promised. One new feature is the appointment of a governor for Macedonia, not necessarily a Christian, who shall have authority to act without specific instructions from Constantinople in every contingency.

These troubles were made the subject of one part of King Edward's speech from the throne at the reopening of the British parliament. After the adjournment of December 16 (p. 600) parliament reopens on the 17th of the current month, on which occasion the King was accompanied by the Queen and all the officers of state. Referring to the Balkan situation, the King in his speech said:

The condition of the European provinces of Turkey gives cause for serious anxiety. We have used our best efforts to impress upon the Sultan and his ministers the urgent need of practical and well considered measures of reform. The governments of Austria-Hungary and Russia have had under consideration what reforms would be desirable that the powers who were parties to the treaty of Berlin should recommend to the Sultan for immediate adoption. The papers dealing with the subject will be laid before you.

In the House of Lords, after the King's speech, in which the Venezuelan question had been touched upon, the Duke of Devonshire, speaking for the ministry, said that Great Britain accepts the Monroe doctrine unreservedly, and defended the action of the ministry in coercing Venezuela on the ground that not to have done so would have tended to prejudice every civilized power against the Monroe doctrine. In the House of Commons Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal leader, spoke in criticism. He said that information was desired regarding Venezuela and Macedonia.

In Venezuela, he said, the cloud happily had passed, but it was a black cloud and one which many people thought might have been avoided. It might have had dangerous consequences, and it was the duty of the country to inquire how it had been led into such a difficulty. He commented questioningly in this connection on the fact that Germany was not mentioned in the King's speech regarding Venezuela. There were people in England, he explained, who were of opinion that Great Britain should not associate with Germany under any circumstances, but he did not sympathize with that view, although he was opposed to cooperation with Germany in a matter like the Venezuelan. He characterized Germany as strong but rough. If there ever had been a case for arbitration, he argued, the Venezuelan affair was one; and if this course had been adopted in the first place a great precedent would have been established towards the peaceful settlement of international controversies.

One of the important measures likely to be brought before parliament at this session is a bill advocated by the British labor unions for protection against recent court decisions holding unions responsible in damages for business injuries caused by strikes. This bill proposes a legislative definition of the rights of unions, which shall include the right of peaceful "picketing." It would also amend the conspiracy law so as to make it lawful for several strikers acting together to do anything which a single striker may lawfully do when acting alone; and would protect union funds from attachment for damages caused by union members in committing acts unauthorized by the union.

The arbitration proceedings in the Pennsylvania anthracite strike (p. 713) have terminated. George F. Baer, president of the Reading company, began the final summing up for the employers on the 12th. Toward its close he made the following offer:

That the rate of wages now paid shall be the minimum basis for the next three years; that from Nov. 1, 1902, to April 1, 1903, all employes, other than contract miners, shall be paid an additional 5 per cent. That on and after April 1, 1903, for each 5 cents in excess of \$4.50 per ton on the average price realized for white ash coal in the harbor of New York, on all sizes above pea,

wages shall be advanced 1 per cent; the wages to rise or fall 1 per cent. for each 5 cents increase or decrease in prices; but they shall never fall during the next three years below the present basis.

Mr. Baer was followed on the same day by Clarence S. Darrow, attorney for the miners, who made the final speech in the case. He opened with this response to Mr. Baer's offer:

We have seen the President of the United States appoint this commission to settle this difficulty and then, this afternoon, in the last hour of this proceeding, the man more responsible than any other comes before this commission and says: "We will do exactly that which these men demanded nine months before." Why did not Mr. Baer go to John Mitchell nine months ago as he came to this commission to-day?

And later, referring again to Mr. Baer's offer, but in connection with representations of the employers as to the high wages the miners have been getting, Mr. Darrow responded:

If, at the end of all this time and labor, he is willing to give us 5 or 10 per cent. upon the figures that he says correctly represent our earnings we will be very glad indeed to take it. From the beginning of this strike until the end, whatever you may say about whether the miners knew what they were getting or not, these operators have never given out a correct figure or made a statement that would stand the light of day for a single moment when they talked to the public.

He went on to show, however, that—the 1 per cent raise on 5 cents suggested by Mr. Baer would give the operators an increase of 3½ per cent. in profits and the miners only 1½ on the \$4.50 basis.

Mr. Darrow concluded on the 14th, whereupon the commission adjourned for the purpose of considering their decision. Three days later, on the 16th, Mr. Darrow, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Lloyd were given a public reception at the Auditorium by the labor organizations of Chicago.

Partly as the result of his work before the arbitration commission, partly because of his remarkably large vote last fall for member of the lower House of the Illinois legislature (p. 482), and partly because of his advocacy of municipal ownership of street car systems, now a burning issue in Chicago, a movement has been started to make Mr. Darrow an independent candidate for mayor at the April election. A large independent committee has been organized. Mr. Darrow has not yet accepted. He

has declined, however, to be a candidate for the regular Democratic nomination. The candidates now seeking nomination to that office are Mayor Harrison in the Democratic party, and John M. Harlan and Graeme Stewart in the Republican party.

In national politics the principal event of the week was the banquet of the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln league, at Columbus, O., which occurred on Lincoln's birthday, the 12th, and was attended by 1,800 people. John J. Lentz, the president of the league, presided. Ex-Gov. Budd, of California, one of the regular speakers, proposed William R. Hearst for the Democratic nomination for the presidency. Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, another of the regular speakers, spoke exclusively on municipal affairs; and in the course of his speech, referring to complimentary allusions that had been made regarding him, he declared that he was a candidate for reelection as mayor of Cleveland and for that office only. William J. Bryan evoked overwhelming enthusiasm when, in his speech he said "the Democratic party could hope for more through converting dissatisfied Republicans than in winning back Palmer and Buckner Democrats." He declared, also, that he was for harmony, but that he would not change his principles if he could, nor would he surrender them, to win any victory for his party, however great. "A party, like a man," he said, "needs a character and a membership that knows what is right and will do it in the advocacy of political principles." He added that he did not propose to take his Democracy from any Democratic leader who received his inspiration from Wall street.

Regarding the local political situation in Cleveland, the only candidate for mayor as yet known to be in the field is Mayor Johnson. No strong Republican has been announced who is willing to run against him. Neither party has made its nominations.

Chicago political affairs are, as indicated above, complicated with the traction question, heretofore described in these columns. As stated at page 695, the local transportation committee of the city council has for some time been in negotiation with

representatives of the traction interests with a view to extending charters for 20 years or less, on terms that will eliminate the claims of the companies to their so-called charters in perpetuity and for 99 years, with which they are obstructing the movement for municipal ownership. These negotiations came to a deadlock on the 16th, over the question of the disputed 99-year franchise. The traction interests demanded (1) delay in the adjustment of the value of the alleged 99-year franchise until the expiration of the franchises for which they were negotiating; and (2) a friendly law suit at any time prior to that expiration, to determine the validity of the 99-year grant. On the other hand, the council committee unanimously demanded that—

the 99-year act be taken up in connection with the consideration of compensation, and that its value be determined now; and if the gentlemen representing the companies desire to proceed on that basis we will take such further action as may be necessary in the premises. The whole matter to be settled between the companies and committee.

With this demand the traction interests refused to comply, and the negotiations were abruptly broken off.

The general question of trusts has been in evidence during the week. On the 13th the Elkins anti-trust bill (p. 713) passed the Lower House of Congress by a vote of 241 to 6, under a special rule prohibiting amendments other than those the committee had made. This measure is supposed to require publicity, the expediting of all proceedings against the trusts under the direction of the attorney general, and the prevention of illegal rebates by providing for a fine of both the giver and the receiver. The House amendments were adopted by the Senate on the 14th and the bill is before the President.

Another scene in the trust drama was enacted on the 18th by United States Judge Grosseup, of Chicago. He made his decision in the "beef trust" suit (p. 586), overruling the defendants' demurrer to the Federal government's bill for an injunction. This decides, subject, of course, to appeal, not the facts in the case but the law. It holds that if the facts are as stated the "beef trust" has violated the Federal anti-trust law.

NEWS NOTES.

—Gen. Miles returned on the 16th from a five months' trip around the world.

—President Roosevelt signed the bill for the department of commerce and labor on the 14th.

—The Religious Educational association was permanently organized at Chicago on the 12th to put into effect improved methods of religious training.

—President Roosevelt has appointed Elihu Root, Senator Lodge and Senator Turner, as the American arbitrators under the Alaskan boundary treaty (p. 713).

—George Bruce Cortelyou, Secretary to the President, was nominated on the 16th by President Roosevelt as Secretary of Commerce and Labor, the new cabinet office.

—A woman suffrage measure pending before the Maine legislature was defeated in the Senate on the 18th by the casting vote of the presiding officer. The tie vote was 12 to 12.

—Gen. Davis, commanding at Manila, has approved the findings of the court-martial acquitting Maj. Glenn (p. 697), but with a rebuke to the accused for having shown a reckless disregard for human life.

—By a treaty with Cuba, signed on the 16th at Havana, the United States are given two permanent naval stations, one on the north coast 55 miles west of Havana, and the other on the south coast, 40 miles east of Santiago.

—The statistics of exports and imports of the United States for the seven months ending January 31, 1903, as given by the January treasury sheet, are as follows (M standing for merchandise, G for gold and S for silver):

	Exports.	Imports.	Balance.
M ...	\$356,546,724	\$598,079,657	\$259,487,087 exp
G	15,831,497	32,793,820	16,962,323 imp
S	30,322,396	16,076,160	14,246,236 exp

\$902,700,557 \$646,949,667 \$255,750,890 exp.

—The January treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government for the seven months ending January 31, 1903, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$174,327,687 89
Internal revenue ..	137,372,166 18
Miscellaneous	22,929,933 50
	\$334,629,787 57

Expenses:	
Civil and misc.	\$74,486,513 07
War	73,706,380 71
Navy	47,537,488 55
Indians	8,901,626 16
Pensions	81,907,139 46
Interest	20,687,712 21
	\$306,625,860 15

Surplus \$28,103,927 42

PRESS OPINIONS.

THREE-CENT FARES.

Chicago Chronicle (Ind.), Feb. 11.—It is anything but ridiculous to say that the public should get the benefit of the service at

as low a price as is consistent at once with excellence of service and a fair return to those who render the service; that the benefit should go to those who ride, and not to the city hall. If the companies can afford to carry a passenger from any point in the city to any other point on any of the lines for three cents it is not ridiculous but reasonable to demand that the service be rendered at that price. It is not ridiculous but reasonable to say that instead of permitting the companies to charge five cents a ride and requiring them to pay over two cents out of the five to the city hall they should be required to carry for three cents a ride.

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. 36 of that publication.

Washington, Feb. 9-14, 1903.

Senate.

Senator Carmack spoke in the morning hour of the 9th (p. 2016) in support of the Rawlins resolution calling for records of Philippine court-martials; and in the afternoon consideration of the Statehood bill (p. 2021) was resumed. The Rawlins resolution was referred on the 10th (p. 2070) to the Committee on the Philippines by a vote of 36 to 23. After reception of the conference report on the department of commerce and labor bill (p. 2061) discussion of the Statehood bill (p. 2082) was continued, until near adjournment when the conference report on the army efficiency bill (p. 2092) was adopted. The passage of the Alaska public lands bill opened the proceedings of the 11th (p. 2170). It was followed immediately by a continuation of the discussion of the Statehood bill (p. 2170). Senator Quay asked unanimous consent later in the day (p. 2177) that final vote on this bill be taken on the 21st, but Senator Proctor objected, and the discussion proceeded (p. 2178). It was interrupted by the adoption of the conference report (p. 2178) on the department of commerce and labor. No business of general interest was done on the 12th, nor on the 13th other than a discussion of the Statehood bill (p. 2253). The House amendments to the so-called Elkins anti-trust bill were adopted on the 14th (p. 2328) and the Philippine revenues amendment bill was discussed (p. 2337).

House.

No business of permanent general interest was done on the 9th, but on the 10th the conference report on the department of commerce and labor bill was discussed (p. 2094) and agreed to (p. 2100). Appropriations work occupied the day on the 11th and 12th. The Elkins anti-trust bill as it had passed the Senate was taken up on the 13th (p. 2266) and passed (p. 2264). The remainder of this day was devoted to appropriations work and the 14th to private bills.

Record Notes.—Speeches of Representatives Henry (p. 1999), Rixey (p. 2061), Thayer (p. 2064), Morrell (p. 2116), Griffith (p. 2116), Jenkins (p. 2118), Palmer (p. 2127), Zenor (p. 2130), Thompson (p. 2139), Clayton (p. 2181), Gooch (p. 2189), Brownton (p. 2190), De Armond (p. 2196), Douglas (p. 2333), Lloyd (p. 2338), Terrell (p. 2321), on trusts. Speech of Representative Feely (p. 2004), on good roads. Text of conference reports on department of commerce and labor (pp. 2060-51). Speech of Senator Dietrich on the Philippine Islands (p. 2281).

Rural Visitor—By gum! It's wonderful how New York's growin'! When I was here years ago there was four an' five-story buildin's where now there's eighteen an' twenty—

His Son—But—but yer don't mean to say they've growed?—Puok.

MISCELLANY

LINCOLN.

A portion of an Ode for the Twelfth of February.

And how shall we, my friends, best honor him? What ends,
What aims, what aspirations make our own?
What cause would he approve with his great human love,
Now his revered republic is full grown?

With beauty we must store the good world more and more,
This very day be artists, every one,
Till we have longed and wrought with truth in every thought,
And without gladness not a hand's turn done.

And what does this imply? What part have you and I
With Lincoln and the cause of liberty?
Are there no slaves to-day? While we sit here at play,
Have we no brothers in adversity?

None sorry nor oppressed, who without hope or rest
Must toil and have no pleasure in their toil?
These are your slaves and mine. Where is the right divine
Of idlers to encumber God's good soil?

There is no man alive, however he may strive,
Allowed to own the work of his own hands.
Landlords and waterlords at all the roads and fords,
Taking their toll, imposing their commands.

Not until every man is free to choose and plan
What service he will do for beauty's sake—
How vent that one supreme desire, the artist's dream,
Bidding new wonders at his touch awake—

Not until he is made the lord of his own trade,
Can any man be glad or strong or free.
There looms the coming war. Which captain are you for,
The chartered wrong, or Christ and liberty?
—Bliss Carman, in The Literary World.

A REFORMER IN OFFICE.

The readers of The Commoner had occasion to rejoice when a Kansas City platform democrat, Hon. Lucius F. G. Garvin, was elected governor of Rhode Island, for they knew that he was interested in doing something more than drawing his salary and enjoying the honors of the position. They will be glad, though not surprised, to know that Governor Garvin is justifying their hopes and expectations. He begins his message to the legislature by using language which the Republicans may regard as sacrilegious. He points to the great productive capacity of the United States during the year 1902, but

instead of attributing this prosperity to the Republican administration he attributes it to our "vast natural resources and to the industry and enterprise of our people." He calls attention to the abuses of governmental functions of the state—first, the passage of laws by one general assembly which cannot be amended or repealed by subsequent assemblies; second, the establishment of a board of police commissioners which spent money raised by taxation, although not responsible to the people who pay the taxes; third, the post-election sessions of the general assembly which passed laws that they would not dare to pass before an election; fourth, the domination of a third house, causing legislation to be sold to the highest bidder. He also points out that the theory of representative government is constantly violated in Rhode Island, and that under the constitution of Rhode Island one-twelfth of the inhabitants living in small towns possess as much influence as eleven-twelfths of the people living in large cities. He calls for a constitutional convention, and points out other needed reforms.

The eastern Democrats are looking around for a presidential candidate. Why is it that they ignore such timber as that furnished by Rhode Island? Why is it that they pick up men who have never expressed themselves on public questions and have never given any evidence of sympathy with the people? Why? Because the reorganizing element of the party does not want a president who would be Democratic in office and who would use the great prestige of the presidency to protect the people from the encroachment of organized wealth.

Governor Garvin lives in an eastern State, but he would be as obnoxious to the reorganizers as any western or southern believer in the Kansas City platform. If he were to announce his candidacy for the presidency he would be assailed as a small, insignificant, narrow-minded man, "an accident in politics," and as a person lacking the breadth and depth which the metropolitan papers are in the habit of conferring upon those who are under secret obligation and pledge to the corporations.

The Democrats, however, who are interested in good government—and such Democrats are quite numerous on election day—will rejoice that little Rhode Island is going to have a taste of Democracy. Governor Garvin will have their best wishes if he tries to secure remedial legislation for his constituents.—The Commoner of Feb. 13.

"MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP."

A portion of an address upon the above subject, delivered before the Henry George association, of Chicago, January 18, 1903, by Judge Edward F. Dunne.

In recent years perhaps no subject has engrossed so much of the attention of the public in great cities of this country, and in Chicago particularly, as the question of the ownership and operation by the public of public utilities. By these I mean street cars, gas works, electric light plants, telephones, telegraphs, railroads and other enterprises, the operation of which requires the possession and use of public property.

In this city to-day a citizen is charged from \$40 to \$175 for the annual rent of a telephone, and the service is not overgood at that. The same service is given in Stockholm, Sweden, for \$20 a year (on the average); in Christiania, Norway, for \$22 a year (on the average); in Trondhjem, Norway, for \$13.50 a year (on the average); in Berne and Zurich, Switzerland, for \$10 and upward; in Berlin, for \$36 per annum; in Copenhagen, from \$27 to \$48, and in Paris, France, for \$78.

In Chicago to-day we are paying \$1 per thousand feet for gas, which has been sold to the citizens of Hyde Park, in this city, up to two years ago, for many years past, for 72 cents per thousand.

The city of Glasgow is charging 52 cents for the same kind of gas, and the average price charged by all the cities in England, operating municipal gas plants, in 1897, was only 75 cents, upon which price the municipalities netted 18 1-3 cents profit, making the gas cost the consumer only 56 cents net.

In Chicago to-day electric light companies charge from \$105 to \$125 per annum, per arc lamp. They are empowered by law to sell electric light to private consumers all over the city, while the city, which cannot sell light to private customers and is confined by law to furnish gas to itself, is producing the same for \$99 per lamp.

The city of Detroit is producing the same light for \$61 per arc light; Aurora, Ill., for \$50; Elgin, Ill., for \$50, and Bay City, Mich., for \$52.

In Chicago to-day the shortest ride a man can take on the street car costs him five cents, and then he rides a great part of the way hanging to a strap, most of the time in a dirty car, and always, during the rush hours, jammed, jostled and jolt-

ed about, in a manner that is irritating to his fellow-passengers, and indecent to the gentler sex.

The fare paid in other great cities of the world, outside of the United States, is about half of this amount.

In most other American cities a citizen is charged the same price for the same reason, to-wit, because the service is in the hands of private companies.

This state of facts and figures in Chicago, and this state of facts and figures elsewhere in the world, have caused, are causing and will cause the people of Chicago to endeavor to find the reason for this situation of affairs, this discrepancy in the cost of such necessities of life, and when the cause has been discovered, to find a remedy.

On the threshold of this inquiry the people of Chicago have discovered that all these public utilities furnished to the citizens of the city of Chicago are owned and operated by private corporations, organized and conducted for private gain.

On stepping over the threshold into the vestibule of the investigation they have also found that in all the cities above mentioned, where public utilities were furnished at a cheaper price, these public utilities were being owned and operated by the public—in other words, by the municipalities themselves.

Must or must we not conclude that the difference in ownership and operation is the cause of the wide discrepancy in the cost of these absolutely essential necessities of life to the residents of cities?

If it be found upon investigation that in Chicago and other cities where these public utilities are furnished by private persons or corporations, the prices charged for the same are higher than they are in a few other large cities where these utilities are furnished by public corporations, it might appear, upon investigation, that the different prices result from many and various causes.

But if we find upon investigation that private corporations in different parts of the world, and under varying conditions, nearly always charge more than public corporations for the same service, we must conclude that private corporations charge exorbitant prices, and that it is to the interest of the public to place the production of their utilities in the hands of the public authorities.

According to the official report of the American consul in Liverpool,

now on file in Washington, dated May 19, 1902:

There are now in Great Britain 961 municipalities, owning water works; 99 owning the street railways; 240 owning the gas works; and 181 supplying electricity. Municipalities were not allowed to work tramways until 1896. It is estimated that half the gas users in England use municipal gas.

Among the municipalities owning and operating street cars are cities ranging from 4,000,000 to 50,000 inhabitants.

In Germany, Wurtemberg, Bavaria, Bulgaria and some of the Australian states all telephones are owned by the public. In Switzerland nearly, if not all, of the telephone systems are owned by municipalities. Many of the municipalities of Norway and Sweden own their own telephone system, and in the duchy of Luxemburg the telephone system is owned and operated by the duchy. In Holland the telephone system was private till 1896, when the two leading cities, Amsterdam and Rotterdam, secured franchises for municipal plants. In France the telephone was in private hands till 1899, when the government took possession and reduced rates. Austria and Belgium began with private exchanges and afterwards adopted public ownership. In Denmark the government in 1898 assumed control of the telephone business, reserving the power to fix rates, and in England there is a decided movement from private to public ownership.

Municipal ownership and operation is now practically in force in the following great cities of Great Britain: London (in part), Glasgow, Leeds, Southampton, Nottingham, Liverpool, Hull, Bradford, Blackburn, Aberdeen, Sheffield, Huddersfield, nearly all of which cities have a population of from 100,000 to over a million.

In Milan, Italy, a city of half a million, the city owns its gas works and railways, and has a joint interest with the private corporation in the net proceeds of the company.

In Saxony the gas plant is owned by the public.

In Great Britain, approximately, 60 per cent. of all the gas consumers are served by publicly owned companies. Birmingham, Glasgow, Manchester, Leicester, Nottingham, etc., own their own gas works, and probably 60 per cent. of the municipalities of Great Britain also manufacture their own electric light.

Let us now examine and see what are the prices charged in these differ-

ent countries for these public utilities, when furnished by public corporations:

TELEPHONES.

Telephone charges in the United States are three times the government tariff in England, and also three times the charges permitted by the government in France.

In Trondjhem, Norway, with 780 exchange lines, the average rental was \$13.25 a year per 'phone. Subscribers speak to 11 towns, within a radius of 50 miles, for five minutes for five cents.

Stockholm has an average of \$20 per 'phone, and communication within a radius of 43 miles. The Bell company, bought out by the government, charged \$4 for the same service. The public telephone of the duchy of Luxemburg (44 by 30 miles) makes a uniform yearly charge of \$16 for each 'phone, and each subscriber can talk all over the duchy.

In Switzerland, which has an excellent system (metallic circuit), the cities make a moderate charge of \$8, plus one cent for each call. In Zurich and other cities the average total rate is \$15 per 'phone per year.

In Sweden there are 160 cooperative telephone exchanges, and the average of their charges is \$10 per 'phone per year.

GAS.

In England, where municipal ownership has been established, the cost of gas is, on an average, one-half what it is where the same is furnished by private companies.

The private companies, operating in Glasgow, before the same were purchased by the municipality, charged consumers \$1 per thousand feet, while the municipal company now being operated by the city of Glasgow charges 52 cents per thousand.

Private gas companies in England are now charging 90 cents per thousand, and publicly owned companies charge from 52 to 60 cents per thousand.

The private gas company or companies in the city of Chicago, as we all know, charge \$1 per thousand for gas, and in many cities of the United States private gas companies charge considerably more.

It may be urged, however, that the difference in the price of gas in American and European cities might result from the increased cost of labor, or some other reason outside of the character of the management. That this is not true is shown by the fact that in those States of the

union where any of these public utilities are furnished by both private and public companies, the same difference in rate prevails as those between American and European cities.

Some years ago it was found, upon investigation, that there were eight private gas companies in Virginia and four municipal plants. All but two of the private companies charged from \$2 to \$3 per thousand feet, and the average of the eight companies was \$2.11. Three of the public works charged \$1.50 per thousand, and one of them \$1.44, and the average cost to the people, operating expenses and all fixed charges, was \$1.17.

In West Virginia there were five private companies and one municipal plant. One of the private companies charged \$1 per thousand feet, another \$1.60, and the other three \$2 and \$2.25. The public works in Wheeling charged 75 cents per thousand, and the total cost to the people was 50 cents, there being no debt and no interest to pay, operating cost, depreciation and taxes were the whole expense.

Of the 89 private companies in Pennsylvania, 26 charged \$2 per thousand, and over 55 charged \$1.50, and only eight made a rate as low as \$1. At the same time the public works in Philadelphia, Pa., charged \$1.50 per thousand, but 60 cents of it was clear profit in the treasury, above the cost of operation and fixed charges, so that the people really got the gas for less than \$1.

In Kentucky none of the 18 private companies sold as low as the public works in Henderson, Ky.

In Ohio there were two public plants, one at Hamilton, which supplied gas at a total of \$1 per thousand (30 cents of it being interest), and the other at Bellefontaine (free of debt), which supplied gas at a total cost of 63 cents per thousand. Of the 43 private companies only five made so low a rate as \$1.

ELECTRIC LIGHT.

What is true of gas and water is also true of electric light.

While private companies in Chicago are charging from \$105 to \$125 per annum, per arc lamp, the following cities, which have municipal plants, are furnishing the same light for the same period at the following prices:

Bangor, Me.....	\$46 00
Lewiston, Me.....	52 00
Dunkirk, N. Y.....	53 50
West Troy, N. Y.....	75 06
Allegheny, Pa.....	57 00
Easton, Pa.....	95 00
Bay City, Mich.....	52 00
Detroit, Mich.....	61 50

South Park Plant, in Chicago.....	57 00
Aurora, Ill.....	50 00
Topeka, Kan.....	51 00
Little Rock, Ark.....	49 50
Wheeling, W. Va.....	57 50
Peabody, Mass.....	61 50
Braintree, Mass.....	61 50
Danvers, Mass.....	56 50
Jamestown, N. Y.....	49 00
South Norwalk, Conn.....	47 50

The city of Boston, Mass., is furnished electric light by a private company, which charges one cent per meter hour; the city of Braintree, Mass., is furnishing light by a public plant, which charges one-half cent per meter hour. Brookline, Mass., is charged one cent per meter hour, by a private company; Swanton, Vt., one-third cent per meter hour, by a public plant. In New York city the charge by a private company is one cent per meter hour; Westfield, N. Y., has a public plant, which charges one-half cent per meter hour. The city of Philadelphia, Pa., is charged three-quarter cent per meter hour, by a private company; and Newark, Del., three-tenths cent per meter hour, by a public company. In Detroit, Mich., the private electric light plant charges \$1 per month for each lamp; in Wyandotte, Mich. (near Detroit), the charge by a public plant is 16 2-3 cents per month for each lamp. In Kalamazoo, Mich., citizens are charged 20 cents per kilowatt, by a private company; Coldwater, Mich. (near Kalamazoo), which has a public plant, charges five cents per kilowatt. In Chicago, Ill., the charge is one cent per meter hour; and in Peru, Ill., the charge by a public company is one-half cent per meter hour.

WATERWORKS.

The same is true of waterworks in the United States. In Indiana the charges made by private companies have been found to be double those charged by public companies. Only nine of the 50 large cities of the United States are supplied with water by private companies, and only two of these companies have made public their receipts and expenses. The two that have made reports admit that they have earned from 30 to 40 per cent. per annum on their capital stock.

The following statistics with relation to the rates paid for water by Illinois cities will convince the most skeptical that the rates charged by private companies for water are much in excess of those charged by publicly owned and operated companies:

Private Water Supply and Ownership.	Total Revenue per Family per Year.
-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

Lincoln, Ill	\$18.00
Mount Vernon, Ill.....	10.00
Effingham, Ill	6.50
Alton, Ill	4.33 1-3
Sterling, Ill	8.70
Kankakee, Ill	7.90
Chillicothe, Ill	9.80
Calro, Ill	10.66 2-3
Oak Park, Ill.....	20.00

9) \$94.90

General average \$10.50

Public Water Supply and Ownership.

Moline, Ill	\$4.50
Taylorville, Ill	4.50
Savanna, Ill	2.00
Lexington, Ill	3.00
Elgin, Ill	3.00
La Salle, Ill.....	4.50
Evanston, Ill	6.40
Rock Island, Ill.....	5.33
Aurora, Ill	4.00

9) \$37.20

General average \$4.10

What is true of gas plants, electric light plants, waterworks and telephones is also true of street railways.

STREET RAILWAYS.

The street car fare paid in the United States, where private ownership prevails, we all know to be five cents a ride, whether it be short or long, which is more than double what is paid to municipal street car companies in Europe, as will be apparent from the following table:

Town.	Population.	Fare. cents.	Average Fare. cents.
Milan	440,000	1 and 2	1.8
Vienna	1,500,000	1.6 and 2	2.7
Berlin	1,800,000		3.
Buda-Pesth ..	500,000		2.7
London	4,000,000		2.5
Belfast	256,000		2.2
Glasgow	840,000		1.78

The principal street car companies in Chicago are capitalized and bonded for over one hundred millions of dollars. The value of their tangible property is shown by Mr. Arnold's recent report to be less than \$30,000,000. Until recently they have been paying interest and dividends upon their total bonds and capitalization.

In other words, they have been compelling the citizens of Chicago to pay them five per cent. dividends upon over seventy millions of dollars of stock, which has no tangible property behind it, and which has not been invested in the railroads, but which is the value placed by these companies upon the charters given to them by the very people out of whom they are squeezing this extortionate income.

A consideration of the foregoing figures must convince the most skeptical that private companies that are furnishing water, gas, electric light and street railway transportation, both in this country and in Europe, are charging exorbitant prices for these commodities, and much more than they can be, and are being, furnished by publicly owned companies.

This cannot be the result of mismanagement by private companies and efficient management by public companies, for it has always been claimed, and I think it will be conceded, even by advocates of private ownership, that the wages paid by publicly owned companies are always higher than those paid by private companies, and that the publicly owned companies are not managed with the same stringent economy that is characteristic of private ownership, where every attention is paid, even to the minutest detail, in order to decrease the cost of production. It must then result solely and exclusively from the fact that private companies, in their anxiety to swell the dividends of their stockholders, charge the public more than is reasonably necessary for the pecuniary success of these enterprises, and charge such rates as can safely be called "extortion."

The interest of the private companies is solely to make big dividends for their stockholders; the interest of the public companies is mainly to furnish the utilities to the public as cheaply and efficiently as possible, consistent with successful management of the enterprise. The spirit which actuates the former companies, is that of private gain; the spirit which actuates the latter companies, is the public good. The motive controlling the former companies, is selfish; the motive that actuates the public companies, is altruistic.

But it has been said by those who oppose municipal ownership and operation that the service rendered by the public corporations is not as efficient or as satisfactory as the service rendered by the private corporations.

The American consul at Liverpool, England, in his report, dated May 19, 1902, declares:

Liverpool is one of the foremost cities in municipal socialism. It owns the waterworks (one of the best systems in the world); it operates the street cars; it supplies the electric light and power; it has one of the largest and best public bath systems anywhere, and proposes to erect the finest Turkish bath in Europe.

The London correspondent of the New York Tribune has been investigating the government and varied industries of Nottingham, and he sends the following report to his paper:

Good local government (he says) is the chief glory of modern England, and cannot be too highly extolled, and the great distinguishing feature of English local government, as compared with American, is the extension of the local government into enterprises which in this country are, for the most part, carefully kept in private hands, who overlook no opportunity to plunder the duped and befogged citizens.

Nottingham, a city of 240,000 people, owns its own markets, cemeteries, waterworks, gas and electric light service and street railways, and while giving the people very low rates, it has been able to turn into the treasury within five years \$20,000 as net profit, after payment of interest on purchase debts, payments to sinking funds, and liberal allowances for depreciation. This profit serves to reduce the tax rates materially. But while profit for tax reduction is secured, it is not the sole or the greater object of the city in conducting these enterprises. The collective interests of the community are mainly considered—the advantage of the common people considered apart from their liability as tax payers.

Water, for example, is furnished to tenements of low rental at not exceeding 4 cents per quarter year; and still the works are made to yield a small profit to the public treasury. The charges for municipal gas range from 28 to 34 cents per 1,000 cubic feet, and electric light and power service are correspondingly low.

In speaking of public utilities in Liverpool, the American consul says:

Liverpool boasts of having one of the best railroad systems, not only in Great Britain, but in Europe. The corporation got control of the system in September, 1897, and has substituted electric for horse cars.

The same consul in the same report speaks of his observations with reference to the operation of public utilities by the public throughout the kingdom, and concludes his report by saying:

Two observations are appropriate to be made in conclusion. Speaking generally, municipal government in Great Britain is honest, intelligent and energetic; and as a rule politics has but little to do with the engagement or retention of civic employes.

* * * * *

Corruption of public officials, the stealing of public property, favoritism in the selection of employes, strikes, inefficient service, exorbitant charges, and insolence towards, and defiance of the public, have marked the history of private management of public utilities in Chicago, and elsewhere in America.

The people have called a halt. The demand of the people to place a check upon public corruption by and with the referendum, at first feeble and unheeded, has swelled into a roar whose reverberations are heard in the council chambers of the land, as well as in the temples of finance.

No longer will the people be despoiled and flouted, as they have been in the past, and the legislator or councilman who remains deaf to the cry of the people, and heedless of the popular demand for municipal ownership and the referendum, may as well prepare for sepulture under a stone, upon which will be written the epitaph:

HE SERVED THE CORPORATIONS—
NOT THE PEOPLE.

NO PUBLICITY.

John D. is a duffle smart man;
 He stays to his home an' looks arter his
 wealth.
 An' layn' low allers wuz part of his plan—
 The millions he's gathered he gathered by
 stealth.
 So John D.
 Rock'feller he
 Sez he can't stand much of publicitee.
 John sez the trust agitation must stop;
 Sez the imper'nence hez gone fur enough;
 Heard all he wants to of trust bustin' sloop,
 An' is all-fired tired of thet sort of stuff.
 An' John D.
 Rock'feller he
 Sez the senate won't "haw" if he hollers
 out "Geel!"
 My! ain't it terrible? Wut shall we du?
 We can't never search him, o' course—
 thet's flat.
 Guess we shall hev to submit (don't you?)
 An' let him continner to fry us for fat.
 For John D.
 Rock'feller he
 Sez he won't stand for publicitee.
 —Chicago Tribune.

I have seen the time when a political convention without a disturbance and the drawing of weapons was rare. That time is past in Colorado, and it is due to the presence of women. Every man now shows that civility which makes him take off his hat and not swear, and deport himself decently when ladies are present. Instead of women's going to the polls corrupting women, it has purified the polls.—Hon. John F. Shafroth, of Colorado.

While the Anglo-Russian row about the Dardanelles is unpleasant, it has not yet reached the acute stage which would justify clearing Rudyard Kipling for action.—Chicago News.

Heap big! The combined European powers want the world to understand that they are not afraid of little Venezuela. Whoopee! — Nashville Banner.

Instructor—"Mention some of the by-products of petroleum." Young Man—"Universities." — Chicago Tribune.

BOOKS

A BOOK OF GENIUS.

A few days ago I was looking through an old Harper of the year '84. As I turned the advertising pages, my eye caught the titles of books the very names of which have been forgotten. It was amusing to read the culled criticisms of some of these. In two instances there was confident prediction that the books would live as permanent additions to our American literature. Alas, their name is now Ichabod—their glory has departed!

And yet critics go on predicting. We must pardon them; but I think we have a right to demand that they give us grounds of their prophecies. This I shall attempt to do in the prediction I am about to make.

In order that a book may be of permanent value in the literature of a country, it must have at least three characteristics. It must deal with a great theme. This is the least important element, for, in a way, all themes can be made great. Secondly, it must deal with its theme in a fine way—let us say artistically; for art is a real thing, and no book can live without it, unless it be a dictionary, or something of that kind. Thirdly, the book must show insight and imagination, which is saying that it must show genius, whatever that subtle thing may be.

All these characteristics seem to me to be found in Mr. John S. Wise's book, "The End of an Era" (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston). Its theme is the South, especially Virginia, on the eve of, and during the civil war. Its style is delightful—free and easy, yet correct—straightforward, and frequently eloquent. Its insight into social conditions and the thoughts that swayed men's minds in those eventful days seems to me clearer than that of any book I have ever read dealing with that period.

Let no one imagine that the book is a formal discussion of social conditions. There is not a dull page between its covers. What makes it so delightful is that it tells so much not by abstract discussion, but by living incidents. The life on a Virginia farm, the governor's house in Richmond, the slave auction—here you have them before your eyes, and everything is told with the art of a master story-teller.

It was my fortune once to hear the author argue a case before Chief Justice Waite. His associate was Gen. B. F. Butler; their opponent was Mr. Choate, now ambassador to England. Mr. Wise was the speaker that made even the details of the case interesting. I was struck with his fine gift of interesting presentation both on that occasion and again, when I heard him during the campaign in which he was defeated for the governorship of Virginia. The same gift of style which I observed in him then, I now find in his book. It is not "rhetoric;" if it were, the same quality would not be effective in both speech and book. It seems to be simply the power of clear, unaffected English.

A style like his makes any subject interesting, even a corporation law case. It is not surprising then that this book, telling of the most exciting events in our history, should be one of unique interest. He recalls these events, from his boyhood

memories, and presents them to us with the reflections of a mature thinker. How effectively these are mingled may be seen in the chapter on the John Brown raid. His father was governor at the time. He tells of the receipt of the news, of his amusing, boyish attempt to go with the troops; and in the same chapter he makes us feel the tragedy of a situation in which Robert E. Lee and his father, both opposed to slavery, were driven to become, in a way, its champions.

At that time the present humble critic was just getting born a few miles south of Richmond. Thus it happened that in a few years I could begin to remember something of the life and events of which this book tells. It is the true and vivid way in which the author recalls these recollections of my own scenes and impressions, that helps me to risk the prediction that few books of this decade will live as long.

J. H. DILLARD.

LITERARY NOTES.

The Seventeenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor of the United States, which has just been issued by Carroll D. Wright, the commissioner, from the government printing office at Washington, is devoted to the subject of trade and technical education in several leading countries of the world. The countries included are Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Switzerland and the United States.

The Manchester (England) Guardian published recently a letter from a correspondent on Christian Democracy in Italy, a movement under the leadership of a young priest, Don Romolo Murri. It would be interesting to know more definitely of his policy than the letter tells. It seems that he is opposed by both the Church and the Socialists. The writer speaks of him as having great ability and earnestness, and thinks that he and his followers may have an important influence upon Italian politics.

The Spectator (London) comments in a telling way upon the conditions in Germany following upon the modern strenuous policy of the government. It says: "The old, careful, and even penurious, fiscal system of the Germans has now been abandoned for many years. The results were at first apparently favorable, but now the reaction is being felt, and protection, subsidies, state interference, and direct state action over an enormous commercial area are beginning to produce their inevitable results."

Paul Tyner contributes to the December Medico-Legal Journal (New York) a paper on "Anarchism and Atavism" which might be a satire, but is probably serious. Inasmuch as "all progress, healthy growth, in humanity is based upon development and recognition of the social consciousness," he regards the absence from the individual make-up of this "consciousness of kind" as being, in our present stage of human evolution, "an abnormality, a diseased state of mind." Wherefore he looks upon anarchism as atavism, and, with "no more constraint than is necessary" would quarantine avowed anarchists as we now quarantine sufferers "from contagious diseases or mental maladies."

The Independent of February 6 begins a series of articles on co-education, which promises to be very interesting. The first writer, Mr. Henry T. Finck, in his first article begins in a breezy way, to answer the question, Why Co-education is Losing Ground. He gives three reasons so far, and promises three more. He thinks the economic argument for co-education is passing; that co-education fosters flirtation and early marriages; that girls do not refine the boys, but, on the contrary, get to be rough themselves. Many will approve



AN INDEPENDENT DELIVERANCE.

View of Tom L. Johnson being knocked out by the Report of Labor Leaders of Cleveland against the feasibility of 3-cent street car fares.

his ridicule of feminine yells and basketball played a la football; but we know of these new phenomena where there is not co-education. Another interesting article in this number is the Cooperative Brotherhood and its Colony; and many teachers will surely say amen to the editorial attacks upon the modern methods of classical study.

J. H. D.

Professor Slosson, of the University of Wyoming, replies, in the Independent of Feb. 12, to the attacks upon co-education. His reply is somewhat surprising, and is all the stronger because of its very temperate tone. The following passage is worth quoting as a whole: "In my opinion the reaction against co-education is a part of that general movement towards medievalism of which Mr. Finck is one of the symptoms. This tendency shows itself in a thousand ways, of which it is sufficient to mention the dominance of corporations, monopolies and guilds; the establishment of hereditary societies and the revival of interest in heraldry and archaic forms in books, art and literature; the recrudescence of astrology and kindred superstitions; the advance of ritualism in church and college; the enthusiasm for athletics and physical development; militarism and imperialism;

the rise of the chaperon and the concomitant acceptance of the double standard of morals." Certainly Professor Slosson puts his opponents in bad company. J. H. D.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

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

Houston.

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

New York.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW,
BENNETT BLDG.,
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan.
Tel. Call, 404 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

SINGLE TAX LITERATURE

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

The Public
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.

TERMS.

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

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

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

ORATORICAL CONTEST.

On Saturday evening, February 21, there will be an oratorical contest by six competitors in the First Methodist church hall, southeast corner of Washington and Clark streets. The contestants are graduates of different colleges. William J. Danford, of the Illinois College of Law, will have for his oration, "Social Equality Through the Single Tax," William Harrah, "Duty," H. Howard, "Discovery of America by Norsemen;" G. Clark, "Opportunity;" W. Weber, "American Triumphant."

AN OPPORTUNITY

To get into the parent plants in the center of both of the famous TEXAS and LOUISIANA OIL FIELDS by an investment in the stock of

THE BIG MOUND OIL COMPANY.

Capital Stock, \$1,000,000.

All stock full paid and non-assessable.

GEN. J. B. WEAVER, Des Moines, Ia., Pres. A. K. RILEY, Des Moines, Ia., Sec'y.

PROPERTIES.

2,000 acres in the center of the famous Texas oil fields half-way between Beaumont and Sour Lake, to be developed at once. Over 700 acres at Roanoke, Louisiana, midway between the Jennings and Welsh oil fields, on which we are boring at the present time.

- \$50 . . . buys . . . 100 shares, par value . . \$100.
- \$100 . . . buys . . . 200 shares, par value . . \$200.
- \$200 . . . buys . . . 400 shares, par value . . \$400.
- \$500 . . . buys 1,000 shares, par value \$1,000.
- \$1,000 buys 2,000 shares, par value \$2,000.

Etc., Etc., Etc.

We have proven property and a reliable and very promising investment and I would not take several times par value for my stock if I could not immediately replace it.

J. B. WEAVER.

An exceptional opportunity for a big profit as we are only selling a small portion of stock until our wells come in, in order to push the boring for oil. Address all communications to the BIG MOUND OIL COMPANY, 315-316 Equitable Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

References as to value of our properties :

First National Bank, Welsh, Louisiana.
Central Oil and Refining Company, Welsh, Louisiana.
S. M. Scott, Vice-President and Manager of the Export Oil & Tankline Company, Beaumont, Texas.

The following telegram just received at the home office from our President who is personally superintending the development :

"154-cx-gg-sa....14 paid.
Roanoke, La., 2-9-1903.
A. K. Riley,

316 Equitable Bldg., Des Moines.
At depth Zwick well struck gas and oil came up all afternoon have specimen.

J. B. Weaver. 115p."