

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1903.

Number 266.

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 the time for acting in national politics approaches, it becomes somewhat more certain that Senator Hanna will be unable to displace President Roosevelt as the Republican candidate. With equal or even greater clearness it is developing that the so-called "money power" is looking to the Democrats to name a candidate whom it can support in order to beat Roosevelt. This is the meaning of the boom for Grover Cleveland.

That Mr. Cleveland has assented is believed by so well informed and acute a Washington correspondent as Walter Wellman, who writes to the Chicago Record-Herald of the 1st:

St. Clair McKelway, the brilliant editor of the Brooklyn Eagle, is one of Mr. Cleveland's close friends. He is supposed to be in the former President's confidence, and no one believes Mr. McKelway would urge the Democratic party to make Mr. Cleveland its nominee without the consent of that gentleman, or at least without the knowledge that Mr. Cleveland would accept.

Mr. Wellman indicates pretty plainly, also, what it is that makes Mr. Cleveland acceptable to certain Democrats who "want to win," notwithstanding that he hasn't voted the Democratic national ticket since he was himself a candidate. On this point Mr. Wellman writes:

When Mr. Cleveland's name was first mentioned, most Democrats at the National capital regarded it as a vain and almost foolish suggestion, but the more they think about it the less impossible does it appear to them. Many Democrats who never liked Mr. Cleveland have of late said: "I would rather vote for almost any other man in the country than old Grover, but I'm forced to

admit that it looks as if he was the only man who would stand a chance to beat President Roosevelt."

The reason they think Cleveland the only man who would stand a ghost of a chance against Roosevelt is obvious. Against Roosevelt, Cleveland would have the support of "Wall street."

A slightly different, but hardly more reassuring reason was indicated editorially by the Boston Herald of April 24, when it referred to "the felicity of Mr. Cleveland's election" the first time as being—

that he was the kind of man adapted to induce Republicans to support a Democratic candidate for President, while doing the least violence to their party feelings.

A remarkable recommendation, to be sure, yet quite the kind to be expected from a plutocratic neutral like the Boston Herald.

But why should the Boston Herald delude its confiding readers by reiterating the exploded falsehood that, while Cleveland made the Democratic party popular and successful, Bryan compassed its defeat? We quote its repetition of that stupid misrepresentation:

The Democratic party has suffered the loss under Mr. Bryan of more than it gained under Mr. Cleveland. . . . And this man who has practically ruined and nearly wrecked the Democratic party [meaning Bryan] has been compelled, etc. etc.

Anyone who can gain access to any political almanac can convince himself of the mendacity of that statement.

The fact is that Cleveland himself "practically ruined and nearly wrecked" the Democratic party; and that Bryan has made it again a fighting power strong enough to tempt Mr. Cleveland now to accept a nomination from it which he dared not con-

sider when he abandoned the wreck he had made. Listen. Cleveland had been elected President in 1892 with a Democratic Congress at his back. In the lower House there were 219 Democrats, making a clear majority of 41. Two years later, long before the advent of Bryanism, this Democratic majority was swept away. Only 93 Democrats were elected, and the Republicans controlled the new House by a clear majority of 74. At those Congressional elections not one Northern State, not a solitary one, elected a majority of Democrats in its delegation to Congress; although the delegations of Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Wyoming and Wisconsin had won Democratic majorities in 1892. From California there was only 1 Democrat in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Illinois, none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Indiana none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Iowa, none in 1894, where there had been 11 in 1892; from Kansas none in 1894, where there had been 1 in 1892; from Massachusetts 1 in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Michigan none in 1894, where there had been 5 in 1892; from Minnesota none in 1894, where there had been 2 in 1892; from Nebraska none in 1894 where there had been 1 in 1892; from New Jersey, none in 1894 where there had been 6 in 1892; from New York 5 in 1894, where there had been 20 in 1892; from Ohio 2 in 1894, where there had been 10 in 1892; from Pennsylvania 2 in 1894, where there had been 10 in 1892; from Rhode Island none in 1894, where there had been 2 in 1892; from West Virginia none in 1894, where there had been 4 in 1892; from Wisconsin, none in 1894, where there had been 6 in 1892; and from Wyoming none in 1894, where there had been 1 in

1892. Even the Southern State of Tennessee had only 6 in a delegation of 10 in 1894, while Missouri had only 4 in a delegation of 15. The Senate, too, was changed from Democratic to Republican. In the Congress which followed the elections of 1894 there were only 39 Democratic Senators to 42 Republicans; whereas in the Congress following the elections of 1892 there had been 44 Democratic Senators to only 36 Republicans. Things Democratic grew steadily worse, until in the Spring of 1896 the Democratic nomination for President went a-begging. Excepting the impossible Hill, none of the old "available" nor the new "possibilities" wanted it. Utter defeat for the Democratic party was regarded as inevitable by the leaders on both sides. Such was the hopeless condition of the party when Bryan was unexpectedly put forward to save it from dropping out of the political arena or into a scarcely concealed alliance with the Republicans. At once its prospects revived, and in spite of Cleveland's going over to McKinley's support, it continued to regain strength. Under the circumstances success was impossible. But the heaviest load it had to carry through it all, was not "Bryanism", but the unpopularity of the Cleveland administration. Outside of financial circles that was the tune which the Republican orators sung, and that, together with Hanna's corruption fund, was the cause of Bryan's defeat. Yet the popular vote for Bryan in 1896 was larger than that for Cleveland in 1892 by 946,007. His proportion of the total vote was 46.7 per cent., whereas Cleveland's in 1892 was only 46.08—Bryan's being larger by two-thirds of 1 per cent. In harmony with this result was the change in the Democratic representation in the lower House of Congress. From a total of only 93 elected in the last Cleveland year (1894) the Democratic representation was raised in the first Bryan year (1896) to 130, and the Republican majority reduced from 74 to 24; while in the second Bryan year (1900), the

Democratic representation was raised to 153 and the Republican majority reduced to 20. The number of Democrats in the California delegation was increased from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896, though both were lost in 1900; that of the Illinois delegation from none in 1894 to 5 in 1896, and 11 in 1900; that of the Indiana delegation from none in 1894 to 4 in 1896 and the gain held in 1900; that of Kansas from none in 1894 to 1 in 1900; that of Massachusetts from 1 in 1894 to 2 in 1896 and 3 in 1900; that of Michigan from none in 1894 to 1 in 1896, which, however, was lost in 1900; that of New York from 5 in 1894 to 6 in 1896 and 12 in 1900; that of Ohio from 2 in 1894 to 6 in 1896, but reduced to 4 in 1900; that of Nebraska from none in 1894 to 2 in 1900; and that of New Jersey from none in 1894 and 1896 to 2 in 1900. The Democratic delegation from Tennessee rose from 6 in 1894 to 8 in 1896, remaining at 8 in 1900, and that from Missouri from 4 in 1894 to 12 in 1896 and 13 in 1900.

The merit system in the civil service, as "she is practiced" by the Roosevelt administration, has received a new illustration from Fairhope, the single tax colony of Alabama. The post office for that colony was established in 1895 and the founder of the colony was made postmaster, a place he has held without interruption ever since. As the new post office was then and is now especially for the accommodation of the colony, the selection for postmaster was a proper one, and the incumbent should have been continued in office during good behavior and while satisfactory to the colonists. This, at any rate, is the idea which the administration professes to hold. But profession and practice are different things in politics as well as religion, as the Fairhope colonists have learned. Though the incumbent was a satisfactory postmaster he was not a satisfactory Republican, while the colonists themselves are altogether unsatisfactory to a lot

of land speculators who own tracts on the outskirts of the colony. Hence the change in postmasters.

Since this colony offers sites for homes and business to all comers, on condition only of paying ground rent in proportion to the value of their sites respectively, and with exemption from all other taxes that can be distinguished as such, the surrounding land does not rise in value with the expansion of prosperity. This is the quite natural cause of the dissatisfaction among the land speculators at whose instance the colony has now been not only deprived of a faithful postmaster, but forced to take a successor from outside. One instance like this would not be enough to make President Roosevelt responsible for disregard of sound civil service principles. He might easily be ignorant of the circumstances. But when all instances are taken together, from the appointment of a spoilsman at the head of the department on down to the arbitrary removal of the postmaster at Fairhope, Mr. Roosevelt's sincerity with reference to the merit system in the public service cannot be excused upon the plea of ignorance.

The appellate court in Cincinnati has made a decision in a street car case which bears with great heaviness upon the "widows and orphans" who own the watered stock of street car companies. The circumstances are interesting—pleasantly so, except to the "widows and orphans." The street car monopoly of Cincinnati had acquired a 50-year renewal of franchises under the infamous "Rogers law;" and this law, having been held to be unconstitutional, the Republican "gang" in the Ohio legislature, under orders from Foraker, Hanna, Coxe, et al., rushed a "curative" clause into the new municipal code. This curative clause assumed to make invalid grants valid. But the Cincinnati court seems to have been constituted when "Boss" Coxe

was napping, for it makes ducks and drakes of the "widows and orphans" curative clause. Very concisely does Judge Rufus B. Smith—with whom the other judges, Ferris and Dempsey, concur—describe the fatal defect of that clause. "It simply re-grants," says Judge Smith, "all unconstitutional grants heretofore made"! He then proceeds:

If it had been given a prospective as well as a retrospective operation it would be simply a reenactment of the Rogers law. As it stands, it is a reenactment of the Rogers law, limited in its operation to the past. The unconstitutionality of such a law is self-evident. The contention that it is constitutional proceeds on the theory that the General Assembly controls the constitution, instead of the constitution controlling the General Assembly. That an unconstitutional law can be vitalized by re-passing it, and that a grant made under an unconstitutional law can be made valid by a declaration by the General Assembly that it shall be considered valid is absurd. It might as well be claimed that a false statement can be made true by repeating it, or that a thing which does not exist may be brought into existence by the mere insistence that it shall exist.

Our comment upon the "Warning" sent out by the San Francisco Labor Council (p. 17), in which workmen throughout the United States are urged to ignore the efforts of Pacific coast employers and the transcontinental roads, and stay away from the Coast, has brought us a letter of explanation from the California Promotion Committee of San Francisco (evidently an organization of employers and railroad managers) which advises us that—

there is some misconception, not only here, but throughout the country, as to the class of people who are being brought to California. These people are not as a rule laborers who will compete with the laborers already established here, but they are more than often farming people who are already possessed of some capital, experience and means. They are people of families, and when they come here they are able to buy property and settle down and add their wealth to the community. We quote also the final paragraph of this letter of explanation, as throwing light upon the character of the

Committee, with reference to labor matters:

The California Promotion Committee is in a position to actually realize these facts, as it is in correspondence with thousands of people throughout the East, and realizes just what is being done, and the class of people who are emigrating to this section. We are very friendly, indeed, to labor, and this is the reason why I write you.

The explanatory letter is signed in the name of Rufus P. Jennings, as executive officer, by Hamilton Wright, the chief of the publication bureau of the committee.

While so much American sympathy is being extended to the people of Ireland who suffer from evictions, and so much American indignation is poured out upon England for enforcing those evictions, it might be a wholesome moral exercise for Americans to look at home. They are worse than the English. A New York city official, Julius Harburger, was quoted in the New York World of April 5 as saying:

In one judicial district in this city there have been more evictions within the last three months than have occurred in the whole of Ireland during the same period. Judge Roesch, of the Fourth municipal district court, had before him on April 1 350 such cases, and there were at least 100 more within the following two days. In the clerk's office of the same court over 1,000 dispossession warrants were issued during the month of March.

That brief statement of fact is in itself a whole essay on the universality, as well as the oppressive character of landlordism. Terrible as the word "eviction" is to Irish ears, it is no less terrible to impoverished multitudes in the American metropolis.

In writing a syndicate article on the subject of the road to success for young men, the president of the Erie railroad makes a grave admission. "Of all the men I know," he says, "who have from a small beginning created name, place or a fortune for themselves, not one can tell just how it was done." It may be that some couldn't tell because they are ashamed and wouldn't like to;

but what the writer evidently means is that the secret of so-called success is a mystery hidden even from those who profit by it. This admission might embarrass the Yankee-doodle optimists who say that everybody can succeed who tries. It would embarrass them if they could be embarrassed by anything.

RATE OF PAY FOR WORK.

One of the recent efforts to arbitrate labor controversies over questions of wages has had a comical outcome.

The steam engineers at the Chicago stockyards, who were the parties on the labor side of this controversy, agreed to submit the matter to the arbitration of three clergymen—two Protestant ministers and a Catholic priest. After spending something like 48 hours upon the case, this clerical board of arbitration reported that 30 cents an hour would be fair pay for the stockyards engineers.

The award was hardly satisfactory to the workmen, though they accepted it with grim good humor. But the end was not yet. The engineers had agreed to pay half the expenses of the arbitration, and when they were confronted with the arbitrators' bills for services the amount staggered them. In comparison with what the same arbitrators had considered fair pay for engineers, their estimate of fair pay for themselves seemed superbly liberal. For they charged \$1,000 apiece, or about \$21 an hour.

After due consideration the engineers' organization decided that, inasmuch as the preachers had thought 30 cents an hour good wages for men working as engineers, they ought themselves to be satisfied with that amount for acting as arbitrators; especially as it is easier to make such a decision as they had made than to run a power plant. Accordingly a motion was carried to pay the arbitrators \$14.40, which is at the rate of 30 cents an hour; and an order for half the amount, \$7.20, was drawn on the treasurer in favor of each arbitrator. This done, the engineers tore up their arbitration agreement and went on strike.

The laugh surely seems to be

upon the preachers. Yet it is easier to laugh at them than to show that they were wrong. What they had been called upon to decide was not the essential worth of a day's work at running the engine of a power plant, but the worth of such work according to usual standards. They were compelled, therefore, to govern themselves, in arriving at a decision, by prevailing customs relative to wages, and by the cost of customary living for engineers.

They could not have awarded the engineers a scale of wages at the rate of \$21 an hour, nor even a tenth of that amount. Had they done so they would indeed have been laughed at, with a loud and irreverent guffaw, and by no one more derisively than by engineers themselves.

The same rule applies to the pay of the arbitrators. It is not what their service was worth in itself, it is not what they actually earned or could earn, it is not what it would cost them to live if they lived as engineers live, it is not what a board of mechanics would have done the work for—none of these things determine the proper rate of pay for such work when done by professional or business men. What does determine it is what such men engaged in such service are accustomed to receive.

Precisely as in the case of the engineers, it is the usual standard and not the essential worth that determines rates of pay; and, measured by that standard, \$21 an hour would not be very excessive—not excessive enough, certainly, to excite anything like the derisive laughter among business and professional men that the same rate if proposed for power plant engineers would excite among the class commonly called "workingmen."

There is a lesson in this episode for all good people who would settle rates of wages arbitrarily. By no possibility can wages according to earnings be adjusted by means of arbitration or of any other arbitrary process. All that can be done in any of these ways is to decide approximately upon customary wages. Nothing can be done but what the courts do in law suits for services rendered without agree-

ment as to price. They allow one class of workingman a dollar a day and another five hundred; not at all with reference to any difference in their usefulness, but altogether with reference to differences in the standards of pay in different vocations.

But what is it that makes these standards?

They are made by competition. Nothing else can make them. And whether they are fairly made depends wholly upon the degree of freedom in which all the competitive forces operate.

If these forces operate with absolute freedom, the usual standards of pay for work will tend all the time to coincide with the usefulness of the work. In that case it would be the most useful workers, and not the kind we now regard as most respectable, who would command the highest pay.

In those circumstances it might very well be—we express no opinion—that the usual standard for preachers turned labor arbitrators would be 30 cents an hour, while the standard for power plant engineers was \$21. That might then be without exciting special wonder or derisive laughter; but if such were the result, we could be sure that the engineers were, by that much, generally regarded as the more useful workers.

When competitive forces are obstructed, however, so obstructed that they operate in one-sided ways, the standards of pay for work get to be lopsided. In consequence we see useless workers well paid and useful ones getting but a pittance.

According to some theories regarding pay for work, all workers ought to be paid alike, hour for hour. This would be the logical outcome, too, if the arbitration principle were applied universally. Such plausibility in justice as that theory has, it derives from an untenable interpretation of the doctrine that "labor produces all wealth."

Now, it is true that labor produces all wealth. Nothing ever has or ever can be produced except as it is produced by labor. But the meaning of the term "labor," when used in this way, is "laborers." For it is not true that the whole body of labor produces

every particle of wealth. Some laborers produce some wealth, other laborers produce other wealth, and so on. Consequently, while wealth, considered as the whole product of exertion, may be said to have been produced by labor considered as the whole body of laborers, it is fallacious to conclude that any particular share or portion is produced by all.

This distinction becomes important when we are dealing with the subject of wages. For that subject relates to the distribution instead of the production of wealth; and in distribution each laborer is entitled, in fairness, to the equivalent of his own contribution.

It will not do to say that there is so much interdependence throughout the industrial field that no one can be said to have contributed more than another. The obtrusive fact cannot be ignored that some workers do contribute more than others. That the work of others contributes somewhat, or is necessary to the general result, makes no difference. He who is more skilled, more attentive, more faithful, more learned in his calling, contributes more to the general production of wealth in an hour than does he who lacks those qualities, even though his less effective work may also be needed. The only fair rate of pay, therefore, is to each in proportion to his own contribution to the result. Any other rate, if with intention, has to do with pauperism or theft rather than with honest industry.

But how can that rate be measured?

Not by arbitration certainly. Not by boards of preachers who award power plant engineers only one-seventieth of what they ask for themselves. It can be determined in no other way than by abolishing every monopoly and thereby unshackling all the forces of competition. Out of the conflict of unrestricted competition in trade, comes equity in distribution.

This is a hard saying to many people who do not understand that free competition and monopoly are antithetical. But monopolists confirm it. "Unrestricted competition," tes-

tifies the liberally paid president of the Lehigh Valley railway monopoly, one of the constituents of the great anthracite coal road trust, "would be one of the worst evils to which the country could be exposed." This has been the theory of the privileged classes since they began to subject their brethren to slavery. And in their view of what is evil for a country, it is a sound theory. It is the favorite philosophy of special privilege and the sacred creed of the monopolist.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Cleveland, May 5.—Yesterday was a red-letter day in Cleveland, at least to a majority of its citizens. Its local government under the new municipal code (vol. v. pp. 457, 536), which is applicable uniformly to all the cities of the State of Ohio, was organized after one of the most exciting city elections its inhabitants have ever known. Although a similar organization was effected in every other city in the State, Cleveland was the center of greatest interest, because of the peculiar circumstances of her political situation.

The antecedent facts are all well known, but the situation will be better understood if they are recapitulated.

For 50 years or more the cities of Ohio had what amounted to special charters. Though applicable in terms to all the cities of the State (to comply with a requirement of the State constitution), each charter was, nevertheless, so drawn as to affect only the city for which it was intended. For illustration, cities of not less than 25,000 inhabitants nor more than 25,250, might be put in a specified class, and provisions then be made for the government of all cities of that class. Only one city, of course, would come within the class. It was a transparent evasion of the constitutional prohibition of special legislation, but for more than 50 years the courts winked at or approved it.

Under this practice a charter for Cleveland was granted some dozen years ago, which did away with all the antiquated and corrupting systems of board rule, and established what was known as the "federal plan." The essential feature of the "federal plan" was its concentration of responsibility. Legislative functions were left to the city council, but the mayor was

invested with all executive functions, coupled with a legislative veto. This plan worked admirably. When an administration was bad, the people knew where to place the responsibility, and the mayor had to bear the brunt. He was responsible even for bad legislation, unless two-thirds of the council were willing to override his vetoes.

In course of time Mayor Johnson came into the mayor's office. This was two years ago. His first act was to veto a corrupt ordinance, which his predecessor would have signed but for a timely injunction. In control of the council he found a Republican majority, and among the Republicans there were enough expert corruptionists to dictate the organization, if the ordinary party caucus were to be allowed to run its course. But Mayor Johnson interposed. Getting together a majority of the council, both Democrats and Republicans, he said to them, in substance: "Gentlemen, the Republicans are in the majority in this council. Therefore the organization ought, in fairness, to be Republican. But the honest Republicans, and not the crooked ones, ought to control. I propose, therefore, that this joint caucus of honest councilmen of both parties, join hands to effect an honest Republican organization of your body." It was done. A year later Johnson had carried the city for the Democrats, and thereupon an honest Democratic organization of the council was secured. The effect of all this was decidedly renovating. When the last council came to go out of office, hardly a "crook" of either party had a seat in it.

Two principal subjects—each with many ramifications, however—commanded Mayor Johnson's attention during his first term. One of these related to the street car service, and the other to local taxation.

It was his unconcealed purpose to establish in Cleveland a complete system of street car lines to be owned and operated by the municipality. To promote this movement, and at the same time to undermine the spoils system, he placed Prof. Bemis in charge of the waterworks, already owned and operated by the city, and gave him instructions to organize that department strictly upon the merit system of civil service. This work Prof. Bemis has most effectively performed, while Mayor Johnson has faithfully protected him from all partisan interference. But without waiting until municipal ownership and operation of street car

service could be established, Mayor Johnson undertook at once to reduce fares to three cents.

He encountered obstructions at every turn. Though the council fell in with his plans, Senator Hanna did not. As leader of the Republican party, Hanna enlisted his party organization in the work of saving his highly-watered street car interests.

Similar opposition was encountered by Mayor Johnson in his efforts to equalize taxation. In this fight Senator Hanna was able to enlist the practical sympathies, not only of investors in street car stock, but also of all the tax-dodging interests. And at last, when every other device had failed him, he secured from an attorney general who owed the office to him, and from a Supreme Court composed principally of railroad lawyers, a decision declaring unconstitutional the whole system of municipal charters which had so long prevailed in Ohio.

Considered in itself, this decision was doubtless right. But when it is remarked that Mr. Hanna's attorney general refused to proceed against the Republican city of Cincinnati, even while he was proceeding against the Democratic city of Cleveland; when it is remembered that it was not until the city of Cleveland had been "Johnsonized" and corporate privileges there were consequently in jeopardy, that the Supreme Court discerned how fundamentally unconstitutional the Ohio municipal system was; and when it is considered, withal, that only such a decision could save corporate privileges from Johnson's relentless onslaught—when these things are noted, one may be pardoned for suspecting the entire good faith of that revolutionary decision.

The burden was now upon the legislature of creating a new and uniform system of municipal government for the whole State. For that purpose a special session was called. But the legislature had no opportunity to work out a code for the benefit of the people. Hanna, of Cleveland, with his personal interests, and "Boss" Cox, of Cincinnati, with his, compromised upon a code, which they then whipped unceremoniously through the legislature.

With reference to Cleveland, this code-making went upon the assumption that Johnson could be beaten at the municipal election. Although that was after Johnson's first election, and his subsequent victories in the legislature and the school elections, it was before he had carried Cleveland for Bigelow, the Democratic candidate for

Secretary of State; and Hanna believed that with party lines drawn closer than before, and the expenditure of large sums of money, Johnson's career could be brought to a close.

At the same time he threw an anchor or two to windward. Lest Johnson might possibly be elected himself, the code was fixed to render him incapable of making appointments without the assent of two-thirds of the council, the governor to appoint when the mayor and two-thirds of the council did not agree. It also abolished that excellent feature of the "federal plan" which allowed the mayor to participate in all debates in the council, and department heads to participate in all debates there on matters relating to their departments respectively.

The whole thing was as well calculated as the conflict of interests between Cox and Hanna would permit, to minimize Johnson's influence. But the recent election (pp. 1, 5, 39), a wonderful vindication of Johnson's leadership, has knocked it all "into a cocked hat," and a pretty badly battered cocked hat at that.

Not only was the mayor himself re-elected, along with all his executive associates on the Democratic ticket, but out of 32 councilmen 23 are Johnson Democrats. This gives to Mayor Johnson's civic policies a clear two-thirds majority, and disappoints all expectations of gubernatorial interference with appointments.

One of the first things the new councilmanic majority did was to agree in caucus to restore the old prerogative of the mayor and heads of departments to participate in the discussions of the council. By one of those oversights which so often interfere with the best-laid plans of mice, etc., the code makers had given to city councils the right to invite non-members to address them, and upon the basis of this authority the two-thirds majority of the Cleveland council has unanimously agreed to vote for a rule—it will doubtless be adopted next week—to extend a standing invitation to the mayor to address the council at any time during its sessions upon any pertinent subject; and to the heads of departments a standing invitation to address it upon subjects relating to their respective departments.

When the council met on the 4th for the first time, its principal duty was to elect the city clerk, who is also clerk of the council, an officer under the new code whose functions extend in many directions and whose

abilities and incorruptibility are considerations of more than ordinary importance. For this place, 24 of the 32 councilmen (one Republican bolting his own party) voted for Peter Witt. In view of the qualifications, mental and moral, which this office requires in a city government to be administered in new ways and with clean hands, the almost unanimous election of Mr. Witt is significant. Under Mayor Johnson's first administration he was the trusted chief of that tax bureau which Mr. Johnson established, and which, for extensively exposing the unfair taxation methods of Cleveland, was closed by hostile proceedings instigated by Senator Hanna and the tax-dodging interests with which he is bound up.

When the council had been organized and its officers elected and sworn in, Mayor Johnson read his inaugural address or message, printed in full elsewhere in these columns. It was listened to with interested attention, and hearty applause greeted its principal points. The subjects of absolute home rule, low fare and public ownership, and of carrying the local fight over the State for the purpose of securing local rights, were received with especial enthusiasm. Immediately after the mayor's address, the initial steps were taken under the law for realizing his two immediate plans—public lighting and power service and low street car fares.

The whole scene was exhilarating. Not merely because of the banks and beds of flowers, curiously shaped and beautifully contrasted, which decorated the council chamber, nor of the crowded spaces on the floor and in the gallery, nor yet of the natural enthusiasm of the successful candidates who were inducted into office and of their friends; but because the observer could not but feel that here was a city which, in spite of peculiar difficulties, had set out upon a sensible policy for demonstrating the splendid possibilities of democracy in municipal government. No one could fail to sympathize with that manifest and more than pardonable pride of nearly all concerned, to which Mayor Johnson gave expression, when, in inviting them to join him in making of Cleveland a model municipality, he said: "What greater honor could any of us desire? What object could there be more worthy of any man's ambition than to succeed in giving strength and tone and exalted character to the municipality of which he is a citizen? to succeed in

effectively cooperating in the task of establishing in his own city a municipal government upon the basis of equal justice, and thereby setting an example of practical democracy to the civilized world." L. F. P.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, May 7.

On the 4th the city of Cleveland came out from under the Supreme Court decree which for several months has rested upon this city alone of all the Ohio cities (vol. v, p. 536), and organized a new government under the new municipal code of the State. As soon as the city council, elected in April (pp. 5, 39), had completed its organization, the preliminary steps were taken to establish a lighting and power system under city ownership and operation, and also to revive the obstructed proceedings (vol. v. 187, 201) for the establishment of the 3-cent fare street car system.

The street car situation in Chicago (p. 59) is becoming clarified. On the 30th the special investigating committee of the lower House (p. 60) unanimously reported that the evidence produced before it did not establish any real attempt corruptly to influence Speaker Miller, and that there was no reasonable or substantial ground for a sensational editorial entitled "Boodle," published in the Chicago Inter Ocean on April 21, and regarding which the editor of the Inter Ocean had been examined by the committee. On the subject of gavel rule by the Speaker (p. 59) the committee expressed in its report the hope that this episode will mark the end in Illinois "of that unconstitutional practice known as gavel rule, whereby the constitutional right to a roll call has so frequently been refused in the legislative bodies." It expressed the further hope that it will also stop reckless and unfounded newspaper attacks calculated to influence legislative action unduly. When this report had been made the House took up the Mueller bill (pp. 50-51) for allowing cities to own and operate or lease their street car systems. By an almost unanimous vote it ordered the chairman of the committee on municipal corporations to report the bill at once, and he did so, but without recommendation. Several amendments proposed by

friends of the bill were then adopted, and on the 1st the amended bill passed the House by a vote of 90 to 20. On the 5th these amendments were concurred in by the Senate with only 4 dissenting votes.

To the Chicago strike against the harvester trust (p. 60) has now been added a laundry strike which extends over the entire city of Chicago and is causing an inconvenience to the public as general as it is peculiar. Three months ago the employes of the 800 laundries of the city began to organize. Within a month their organization had 2,000 members. Now it has 3,000. Organizations of the big laundry firms were formed at the same time to resist the employes, so that when the union made its demand it was met by a committee of the firms. The demands were for an increase in wages. Women were getting from \$2.50 to \$9 a week and men from \$8 to \$14. The employes are reported to have refused arbitration. They sent a communication to the employers telling them that if they did not agree to the terms by 7 o'clock p. m. of the 30th there would be a strike. In response the combination of employers issued a statement in which they asserted their belief that the demands were beyond their power to grant, and added:

All business must be so operated as to yield a fair and reasonable profit, and it goes without saying that if we increase the expenses and curtail the capacity of our plants beyond a reasonable limit, either the plants will be operated without profit, if not at a positive loss, or the public will be obliged to pay for the increase in the long run. We would be glad to take the matter up with you and endeavor to satisfy you of the justice of these views, but your demand is presented to us as an absolute ultimatum, and by its terms you have left us no room for negotiation. We must either accede or refuse and we reluctantly refuse. We hope you will reconsider your ultimatum and that you will at least meet with us in an effort to arrive at some modification of your demands which it would be possible for us to accept. The controversy may be submitted to arbitration of a fair, impartial and disinterested board. This we now offer to do, and if you are likewise willing you may have your representative call upon us and we will discuss with him details and arrangements looking to that end.

The laundry employes refused the overture, and at a meeting called to consider it decided to strike.

Almost 80,000 workmen in all parts of the country were reported on the 2d to have quit work for the purpose of enforcing the periodical May-day demand for a reduction of hours. Following is the classified list as reported:

Akron O., carpenters	500
Allentown, Pa., carpenters.....	200
Bedford, Ind., stone workers....	5,000
Baltimore, building trades	4,000
Boston, building trades	3,500
Bloomington, Ill., carpenters ...	500
Bloomington, Ill. horseshoers ..	100
Cincinnati, building trades	700
Duluth, Minn., waiters.....	200
Elizabeth, N. J., shipworkers....	200
Elkhart, Ind., plumbers	50
Elizabeth, N. J., masons.....	200
Huntington, W. Va., cigarmakers	100
Lafayette, Ind., carpenters	200
Lancaster, Pa., building trades..	500
Madison, Wis., plumbers	50
New York City, excavators.....	30,000
New York City, teamsters.....	4,000
New York City, iron workers....	350
New York City, marine engineers	200
New York City, flour millwrights	200
Newark, N. J., masons.....	2,000
Newark N. J., laborers.....	500
Newark, N. J., marine engineers	50
Omaha, building trades.....	1,000
Omaha, teamsters	800
Omaha, waiters	400
Philadelphia, building trades....	8,000
Pana, Ill. miners	2,500
Providence, R. I., building trades.	2,300
Pittsburg, building trades	1,000
Pittsburg, boilermakers	1,000
Pueblo, Col., steel workers.....	300
Springfield, Ill., building trades.	1,000
Scranton, Pa., plumbers	300
South Bend, Ind., plumbers.....	50
Toronto, building trades.....	5,000
Wilkesbarre, Pa., building trades.	1,000
Wilkesbarre, Pa., barbers.....	100

The Omaha teamsters' strike mentioned in the list above has been accompanied with rioting in the wholesale district in connection with attempts to have goods hauled by non-striking teamsters. It was reported on the 5th that at that time not a ton of coal was being delivered and that the wholesale houses were unable to handle their wares to and from freight depots. A number of large buildings had been compelled to shut down elevator service, several factories were contemplating closing down for want of fuel, and at the hotels the same difficulty was being experienced. To augment the strength of the strikers the teamsters had added a hundred more men to their ranks, and the horseshoers' union had voted not to shoe horses driven by nonunion men.

The Federal court interfered with

this strike on the 6th by issuing an injunction forbidding breaches on the part of the strikers of the local peace of the city. This injunction is reported by the press dispatches from Omaha to have been the result of a determination on the part of the Business Men's Association to invoke the aid of Federal troops in the protection of nonunion teamsters in case of any trouble with the strikers, the members of the Association fearing to place reliance on the National Guard. In case of a violation of this Federal injunction, granted by Judge Munger, of the United States Circuit Court, they feel that the Federal government will assist them. No violence had yet been reported. On the day of the injunction about 1,000 freight handlers joined the striking teamsters.

NEWS NOTES.

—James Howard was convicted on the 30th at Frankfort, Ky., of murdering Gov. Goebel (vol. iv, p. 489). The jury fixed his punishment at life imprisonment.

—Geo. Williamson Crawford, of Alabama, a Negro student of law at Yale, won the third prize for debate on the 1st. He is the second Negro at Yale to win a student's prize this year.

—After a term of five years the German reichstag (p. 40) dissolved on the 30th. Great fears are expressed in Berlin of large Socialist gains at the approaching elections for the new reichstag.

—The inter-State National Guard Association closed its annual session at Columbus, Ohio, on the 5th. It voted for a request to Congress to increase the annual appropriation by the National government to the national guard to \$2,000,000.

—Edward VII. reached Paris on the 1st in the progress of his tour (p. 60) of Portugal, Italy and France. He was received by President Loubet, who had returned from Algeria (p. 60) in time to greet him. King Edward returned to London on the 5th.

—The exposition at St. Louis in celebration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory from France was formally dedicated on the 30th. The principal speeches were made by ex-President Cleveland and President Roosevelt.

—Yale won the debate with Princeton on the 4th, making the fifth victory for Yale out of nine debates between these two colleges. Her debating team had the affirmative of the proposition that the United States Senate should adopt a closure rule.

—Paul Du Chaillu, the famous explorer and author, died at St. Peters-

burg on the 30th, of apoplexy, at the age of 68. He had made all preparations for a four years' journey through the heart of Russia, with a view to writing a book on the Russian people and their condition.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department for April shows on hand April 30, 1903:

Gold reserve fund	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash	223,326,187.12
Total	\$373,326,187.12
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1902.....	358,674,115.85
Increase	\$14,752,071.27

—The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania decided on the 4th that the Christian Scientists are not entitled under the laws of that State to corporate privileges, the court holding that the Christian Science method of healing is opposed to the general policy of the law relative to the treatment of disease.

—During the absence on the 3d from his pulpit in the Vine Street Congregational church, of Cincinnati, of the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, Democratic candidate last year for Secretary of State of Ohio, Mr. Bigelow's wife supplied his place. Her address in the morning was on "Our Debt to Children." In the evening it was on "The Ideal Courtship."

—After officiating on the 30th at St. Louis at the dedicatory ceremonies in connection with the "Louisiana Purchase" exposition, President Roosevelt (p. 60) proceeded to Kansas City, where he arrived on the 1st, going thence through Kansas and across a corner of Colorado into New Mexico. He reached Albuquerque on the 5th and the Grand Canyon of Arizona on the 6th.

—The April treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government for the ten months ending April, 1903, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$241,723,366.92
Internal revenue	190,276,540.76
Miscellaneous	34,419,694.05
	\$466,419,601.73
Expenses:	
Civil and misc	\$108,221,832.95
War	102,269,742.45
Navy	67,193,329.56
Indiana	10,954,686.67
Pensions	118,068,254.75
Interest	26,302,009.21
	\$430,999,855.49
Surplus	\$35,419,746.24

PRESS OPINIONS.

TOM L. JOHNSON.

The Pilgrim (Ind.), May.—Politically, Mr. Johnson is a national figure. He has controlled his State convention and organization—something Mr. Harrison has hitherto been unable to do. He has been widely discussed as a probable Democratic presidential candidate, and enjoys the support of radical Democrats all over the land. The Republicans, too, have done much to add to his national standing. Senator Hanna, in person, took charge of the campaign in Cleveland, and announced his purpose to "kill Johnson politically once for

all." The issue has reestablished Johnson more strongly than before the loss of the State by the Democrats last fall, and has seriously hurt the prestige of Senator Hanna.

The Commoner (Dem.), Apr. 17.—The Democrats of the nation may be pardoned if they give audible expression to the satisfaction they feel over Tom Johnson's victory in Cleveland. When it is remembered that Cleveland is the home of Mark Hanna and that Johnson's election menaced the business as well as the political welfare of Mr. Hanna, and when it is further remembered that all the financial and corporate interests of the city were openly arrayed against him, Johnson's victory becomes the more remarkable. It proves both that Johnson is popular with the masses and that they are in favor of the reforms for which he stands and for which he has labored. Cleveland's mayor is a brave fighter, an honest man and a good Democrat. It is fortunate for the party that it has such a leader in Ohio—strength to his arm! His sturdy blows are weakening the Republican stronghold.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), April 30.—It should be understood that there is to be a leader in the state this Fall who can lead the Democratic hosts. The old ideas of expediency and what will "take" are to be cast to the winds, and there is to be a campaign of principles conducted from the opening to the close. It is to be an appeal to the people to stand up for their rights, and make a fight against the hosts of greed. Every Democrat who has sold out to the opposition will be denounced and the promise will be made that the Democrats who are elected next will be servants of the people. Equal taxation and special privileges to none will be the battle cry.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (dem.), April 29.—Tom Johnson has put a quietus on the reports of his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for President. He says the movement is unwise and undesirable, and talk of nominating him "is a positive injury to what I am trying to accomplish here." "I do hope," he said to the correspondent, "that you, as a friend of mine, will discourage this in every way." Johnson's next campaign probably will be for governor of Ohio.

OHIO POLITICS.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Ind. Dem.), Apr. 21.—Can it be possible that Mr. Cox came all the way to Cleveland to tell Mr. Hanna that he need not worry about the senatorship or the governorship, for both are Mr. Hanna's, to do as he likes with them? That may be possible, but to one familiar with Ohio political history in the last decade or so it is highly improbable. The recent party disaster in Cleveland put both Senator Hanna and Col. Herrick in a position where aid was greatly to be desired. Mr. Cox appeared in Cleveland at the opportune moment and proffered the aid. It was gladly accepted. When the full State ticket is nominated it may show the recompense.

THE BRITISH LAND TAX BILL.

Johannesburg (So. Af.) Tribune (lab.), Apr. 2.—While the Irish are congratulating themselves—let us hope not prematurely—on the introduction of a land bill professedly aimed at the overthrow of the most mischievous land system the world has ever known, the British democracy has, in our opinion, greater ground for rejoicing that the second reading of a bill for the taxation of land values has been defeated only by the comparatively insignificant majority of 13.

Reynolds (London) Newspaper (rad.).—Dr. Macnamara has scored best this session so far, and has brought the Government majority down to thirteen. That is said by some to be a fateful number. And the division took place on a Friday, a day said by the superstitious to be associated with bad luck. It is to be hoped that the

omen may prove significant with regard to this Government. Dr. Macnamara's bill, which was rejected by this narrow majority was an honest and able attempt to make the landlord disgorge some part of the unearned and ill-gotten spoils which he comfortably and safely filches from the overburdened ratepayer.

THE TARIFF.

The Ithaca (N. Y.) Democrat (Dem.), Apr. 9.—Revision of the tariff by its friends means revision of the tariff for its friends.

MISCELLANY.

ERRATUM.

In the last act of "The Making of a Captain of Industry," by Melvin L. Severy, occurred a typographical error which we regret. On page 44, line 25, the second word, "not," should be omitted. The sentence will then read: "You are but a single atom on this speck of stardust, called the earth, immersed in an etheric sea whose telescopic horizon is more than 12,000 light-years away."

ALL MEN'S PORTION.

For The Public.

Oh, Freedom! still thy ringing harp should sound,
The dull to rouse, the pitiless to wake:
For still the hearts of men and women break,
And still the cry of suffering is drowned
By heedless merry-makers. Earth around,
The weak are crushed, the giant-handed slake
At Love's expense their lust of power, and take
Their ease in plenty, while the poor are bound.

It is not now the age of Tooth and Claw:
It is the age of Plenty and of Peace,
With air and sea and earth all shouting:
"Yours!"
A vaster wealth than Midas dreamed or saw
Is all men's portion. Is the Golden Fleece
To warm the drones alone, and not the doers?

JAMES H. WEST.

Boston, Mass.

AN OLD-TIME SINGLE TAXER.

The Rip Van Winkle of Washington Irving's conception has a counterpart in a man in Milan, Wash., who has just written to "Mr. Schurz," the Secretary of the Interior, propounding a few inquiries on tax matters. The man from the far northwest is laboring under the delusion that Carl Schurz, who held the Interior portfolio many administrations back, is still in the possession of that office and the emoluments thereof. At the head of a series of interrogations that display the nursing of a grievance or two, the writer says:

"Milan, Wash. Worthy Mr. Schurz: I do not intend to sing you a stupid or overdrawn song of lamentation about the injustice of human caprice, but it is my sacred earnest to be able to help

you in short with a few questions to promote the welfare of all humanity. Respectfully, J. Otto —."

Here are the questions he asks:

"First. Is it just that a 40-acre farm is taxed two-thirds higher than an 80-acre of like character of soil, 'only because the former has just as good or better improvements as the latter?'"

"Second. Is it honorable if the law taxes a farm one to ten times higher than another of equal value, 'only because it is cultivated more or less well than the other?'"

"Third. Does it show a noble temperament if any good grain farm is taxed discriminatingly from another of any kind, whether cattle, fruit or vegetable farm, if similar conditions of soil are present?"

"I am willing to testify that under a simple, just taxation of land and money any small farmer, as well as any other mechanic or tradesman, can get along; for that reason my knowledge is permeated with the belief and confidence that homelessness and worthlessness, as well as need and recklessness, will in a short time sink almost into impossibility. With the conviction that I am in a position to prove this to any one, I remain, respectfully, very submissively,

—New York Tribune, of April 19, 1903.

THE BIOGRAPHY OF A SAINT.

For The Public.

There recently passed away a life, known to myself and a few others, which ought to be told if only in brief outline.

Five years ago this man knew his days were numbered. He might live a few years, he might pass away at any moment. I have never read or known truer heroism than he showed in those doomed days that stretched into five long years. So far as he himself was concerned he would have greeted death with a smile any day of these years—the sooner the better for him. But for the world about him it was well that he lived every day that was granted to him.

I had known him eight years. Several years before I came to meet him, he had become acquainted with the works of Henry George, and these writings became a gospel to him. Deeply religious by nature, and a devoted adherent of the church, he saw in George's teachings the very culmination of the gospel for this world as taught by Jesus. The theory that all of God's children were equally entitled to God's world was a veritable revelation to him.

Some years ago I received a letter from him in which he said: "In the midst of the dark injustice of the world, and seeing no light ahead, I found that my faith in God was dying. No words can tell my agony. Was the misery of poverty all that the masses could expect here? Had God made this rich and beautiful world for the few? Was there to be no chance of happy development for all his people? Could this be God's world, if so few owned its usage and fruitage? Were the millions that surely had divine souls put here only to slave for all their days in the bare effort for food? Surely, I thought, if this be so, then is it not God's but some Devil's world."

It is easy for us to see how, writing thus, he welcomed Henry George's books as almost a divine revelation to his darkened vision of life. And so it was. From the day he saw what he conceived to be the truth in "Progress and Poverty," his whole view of life was changed. Life became again a buoyant aspiration, and it continued so until his death. All that he did had reference to the fresh truth, which, however old, had come to him as a new birth in these closing years.

He was a man of position in his community, a leader in various social and philanthropic activities. His antecedents and education had given him an assured station among the people in whose midst he had been born and reared. He was as popular as a man could be whose life was quiet, and free from all pretense and immodest push.

Now herein lay his heroism. In a community where the single tax was then unknown, he, the prominent, conservative citizen, had to proclaim his new platform. And he not only proclaimed it in his former unassuming manner, but he became aggressive. He soon found that his hitherto commanding position in the community was being undermined. People did not listen to him, did not defer to him as formerly.

Then it was that more than ever his nobility, as well as his good sense, showed itself to some of us. Instead of allowing himself to be set aside, he redoubled his efforts in all the chief interests of his community. He deliberately set himself to maintaining his influence as a public spirited citizen, and he did this with the sole purpose of being able to accomplish more for the cause to which he had devoted himself. Prominence was really distasteful to his nature, and many things he did were crosses to him, assumed, as I have said, deliberately in behalf of

furthering and giving weight to his influence in maintaining the teachings of Henry George.

Few knew the depth of his purpose and the heroism with which he adhered to it, all the while facing the doom of an incurable malady. To those who did know, his life was a benediction and an inspiration. No medieval saint was ever fired with deeper enthusiasm, was ever hallowed with a more perfect spirit of devotion and sacrifice.

J. H. DILLARD.

THE CULTIVATION OF PHILADELPHIA'S VACANT LOTS.

The Philadelphia Vacant Lots Cultivation is a charity in which sociologists take the keenest interest. For this is a charity that aims, paradoxically, to be not a charity at all; that aims to help as a friend helps, without causing amongst its pensioners that degradation which is, termed, in sociology, "the pauperizing influence."

R. F. Powell, of No. 14 South Broad street, is the superintendent of the association, and its directors are James T. Shinn, Dr. Thomas S. K. Morton, Nathaniel B. Crenshaw, Frederic W. Spiers, Franklin B. Kirkbride, Samuel McCune, Lindsay and Joseph Fels. It was organized in 1897, and in the five years of its life it has developed very remarkably. At the end of 1903, indeed, its development will have been about 1,000 per cent.

The association borrows from certain benevolent owners of real estate vacant tracts of land. These tracts it divides into quarter-acre gardens, which it lends to poor people—to old men principally, to invalids and to maimed persons. It advances to its pensioners the seed, the fertilizer and the few simple tools that truck gardening requires, and it directs the work of planting, growing and gathering of the various crops of potatoes, peas, cabbages, beans, tomatoes, onions and corn. The pensioners begin in April to work. They are engaged pleasantly and healthfully for two or three hours a day, and by June they start to take in their crops, and by the end of the season they have, in many cases, vegetables enough to see them through the winter.

All this food comes to them through their own work, and hence they feel that they earn it. To be sure, they do not pay rent for the land they till; but, on the other hand, they improve the land greatly, grad-

ing it, cleaning it and beautifying it. The association has taken hold of a large number of these unsightly urban lots called "dumps"—tracts filled with ashes, tin cans, worn-out kitchen utensils, and refuse clothing—and they have become, under its direction, fertile and trim gardens. Thus the vacant lot farmer does in a way pay rent, and thus the paradox is achieved of a charity being not a charity at all.

The association was organized in the hard times of 1897, when an unusually large number of able-bodied men in Philadelphia could get no regular employment. There were loaned to it 27 acres of land; \$2,500 in money was contributed, and, in the first year, 96 families earned \$6,000 in vegetables.

In the second year 40 acres of land and \$2,266 were placed in the association's hands, and crops worth \$9,700 were raised by 140 families.

In the third year 72 acres were cultivated and 249 families, involving 1,495 persons, produced a crop valued at \$14,511. To accomplish this, \$2,650 was expended. In other words, every dollar that was contributed yielded, before it reached its final destination, six dollars. It is said that no other charity can show a result so great as this.

The borrowed lands of the association continue to grow, and the running expenses under the management of Superintendent R. F. Powell, continue to diminish. This year over 200 acres will be in cultivation, yet even these will not suffice to meet the applications for gardens that are constantly being made by deserving people who, through old age or ill health, are unable to earn a living in Philadelphia. Only 60 per cent. of the applicants can ever be aided. Therefore the association is desirous of borrowing more land, and at this season the purchase of tools, fertilizer and seed for the spring planting draws on its treasury heavily.

Just now the 800 urban gardens are busy and picturesque places to behold. In them may be seen old men and women with rakes and spades, clearing the soil and spreading the fertilizer. Maimed persons—here a shoemaker, whose failing sight bars him from employment; there a laborer who has lost an arm in a blast—are burning the brush from some new fields. And up and down little boys and girls are busy with shovels and pitchforks; helping as much as they can, for they are the chil-

dren and the grandchildren of the older workers. The superintendent, with his assistants, oversees all.

The Vacant Lots Association is an elaboration and a perfecting of the idea of the late Hazen F. Pingree, of Michigan. Mr. Pingree, when mayor of Detroit, loaned to the unemployed poor of the city the unused city lands, and on these for several years garden truck—potatoes, in the main—was grown. But with the return of industrial prosperity the idea was abandoned.

With the Detroit system as a base, the Vacant Lots association has developed into an unique and many-sided institution. It teaches modern farming thoroughly; many of its graduates have taken holdings in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and are doing well; and therefore it may be called a trade school.

It conducts a very large cooperative farm, employing poor men at good wages, and sharing with these men its profits in crops and money; and therefore it is a practical demonstration of certain theories in modern sociology. It receives from the philanthropist one dollar, which it turns into six at the season's end; and therefore it is a lesson in the science of charity.

Meanwhile, its gardens in West Philadelphia, in Germantown, in Roxborough and at George's Hill are, with their old men and women and child workers, picturesque spots to visit, and spots also where the latest developments in farming may be seen in operation. These gardens, indeed, yield to the acre 200 per cent. more than is yielded by the average rural farm.—The Philadelphia Times.

HUMAN PROGRESS AND ORGANIZATIONS.

For The Public.

I have never made a speech or address of any kind before an audience, even a small one, unless the recitations of lessons, etc., of my school days, might be called such. But I am reminded now and then of the imitation sermons that I used to attempt in my early childhood, when standing on a chair, before an audience made up of the members of my family, and looking wise (or attempting to look wise), I began: "Ish blink! Ish blink!" and filled in with such nonsense as the suggestion: "Dig a well." followed by the exhortation: "Dig another well!—Dig five wells!"

Since arriving at the "age of dis-

cretion" I have thought things while listening to sermons from the pulpit and elsewhere, and have wondered whether they contained anything of more value than my childish preachment: "Ish blink!"

Whether consciously or unconsciously, it seems to me that much of the pulpit and platform oratory of to-day very effectively avoids saying more than this.

Yet pulpit and platform are not alone responsible. The people do not want to hear anything more intelligible, because anything more intelligible would be disturbing. Their religion and philosophy have become settled things to them; they believe that nothing new should be attempted. True, some like to hear the "Ish blink" spoken elegantly, with rising and falling inflection, and with a certain sure rhythm—in short, in a way to soothe and comfort them; but anything calculated to stimulate serious thought they will not suffer, because they foresee that it would rob them of the pleasure of repose.

A copy of a recent weekly bulletin of a prominent Brooklyn church has come to my notice, which will serve here as an illustration of this feeling. At the head of the programme for the morning and evening services, we find the following:

WELCOME—

Whosoever thou art that interest this Church;

Remember it is the House of God;

Be reverent, be silent, be thoughtful;

And leave it not without a prayer to God.

For thyself, for those who minister,

And for those who worship here.

The first line, we perceive, is an open welcome—which probably serves very well as bait—closing with a semicolon—the sinker. From this point we trace the beginning of a long string: First, the caution contained in the second line. Second, our orders as to what to do. And third, orders as to what not to do. "It is the House of God;"—By whose authority? By the authority of an organization of people known as the Church. We must be "silent;"—yet a good deal of ish blinking is done (by one); and why silent? We must be "thoughtful;"—yet who would be found guilty of thinking! We must be "reverent;"—a command well adapted to insure silence and hamper thought; for if we do indeed stand in the presence of that which is fixed and final and only to be revered and not to be questioned, why think? or why speak? But if honest reverence is truly desired, it would seem at least that the order

of the third line should be reversed, and that silence should be changed to questioning speech; for only from the knowledge gained through honest thought and freedom of speech can spontaneous reverence arise, where reverence is due.

In contemplating this condition, which is illustrated not in the church alone, but in labor organizations, in single tax clubs, and in organizations for government, and organizations generally, I am reminded of Fafnir, the "Worm" of the Nibelungen legend. Having wrested from his brother, Fasolt, the Ring, the Tarnhelm, and the golden hoard, symbols of power, Fafnir has retired to Hate Cavern; there, voluntarily assuming the form of a dragon, he is sought out by Wotan and Alberic, who, for selfish purposes, seek to arouse him; but he, regarding them with indifference, replies to their efforts, yawning:

I lie—in possession;
let me slumber!

This huge body says: "Let me slumber!" and we find all organizations saying this, in effect, at certain periods of their existence. Having gathered their hoard together—in ideas and numbers—and got themselves established in fancied security, ensconced in the cavern of hate against all that signifies life and the love of progress, and despising all would-be disturbers, they repose for a time in peace. But though the Wotans and Alberics of selfish purpose and little persistence cannot arouse them, they are never secure against the young, the fearless, the free—the Siegfrieds—who are bent upon conquering all obstacles that lie in the path of their search for knowledge and truth. Time and again in the world's history have the Siegfrieds fathered the progress of the race by putting an end to the old security—the old death in life of the settled organization. Yet the possibility of return to the old is ever present, and ever being taken advantage of, and new Siegfrieds must therefore continue to be born. When one such appears and, instead of ish blinking, in soothing manner, says, for instance, "Gottterdammerung!" we at once hear such exclamations as "Shocking!" "Horrible!" "Heresy!" "and such a long word! really impossible ever to understand it!" The name of the offender is blacklisted. Pulpit and platform and people combine to denounce him. They do not care to risk themselves in such an

atmosphere for fear of contamination. The paid orators fear to lose their jobs, and the leading (?) men their influence and power if they do not promptly condemn him and his heresies. The organization resorts to persecution—to any device that will "head off" the disturber. Its members are banded together for mutual comfort, etc., seeking to grow, in size, by the addition of others desiring the same thing. The old order must be respected.

Yet another enemy to progress, more formidable, even, than the tendency to lapse into repose, stands in the way, and is always met after the Fafnir of slumber has been laid low. This is the champion of "things as they are," the claimants for "respect for age," the Wotans. Siegfried, having put Fafnir out of the way, and continuing his journey in search of the mountain where Brunhilde, his bride, awaits him, is accosted by Wotan. I quote from Wagner's "Siegfried":

Wanderer (Wotan):
Say, boy, whither
bend'st thou thy way?

Siegfried:
I hear a voice:
will he tell me the way?
For a rock I'm seeking
around which fire doth wander. . . .

Wanderer:
Who stirr'd thy mind
the mount to seek for? . . .

Siegfried:
It was a singing
wood-minstrel
who gave the goodly tidings.

Wanderer: . . .
How knewest thou so
the song's importing?

Siegfried:
It was by the blood
of a wicked worm,
whom I at Hate Cavern butchered. . . .

Wanderer:
Thou slewest the giant?
How germed in thee
the scheme to fight with the serpent?

Siegfried:
I followed Mimi,
a faithless dwarf,
who wanted to teach me Fearing. . . .

Wanderer:
Who shaped the sword
so sharp and hard
that so strong a foe it felled?

Siegfried:
I shaped it myself. . . .

Wanderer:
But who shaped
the sturdy splinters
from which thou smelted the sword?

Siegfried:
What thought I of that?
But this I knew—

for no work fit were those fragments
were they not welded afresh.

Wanderer (with good-humored laughter):
That well I admit!

Siegfried:
Why laugh you at me?
Old enquirer,
hark once for all;
lead me no longer to chatter!
Can you direct
the road to me, do so;
and can you not,
then keep your mouth closed!

Wanderer:
But soft, my youngster!
Since I am old
thou shouldst some honor accord me.

Siegfried:
That is a good one!
So long as I've lived,
e'er in my way
an old one waited,
whom now I have swept aside.

. . . I'll quibble no longer,
Be quick! tell me the way;
then, I warn you, turn on your own!
In nought else
your aid do I need;
so speak, or I'll spurn you aside!

Wanderer:
Didst thou know me,
daring son,
of scoffs, sparing wert thou!
Fiercely thy taunts
tear the heart that enfolds thee. . . .

Siegfried:
Dumb are you still,
stubborn old wight?
Wend from your station!
For I know that way
brings to the slumbering bride. . . .

Wanderer:
The way . . .
shalt thou not pass.

Siegfried:
Oho! my withholder!
And who are you
that thus arrest my road?

Wanderer:
Mock not the mountain's guardian!
A spell engirds
by my might the slumbering maid.
One who can wake her—
one who can win her,
makes me mightless forever! . . .

Turn t'ward the hill!
Dost look on the light? . . .
smothering vapors,
varying lightnings,
vacillate burning
and crackling anigh.
A light-flood
illumines thy head:
the furnace soon
will seize and enfold thee—
Away, then, foolhardy boy!

Siegfried:
Away, old boaster, yourself. . . .

Wanderer (stretching out his spear):
Hast thou no heed of the fire?
My spear then shall spare thee no path!
Still holdeth my hand
the hallow'd haft;
the sword that thou sway'st
was shivered on this shaft:
so too again
'twill snap on the eternal spear!

Siegfried (drawing his sword):

Then my father's foe
faces me here? . . .
Stretch out your spear:
My sword shall strike it to shreds.

(At one blow he hews the Wanderer's spear
asunder.)

Wanderer (receding):

Advance! I cannot prevent thee!

In these passages we find, would we heed it, the warning, and the open path of duty and of safety, for organized life, as for all life. We are made for progress; and progress admits of no resting upon past gains, no standing in fear of fiery threats, no distrust of the weapon that we have reformed for our journey. The present is not for awe or reverence of the past, but for command of the service of the past to itself and the future. If the past have no quick, clear answer to the youthful, present query, "What next?" "How shall I go forward?" if it stands pleading for its own life through reverence and duty, and so barring the onward move into the future, though it fancies that it holds the power of the eternal in its grasp, it has yet the lesson of its destiny to learn, and will be compelled to acknowledge to the new life:

Advance! I cannot prevent thee!

But this is not easy. When the first flush of interest and of activity in forming the new organization has passed, the temptation comes quickly to jealously guard the ideas for which the work has been done, and to fancy that the goal is reached. The autocratic temper and methods creep in; new members are welcomed, but with the distinct understanding that no "dangerous" questions are to be asked; entire submission is now required to the old body (now become autocratic). It is plain that the organization now fears for its life; and it is also plain that it will lose it. It ceases to take on new life, as well as ceases to exercise the life that it once had itself; and inactivity leads to atrophy—death. Or, standing Wotan-like across the path of the new, stirring life, attempting to stay the march of its progress, it inevitably invites its own conquest.

This drama of "Siegfried," from which I have quoted so freely, is to me full of significance along this line. Perhaps others may see it, or be led to see it, as I do.

C. J. NORTHROP.

"Little folks mustn't be unreasonable."

"Yes; but, grandmamma, it seems a long time to wait till they're grown up!"—Puck.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF MAYOR TOM L. JOHNSON.

Following is the address in full which was delivered by Mr. Johnson, as mayor of Cleveland, in the presence of the new city council, the newly elected executive officers, and a large assemblage of citizens, on the occasion of the organization of the city government under the new municipal code of Ohio, Monday, May 4, 1903.

Something vastly more important is involved in the simple ceremonies of this occasion than the reorganization of our own municipality. We really stand upon the threshold of a new era in the municipal government of every city in one of the most influential States of the American Union. Throughout the great commonwealth of Ohio, all cities come to-day under the sway of one law, a law of uniform operation with reference not alone to what concerns them in their relations to the State at large, but also to what concerns each solely in respect of its own local affairs.

Our outlook, therefore, is the same as that of our sister cities. But our duties are more exacting and our responsibilities correspondingly greater. For Cleveland has become the largest city of the State, and for that reason alone her policies and her administration, her failures and her successes, her progress or her decline, will exert an influence elsewhere which no one can measure and nothing avert. Potent as is that reason, however, there is another more potent still. Need I remind you of what this further reason is? Not alone is Cleveland the largest city in Ohio, but she has successfully taken the lead—a claim she may make with all modesty—in working out the world-wide problem of municipal home rule by the people themselves.

Of all civic problems this one is the most pressing. It is even more pressing in the United States than elsewhere. Our old questions of State sovereignty were set at rest by the logic of the Civil War. Let the mere theory of State rights linger as it may, the stern fact is that Federation has given way to Nationality. In national affairs the central government is now supreme. The only power the States can any longer hope to preserve is power over their internal affairs—the exclusive right of home rule in matters of State concern. That readjustment of the relations of the Nation to the States is suggestive and prophetic of a similar readjust-

ment of the relations of the States to their respective municipalities. This is clear to all who reflect. Along with the decline in the political power once asserted by the States has arisen a necessity, if popular liberty is to be preserved, for an extension to municipalities of the same benign principle of home rule to which the States themselves may still lay claim. Municipalities must cease to be answerable to their States, except in matters of State concern, and become answerable in matters of home concern only to their own people. Such a policy is in line with the trend of the times.

This being so—and who can dispute it?—we could have wished for a more generous recognition of the principle of home rule for the cities of Ohio than the expiring legislature has seen fit to concede. We could wish for a more complete application of the principle than is possible, perhaps, under the State constitution as it now exists. A municipal code under which every city could make its own laws, could design its own organization, could in every way govern itself by the ballots of its own people, absolutely untrammelled by outside dictation or interference except with reference to matters of outside concern—such a code would be the ideal of State legislation for municipal government.

Short of that ideal it is doubtful if a better general scheme could be devised than the "federal plan" with which Cleveland is experimentally familiar and under which she has developed a civic consciousness and conscience among her people of a higher order than that of any other large city in the country. Lodging legislative power in a council elected from wards, and administrative power in a mayor who could be held responsible by all the citizenship for the good conduct of his appointees, that "federal plan" operated to inspire the citizens themselves with a sense of responsibility for good local government. The power of "bosses" was thus held in check, and a wholesome respect was fostered in Cleveland for government for the people by the people.

But we are forced to face the problems of municipal government, as are the people of our sister cities of Ohio, without the advantage either of the ideal system of local self-government, or of the "federal plan" which served our city so well for more than a decade. Our new municipal system is singularly defective. Not only does

it rest on no fundamental principle, not only does it embody no consistent scheme of popular rule, not only does it revive the universally discredited devices of board rule and divided responsibility, but in many respects it is obscure in terms and confusing in detail.

The responsibility is upon us, however—upon you, gentlemen of the city council; upon you, gentlemen of the various executive departments; and upon me as mayor—to administer this system with all the abilities at our command, with complete devotion to the interests of the people whose commission we have received, and in absolute good faith. It is not for us to quarrel with the tools that have been placed in our hands. What is required of us and what we must render is the best workmanship in all respects that the circumstances permit. In every emergency let us remember that we are not the agents of any political party or faction, but are the servants of all the people. At the very outset, then—at this moment and in this place—let us solemnly determine to manage the affairs of Cleveland, in so far as we possess or can obtain the legal power, upon the principle, ever old but never stale, of equal rights and opportunities for all and special privileges and advantages to none.

Actuated by this determination we shall find it necessary to protect the people of Cleveland against the aggressions of certain so-called "business interests." I do not allude to competitive business, but to interests that are grounded in special privilege. These have no natural affinity for legitimate business interests; and their beneficiaries know no political party except to use its influence to serve personal ends of pecuniary profit.

All such spurious "business interests" are now served in greater or less degree by unfair apportionments of taxation. Efforts were made by the city administration which has just retired, to correct this gross abuse; but its beneficiaries were able—through county auditors, through State officials, through the courts, and through the legislature—to obstruct and for a time to nullify those efforts. May it be our aim to renew them and make them fully effective. In this let us miss no lawful opportunity.

Complete success will be impossible, however, until the State legislature establishes fair rules for the

taxation of steam railroads and the like, and permits municipalities to adopt systems of local assessment admitting of fairness in local taxation. Our work, therefore, cannot be confined to the boundaries of our own city. So long as legislators are under the domination of privileged corporations and individuals, unjust taxation will prevail here in spite of all we can do. It will, consequently, be our duty as faithful representatives of the people of Cleveland, to awaken the people of the whole State, regardless of their party affiliations, to the iniquities of unjust taxation. They must be made to realize that national issues and senatorial ambitions are of less importance to the people of Ohio in State elections, than the fitness of candidates for such offices as county auditor, as State auditor, as attorney general, as Supreme Court judgeships, and as legislators.

Nor is taxation the only subject with which this new government of Cleveland must deal even to the extent of appealing to the civic conscience of the people of the whole State. Chief among the questions of prime concern to Cleveland are those relating to the common municipal services that are distinguished as "public utilities."

Already the statutes permit cities to engage in the business of gas and electric lighting, and of this privilege it is our duty to avail ourselves at once. Let us begin with an electric lighting plant of the most modern type, by which we can produce electricity cheaply for street lighting, and in addition can give to the people in their homes and places of business the benefit of electric light and power at the minimum of cost. As that experiment proves its value, the same system can be extended over the entire city.

The management of this plant should be under a merit system of service such as we have successfully introduced in the water department. And in regard to the lighting plant and to the water department itself we should perfect the merit system until we have finally made it secure by ordinance. Of course, subsequent councils might repeal such an ordinance, but by that time public sentiment in its favor would probably interpose an effectual obstacle to their doing so. This policy is of special importance in view of the probability of an early extension in Cleveland of the principle of municipal

ownership and operation to all public utilities. With the rule of merit in full and successful operation in the administration of our electric lighting and water supply, the people would have an object lesson in municipal business, which would be, with reference to its extension to other public utilities, at once a guaranty of good service and an encouragement to make the extension. It would be, moreover, an example to other cities of which our own might well be proud.

Even in itself, regardless of all collateral considerations, the perfecting of this merit system would be a great advance in the art of municipal government; for it would tend to do away with the spoils system altogether, not only in some departments, but in all the ramifications of the public service. Nothing in municipal government is more corrupting than the spoils system, with a single exception, and to that exception I especially call your attention. I refer to the prevalent practice of granting to private corporations franchises to do public business for profit. That practice should be abolished.

So far as supplies of light, power and water are concerned, we are, even now, as I have already observed, legally empowered to abolish this prolific source of corruption. But with reference to street railroads and some other kinds of public service our powers are extremely limited. Yet there is no good reason why the city should not own, and under merit rules of employment operate its own street car system. It owns the tracks on the public viaducts, although there is no specific legislative authority for it. Originally the rails were paid for by the city on all the great viaducts and on some of the small ones. The companies were required to keep these tracks in repair, and now not an original rail remains, the companies having substituted new ones. Yet these new rails belong to the city and the tracks are absolutely under its ownership and control. There is no reason why this should not be done on the streets as well as on the viaducts. Were we to attempt it, however, we should doubtless meet bitter opposition from monopoly interests and probably be tied up with injunctions. With reference to street car service, therefore, as well as to taxation, we of Cleveland shall be obliged to awaken the interest and obtain the cooperation

of the people of the State at large. In no other way can we secure for Cleveland the unobstructed right to establish the kind of system we ought to have and which our constituents clearly demand.

Meanwhile, however, it is fully within our power to begin anew the important work in this connection of establishing a system of low fares. To prevent this consummation a revolution in the judicially-approved practice of half a century of municipal government in Ohio was precipitated. Cleveland was thus divested of its admirable charter and placed for nine months virtually under the government of the Supreme Court. But the day of our city's deliverance is at hand. All the legislative precautions of monopoly lobbyists and party "bosses" have been set at naught by popular vote. The people of Cleveland have spoken, and the duty of their officials is clear.

These are but suggestions of the larger and perhaps more difficult duties before us. Other duties and other problems will unite with these to make our labors arduous and the necessity for our vigilance constant. Doubtless we shall often meet with difficulties that will try our patience and encounter obstacles to tax our resources. Even in the most favorable circumstances it is no easy task to execute with intelligent fidelity the delicate trusts which the people of a modern city, with all its marvelous complexity of public and private interests, repose in their officials. The severity of such a task is intensified as new municipal problems naturally press forward for solution. It is greatly aggravated when in addition the whole structure of the municipal government is suddenly altered by hasty legislation, undigested and unconsidered by the law-making body, and dictated by conflicting private interests having little or no regard for the public good. But I venture the prediction that the officials of Cleveland will prove equal to their peculiarly delicate and difficult task.

Working harmoniously together, without regard to party, with malice toward no man and injustice to no interest, but in response to a lively spirit of fair play to all, whether rich or poor, I believe that the members of this new city government will overcome every obstacle, those that are designedly thrown in their way as well as those that naturally arise, and so triumphantly achieve the beneficent results they have been elected to secure. Upon you, gentlemen of the city coun-

cil, I trust we may depend for a courageous and untarnished record and wholesome local legislation. From you, gentlemen of the various administrative departments, I am sure we may expect industrious, sensible and faithful service. For myself, I pledge again my best abilities and my sincere devotion to the work we have in common to do—to this great work of making our city a model municipality.

What greater honor could any of us desire? What object could there be more worthy of any man's ambition than to succeed in giving strength and tone and exalted character to the municipality of which he is a citizen? to succeed in effectively cooperating in the work of establishing in his own city municipal self-government upon the basis of equal justice, and thereby setting an example of practical democracy to the civilized world.

Perhaps we cannot wholly succeed. Be that as it may, let us firmly resolve, each for himself in his own sphere of official duty, and all of us together, that at any rate we will deserve to succeed.

"ME AND MY FRIENDS."

Mr. Baer says that coal will advance in price again. Asked why the price had not been reduced, he said: "Because you and your friends have succeeded in raising wages and getting up the cost of necessities, so that profits are less."

You and your friends had to come and stick your old proboscises
Into all our business and criticise its processes;

Had to come and quiz us on our dealings carboniferous,
Then go saying wicked things in language most vociferous—

Now, see what me and my friends
Do to you and your friends.

You and your friends had to go and utter things calorified—
Things about our deals that left me and my friends horrified;

Had to egg our workers on until there was no pleasing them
Other than to make their wages suit them by increasing them—

Now, see what me and my friends
Do to you and your friends.

You and your friends spoke of our divine rights disrespectfully,
Treated all our edicts and all our rules neglectfully.

Now it's our turn—wait until winter time's frigidly;
Prices will be climbing up with intense rapidity.

Then see what me and my friends
Do to you and your friends!

—The Chicago Tribune.

The day after President Loubet arrived in Tlemcen (Algeria), which had suffered long from drought, there was a heavy fall of rain. This was attrib-

uted by the natives to the President's visit—with as much reason as our present prosperity is attributed by many to the Republican policies of protection and expansion.—The San Francisco Star.

Dickey, five years old, the son of a well-known minister, reports the Commercial, has not advanced sufficiently in his studies to take up physiology, but that the subject may appeal to him, perhaps, is revealed in a dialogue between himself and his brother Teddy, seven years old, which occurred at luncheon the other day.

"I'm so hungry, I wish I could eat everything on the table and fill my stummick from here to here," said Teddy, indicating what he thought was the "stummick's" location by pointing his finger to either side of his little body.

"Huh, you don't think your stummick goes so far, do you?" questioned Dickey.

"Why not?" asked Teddy.

"Well, you've got a gizzard and a soul; where're they?"—The Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

Smart Aleck—Once upon a time there were three little children. Half of them were boys an'—

Dumb Delia—Why, Aleck! How could there be one and a half girls?

Smart Aleck—There weren't. The other half was boys, too.—London Tit-Bits.

The rich man is the trustee of humanity. In this way, you see, humanity's money is kept profitably invested, instead of being spent for food and drink and other frippery.—Puck.

A PRIMER OF RIGHT AND WRONG.

This attractive little volume, by J. N. Larned (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 70 cents), seems to me the best of its kind. It is easy, interesting reading to grown-up people; whether it will prove to be so to "young people in schools and families," for whom it is by its title page intended, is another matter. It ought to be. It is written simply, though not childishly; concisely, though not without some grace of style.

But it is hard to prophesy what the average child will take to willingly. The little girl who said she had received as Christmas presents three books for improvement and two to read, was doubtless very serious in her criticism, and meant no joke. Among

the books for improvement I should say that Mr. Larned's would at any rate come as near being a book to read as it would be easy to make on this subject.

A happy feature is the addition of examples and opinions at the end of certain chapters, especially the examples. It strikes me that the author might well have added more of these. The concrete, as we know, counts for most both in interest and in effectiveness with children—and, for that matter, with 99 per cent. of the grown-up people.

Turning for a moment to the author's real treatment of the subject. I think it will be found to be in the main very clear and satisfactory. In chapter V., where he speaks of the "mischievous notion" of accepting the laws as standards of sound morality, he should perhaps have made some further distinction in his strictures. For there are laws which one may by no means believe in, and yet he cannot do otherwise than live in accordance with them. Here the morality comes in in trying to change them. And this suggests a failing in all books of this kind. They instill no spirit of aspiration and enthusiasm for improving social relations by standing up for juster laws and better institutions. The young love enthusiasm, and where the atmosphere is healthy they are naturally radical. What a pity that the enthusiasm for social justice is not more frequently aroused and steadily fostered in them by their books and teachers.

J. H. DILLARD.

M'CUTCHEON'S CARTOONS.

It seems almost impossible to say so much that is often wise and almost always funny, with hardly a word of letter press, as John McCutcheon says in the collection of his cartoons which McClurg & Co., of Chicago, have re-

produced in book form. Included in this collection is the series of serio-comic drawings, caricaturistically true, of a country boy's life in Spring time, in Summer time, in the Fall and in the Winter. To regular readers of the Chicago Record-Herald these cartoons will all seem familiar, but they will lack no interest on that account. McCutcheon's is the kind of gentle fun-making that one can enjoy over and over. It depends much less upon exaggeration for its comical effects than upon a true touch here and another there. These touches in such cartoons as those of the boy and the seasons will infallibly awaken ludicrous recollections in the memory of anyone who has ever been a boy, especially a boy with a dog or two. Others than Record-Herald readers are

to be envied. Not only will the book afford them cosy enjoyment; it will furnish them the delightful sensation of enjoyment of a new kind. McCutcheon's pencil is original in its wit, and deliciously faithful. A well considered introduction by George Ade adds interest to the volume.

PERIODICALS.

Some time ago we called attention to an article in the Westminster Review on the startling increase of insanity in England. In the April number of this Review will be found another article on the same subject, from which it appears that on January 1, 1859, there were 36,762 insane persons in England, and on January 1, 1902, 110,713. Another striking contribution to this number is an article entitled, "Why English Literature Is Dying." The writer's chief point seems to be that our education has been increasing in extent rather than in depth. He laments "the appetite for sensation, the widespread and inane habit of reading only scraps and paragraphs, and

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE LIBRARY

This Series of Books is printed from new and large type, on good paper, and bound in red silk cloth, at the fair price of 75 cents per volume, which includes postage.

- SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.** By JAMES E. THOROLD ROGERS, M. P. Abridged, with charts and summary. By W. D. P. BLISS. Introduction by Prof. R. T. ELY.
- THE SOCIALISM OF JOHN STUART MILL.** The only collection of MILL's writings on Socialism.
- THE SOCIALISM AND UNSOCIALISM OF THOMAS CARLYLE.** A collection of CARLYLE's social writings; together with JOSEPH MAZZINI's famous essay protesting against CARLYLE's views. Vol. I.
- THE SOCIALISM AND UNSOCIALISM OF THOMAS CARLYLE.** Vol. II.
- WILLIAM MORRIS: POET, ARTIST, SOCIALIST.** A selection from his writings, together with a sketch of the man. Edited by FRANCIS WATTS LEE.
- FABIAN ESSAYS IN SOCIALISM.** By BERNARD SHAW, SIDNEY WEBB, ANNIE BESANT, etc., etc. American edition, with introduction and notes by H. G. WILSHIRE.
- THE ECONOMICS OF HERBERT SPENCER.** By W. C. OWEN.
- THE COMMUNISM OF JOHN RUSKIN.** Edited by W. D. P. BLISS.
- THE PIONEERS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM.** By CHAS. SOTHERAN.
- NEWS FROM NOWHERE.** By WILLIAM MORRIS.
- SUGGESTIONS ON GOVERNMENT.** By SAMUEL E. MOFFETT.

The 11 Volumes sent to any one address on receipt of \$7

TWENTIETH CENTURY PRESS,
17 E. 16th Street, NEW YORK CITY.

MENTION THIS PAPER.

Volume V of The Public

Complete Volumes, including index, sent post paid at Regular Subscription price, \$2.00.

BOUND VOLUMES, PRICE, \$3.00, by Express, prepaid, \$3.50, will be ready for delivery about May 15.

Address,
PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., Box 687, Chicago.

TO THE STOCKHOLDERS OF ELABORATED READY ROOFING COMPANY.
Gentlemen—You and each of you are hereby notified that a Special Meeting of the Stockholders of the Elaborated Ready Roofing Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, is hereby called to be held at the office of the Company, Number Thirty-four (34) Wabash Ave., City of Chicago, State of Illinois, on the Thirtieth (30th) day of May, 1903, at the hour of Ten o'clock a. m. for the purpose of increasing the capital stock of said corporation from Ten Thousand (\$10,000.00) dollars to Twenty-five thousand (\$25,000.00) dollars; and for the further purpose of enlarging the object for which said corporation was formed.
Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 27th day of April, A. D., 1903.
M. B. BECKER, President.
H. D. COOK, Secretary.
JAY D. MILLER, Attorney, Attest.



A HIGHLY PROBABLE EVENT OF THE MORE OR LESS DISTANT FUTURE.

avoiding like plague anything longer than half a column." J. H. D.

We commend to those interested in the subject of Moral Education in the public schools an article bearing this title in the April number of the Educational Review, New York. The writer is Dr. W. H. P. Faunce, president of Brown university. "We have shown," he says, "a fairly idolatrous devotion to the three R's—the American educational trinity—and have passed over justice, mercy and truth. We have whetted the intelligence of our children, but have ignored the affections, the conscience, the imagination, and the will." Such words as these are common enough nowadays; but what are we going to do about it? Dr. Faunce's article is rather suggestive than conclusive. Many will agree with two conclusions: First, that undogmatic religious teaching is a chimera; secondly, that the public schools cannot do dogmatic religious teaching. J. H. D.

The Nation of April 23 has an editorial on

The Naval Folly, which ought to be read by every thoughtful voter in America. "Twenty years ago," the writer says, "the naval appropriation bill carried less than \$15,000,000. Even as late as 1886 it had reached only about \$25,000,000. But the bill for the current year appropriated no less than \$80,000,000." Of course it is to be expected at the present stage of the game, throughout what Mayor Jones calls "the whole uncivilized world," that there should be in every great nation a large number of people who like this sort of thing. It measures a people's greatness in their eyes. But how shall we explain the fact that a majority of American voters seem to like it? Perhaps it is a mistake to suppose that Americans are shrewd business men, for it is undoubtedly true, as the writer of this article says, that "of all money unproductively locked up, that put into battleships not absolutely needed is the most profligately squandered." Perhaps it is true, as a Republican friend puts it, that we are a people of expansive imagination. J. H. D.



LECTURES ON ECONOMIC SUBJECTS AT HANDEL HALL
40 EAST RANDOLPH ST.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, AT 3 O'CLOCK

UNDER AUSPICES OF THE

Henry George Association

Lectures every Thursday evening throughout the year in Lecture Hall 608, same building.

MR. JOHN Z. WHITE

Will Lecture Sunday Afternoon, May 10th, also on May 17th, subject both lectures.

"Questions and Answers on the Single Tax."

MR. HENRY H. HARDINGE

Will Lecture Thursday, May 7th, subject,

"A Review of Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty.'"

MR. ALBINUS R. WORSLEY

Will Lecture Thursday Evening May 14th, on a

"Review of Clarence S. Darrow's 'Resist Not Evil.'"



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.

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, 4094 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015.
NEW YORK.

JOHN P. ALTGELD



was one of the few really great orators of recent years. Just before his death he prepared a little volume entitled **ORATORY:**

ITS REQUIREMENTS AND ITS REWARDS,

which is the most helpful manual for the student of oratory ever published. Cloth, 50 cents, postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth Ave., CHICAGO.

THE AUSTIN-HAAS DEBATE,

second edition, demonstrates irrefutably, or your money back, that the "Balance of Trade," boastfully referred to by politicians, instead of enriching our country, is in reality a perpetual drain upon its resources. Ex-Senator Pettigrew says of it: "I have read with much interest your very conclusive argument that exports do not enrich our country."

Price, postpaid, 30 cents. Address
A. C. AUSTIN, Hudson, S. D.

G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,
JERSEY CITY, N. J.

Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.
Trolley Roads Built and Financed.