

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1903.

Number 292.

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.

The check which Tom L. Johnson's programme of democratic Democracy met in Ohio on the 3d, over which every plutocrat in both parties from coast to coast is jubilant to-day, is nothing but a check, and a very temporary one at that.

"When do you intend to renew the fight?" Johnson was asked after the first dispiriting news had been confirmed on election night. "To-morrow!" he replied. And so it will be. Johnson, like Bryan, is enlisted for a war, not merely for a battle or two.

And no one could realize better than Johnson has realized all along, that not in one battle, nor in two, nor it may be in many, can a final victory in this irrepressible conflict between plutocracy and democracy be won. More than that, he has realized all along, no less clearly than in this hour of temporary defeat, that the final victory will be preceded by local and temporary defeats as well as local and temporary victories.

How could it be otherwise? The forces against which Johnson has contended and must yet contend, are not weak forces. If they were, they would have collapsed with Johnson's first splendid victories. But note how strong they are. First are the plutocrats of all political shades and conditions, from the millionaire monopolist to the "penniless plute." Then there are the political bosses and heelers of all parties and all grades, from bar-room loafer to senatorial grafter. Then there are the

bribed newspapers, little and big, which find their profits in fooling readers. And then there are the great thoughtless and bedeviled masses themselves, upon whom all these lions and jackals prey. It is these masses that must be reached with sound doctrine and honorable appeal, and thus drawn away from the "confidence" men who annually play off profitable buncombe games upon them in the name of patriotism and prosperity. The man who takes up as his life work the task of dealing with that situation, as Johnson has done, could not drop it if he would, merely because one of his earlier efforts fails.

Doubtless the one great force that operated against Johnson in Ohio last Tuesday was the hourly reiteration by hundreds of Republican speakers throughout Ohio, of the dire prediction that if Hanna were defeated hard times would come again, whereas Hanna would preserve prosperity. It is not complimentary to the intelligence of any voter to suspect him of being influenced by such transparent buncombe, but there is much reason to believe that scores of thousands of Ohio voters were so influenced. The fact that the legislature is even more overwhelmingly Republican than the popular vote for governor, confirms this view; for it was upon the legislature and not upon the popular vote that Hanna's election depended.

Nevertheless, something besides the "hard times" scare had much to do no doubt with the dispiriting result. The State was debauched with the largest campaign fund ever used in an Ohio election. This fund was contributed by the railroad, street car, public lighting, and other monopoly interests of the whole country, for the purpose—not so much of electing Hanna, for they can get

other servants as good as he; but for the purpose of crushing Johnson, over whom they know they have neither control nor influence, nor any possibility of acquiring either. Out of this gigantic fight Johnson has come with clean hands. He has had no great campaign fund. He has spent no money except for the barest necessities for enlightening the people. He has used no billingsgate, has made no personal attacks, has confined his criticisms to the public records of his adversaries and devoted his discussions to principles rather than men. With seven victories to his credit since he began his crusade for even-handed justice in government, and only four defeats, his character and record stand out bright and strong against the day for another battle with the Princes of the Powers of Darkness in American politics.

The solitary place in all the United States which has not been wholly submerged by the plutocratic tidal wave of last Tuesday's elections, is Rhode Island, where Gov. Garvin is re-elected, in spite of the baleful power of Senator Aldrich, though by a reduced majority. Gov. Garvin is a democratic-Democrat. He belongs in the same political category with Tom L. Johnson, even to being a single taxer. Like Johnson, too, he is a man who not only knows but dares. His administration in Rhode Island has made him conspicuous even nationally. The people of his State are to be congratulated upon having defeated their plutocrats with so able and so radical a democrat.

The November issue of "Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly" should be in the hands of every American who has any sincerely patriotic interest in the welfare of his country. For an article by the editors

lays bare the new kind of lobby by which the people of this country are governed and plundered from Washington. This lobby is not a "third house," as the old lobbies were; it is composed of the members and senators themselves. Leslie's describes it in a phrase: "Congress its own lobby."

Few disclosures of concealed facts are made in the Leslie article, but facts well known or reasonably suspected are so put together as to leave no doubt of their sinister significance. Quite correctly the editors of Leslie's assert that "the great curse of national legislation is the campaign contribution." Proceeding, they explain the new lobby as resulting from campaign contributions, saying:

In a Presidential or Congressional election the great corporations pick the candidates and the party to whom they feel they can look for favors; then they contribute enormous sums to carry the election. Frequently a definite bargain is made with the national committee that something shall be done or another one not done. It is a cold matter of business. Commercial Acumen which has built up vast fortunes in a generation or two, like those of "the Standard Oil crowd" or of Carnegie's coterie of young men, can usually pick a winner, or make a winner, in a national campaign. It did so in 1888, when it turned its back on Cleveland and contributed to the Harrison fund for M. S. Quay to spend. Again it did so in 1892, when it switched from Harrison back to Cleveland and gave the millions to William C. Whitney and Don M. Dickinson, with which they swept the country. It could not choose in 1896 and 1900 because William J. Bryan was running for President on a platform which made the corporations quake, so Commercial Acumen emptied a sum equal to a king's ransom at the feet of Marcus A. Hanna at the behest of such men as Cornelius N. Bliss, Senator Aldrich, Senator Allison and Senator Quay. The great interests which contributed in these four campaigns got what they paid for. Under Harrison they got the McKinley tariff law, with protective duties marked up sky high. Under Cleveland's second administration they got exactly the schedules they had bargained for in advance. Under McKinley they literally lived in clover—the richest man in the United States has quadrupled his fortune in the last seven years.

And then Leslie's goes on to prove its case with incontestable testimony.

It is a remarkable fact that two

of the corruptionists named in the Leslie editorial are manifestly to be arrayed against each other by the circumstances of this week's elections, for a gigantic struggle in the presidential campaign of 1904. They are Marcus A. Hanna, Republican, and Wm. C. Whitney, Democrat. As with the presidential elections named in that article, the one of 1904 is now almost certain to be a battle for and with a huge campaign fund. For the unexpectedly triumphant election of McClellan as Mayor of New York, through the management of Wm. C. Whitney and with Wall street funds collected by him, points to McClellan almost unerringly as the Democratic candidate for President. On the other hand, Hanna will probably be forced to accept Roosevelt. Nothing but a miracle in politics can relieve him of that burden. So Hanna will have to stand sponsor for Roosevelt in raising the campaign fund. But no king's ransom will drop at Hanna's feet this time, as when the trusts quaked at Bryan's nomination, or as they quaked when Johnson's broad shadow crept over their door sills. The situation will be like that of 1888 and of 1892, and not like that of 1896 and of 1900. This time there will be a competing bidder for the "king's ransom." Mr. Whitney will come into the field for McClellan, as in 1892 he came for Cleveland. And which of the two—Hanna or Whitney—will get the richest contributions? The one, of course, who can give the best assurances of his power to deliver the post-election goods which he offers for the pre-election campaign fund. This will give the bulk of the fund to Whitney. For Hanna will not be able to satisfy the great campaign contributors of Wall street that the erratic Roosevelt can always be depended upon to make Hanna's bargains good. The outlook for Democratic success in 1904 is certainly much more promising than it was the day before this week's election. It is not improbable that the Democratic Mr. Whitney, with his new presidential protege, will come into nation-

al power just in the nick of time (as with his protege of 1892) to make the Democratic party appear to have caused the business depression which is now about due.

By a vote of 41 to 22 the city council of Chicago has apparently sustained the suspicious behavior of one of its committees relative to negotiations with traction stock-jobbers for an extension of traction franchises. But hasty inferences should not be drawn from this vote. There is no certainty that all who voted with the majority are on the stock-jobbing side of the question. Questions of temporary expediency were involved in the motion voted on, and nothing decisive was at that time at stake. The sheep in the council, therefore, are not yet wholly separated from the goats. But the time is fast approaching when this separation will be made and an inventory of the people's stock of goats in the council can be taken.

To suggest corruption in the Chicago council, after so much has been so widely reported of the reformation of that body, may be startling. The suggestion may even be received incredulously. But there is no implication that those reports of reform are untrue. The Chicago council has probably been pretty completely purified of vulgar bribe-takers. But it has acquired in their place a collection of high-toned business "grafters"—men who make money not by taking bribes for ordinances, but through investments, directly or indirectly in the profits accruing from measures they vote for. For such men the traction question opens up rich and reputable opportunities. No matter how much money they may make out of traction franchises, they make it so strictly in conformity with conventional business methods that their social and business standing is improved rather than impaired thereby. The yeast of this kind of

"graft" is now actively fermenting in the Chicago council.

It is to be regretted that the Chicago Record-Herald is beginning to expose itself to distrust regarding the local traction question. No paper professing to favor municipal ownership can escape reasonable suspicion when it parrots traction lawyers' objections to which there is an apparently sound answer, unless it shows that the answer is in fact not sound. Yet the Record-Herald is beginning to parrot just such objections, knowing that there is an answer to them, but without even mentioning the answer, much less showing that it is unsound. On the 4th, for instance, it said editorially:

Suggestions for immediate municipal ownership are not at all helpful at the present time, but utterly impractical. The people who make them are misinformed or have not reflected upon the situation as they should. What will they do with the numerous grants that are now running for varying terms? Can they stop them all instanter and so devise a municipalized system? What will they do with the 99-year act and its promise of in-terminable litigation? Have they absolute power over the law and the courts, can they waive aside suits and injunctions? Evidently they fail to recognize a series of complications of the most puzzling description. Yet these complications exist, and they cannot be undone at a single stroke of a magical wand labeled municipal ownership. The process will be a slow one, by agreement and contract so made as to enable the city to venture upon municipal ownership when the times are propitious for the experiment.

The answer, apparently sound, is that "the Mueller act" does away with the necessity for "agreement and contract," by authorizing condemnation proceedings. Is that answer really sound, or is it not? If not, why not? If it is, why emphasize the necessity for "agreement and contract," which would only make further complications? In either case why ignore the answer?

Alderman Bennett, of the Chicago city council, is wisest when he speaks not. On several occasions his fatal facility of oral ex-

pression has exposed the animus of the council committee which is negotiating with the traction stock-jobbers (p. 468) and of which he is chairman. The latest instance of Mr. Bennett's fatal facility was in explanation of the suspiciously secret sessions of that committee. "It would be a mighty poor general," said he, on the floor of the council on the 2d, "who would give away his plans to the enemy; whenever we have held secret sessions it has been because we have not wanted to disclose our plans to the enemy." Thus does Alderman Bennett expose the attitude of his committee. For who is the "enemy" whom this committee would keep in ignorance of its proceedings? Not the traction stock-jobbers; for they are admitted to these secret sessions, along with their lawyers and their stenographer. The only persons excluded are the authorized representatives of the municipal ownership movement. So, according to Alderman Bennett, the council committee regards the traction stock-jobbers as its friends, and the municipal ownership voters—at least 143,000 of Chicago's voting citizens—as its enemy. If Alderman Bennett is "long" on effrontery, he is "short" on discretion.

In the line of "pure and unadulterated cussedness," nothing has occurred of late years to quite equal the conduct of the pluto-Democratic papers with reference to the late Mr. Bennett's bequest to William J. Bryan. Here is a case in which Mr. Bryan's nearest friend of considerable means, a man who believed in the same financial and political theories that Mr. Bryan believes in, who had for Bryan the affection of a friend and in Bryan's leadership the confidence of a co-worker in the same cause, has provided out of an ample estate a fund for Bryan's use in his own discretion. It was precisely what any man of sincere purposes and large fortune would desire to do for the acknowledged leader of a movement

to which both were devoted. There was no stinting of the widow. Mr. Bennett provided amply for his widow. He provided liberally for others not of his own household nor even relatives, and between whom and himself there were no such sacred ties of common thought and purpose as those that cemented his friendship with Mr. Bryan. Yet the bequest to Mr. Bryan is attacked as having been secured through undue influence! Attacked nominally by Mr. Bennett's widow, but really by a Grover Cleveland Democrat, a lawyer who had evidently gone into the contest in order that Bryan might be assailed with billingsgate through the Grover Cleveland newspapers. That this was the purpose is fairly well indicated by the facts. This lawyer has wantonly supplied the billingsgate; the local Cleveland organ, the New Haven Register, nominally Democratic, has acted as distributing agent. It gave four columns to this lawyer's speech in court, a legal argument in the course of which Bryan was viciously assailed, while it gave but half a column to Bryan's reply to the personal incriminations and hardly a line of the legal argument of Bryan's local counsel. The same spirit has been exhibited throughout the country. The motive is obvious. It is to discredit Bryan's political leadership by a libelous assault upon the integrity of his private character.

One of the grimly humorous features of this campaign of mud-throwing is the contrast that the scandal-mongers have drawn between Bryan and Henry George, with reference to George's conduct under circumstances which were in some respects like those in which Bryan is involved. George had been left a bequest, not personally as in the Bryan case, but as trustee. The widow of the maker of the will had been left nothing, whereas in Bryan's case the widow is a large beneficiary; the estate proved to be almost insolvent and the widow penniless, whereas in Bryan's

case the estate is large and the widow well provided for. George abandoned his legacy, so far as he was able legally to do so, and afterward supported the helpless widow; and because of this abandonment, the vicious pro-Cleveland papers hold up George's action as a grand example rebuking Bryan. The grim humor of it lurks in the solemn insincerity of the whole thing. The same kind of newspapers that now assail Bryan as a plunderer of widows, assailed George in precisely the same way while he lived.

Efforts are being made to impeach a Federal judge of New Jersey for trying to run his court and a trust company along parallel lines as the manager of both. The name of this judge is Andrew Kirkpatrick. He is United States district judge for New Jersey and president of the Federal Trust Co. of the same State. Judge Kirkpatrick's accuser says:

Judge Kirkpatrick has since 1901 actively conducted this company's affairs with a success which is believed to be largely due to the class of investors who were attracted by his position of a promoter-judge. The names of the directors and stockholders make it apparent that their business interests would readily enable them to make the concern a money earner.

On the ground that Judge Kirkpatrick's business as a promoter is incompatible with his duties as a judge, the accuser asks President Roosevelt to recommend his impeachment. What manner of man can this accuser be? If all Federal judges were impeached and removed for cultivating financial interests that are incompatible with judicial duties, we might have a revolution in the Federal courts. That would never, never, never do! Judges must be respected, whether they respect themselves or not. President Roosevelt's duty in the Kirkpatrick case is plain. It is not to advise the House of Representatives to impeach, as the accuser asks. It is to write one of his spirited letters, rebuking the accuser—with a very great rebuke—

for assailing the honor of the American judiciary.

Congressman Boutell, of Chicago, makes an excellent suggestion in his plan for teaching good citizenship in the high schools. The course of study he proposes may be outlined as follows:

First year—City council and its committees; scrutiny of ordinances, and general study of municipal conditions.

Second year—County government, penal and charitable institutions, justice courts and jury system.

Third year—State government and duties of officials.

Fourth year—National government in its various branches.

This kind of education is urgently needed for useful citizenship. But a warning is necessary to prevent disappointment. It will not make good citizens. Some of our worst citizens could pass the best examinations on those subjects. Unfortunately education has become a species of fetish, and we hear in consequence not a little absurd preaching on educational tests for voting. Education can no more make good citizens than it can make good men. The good man will be a good citizen, whether he is educated or not. But he who is a good man and therefore a good citizen, will be a more efficient man, and therefore a more useful citizen, if his good intentions are armed with the right kind of education. This is the reason that Congressman Boutell's suggestion is welcome. Educate all citizens in the principles and details of popular government, and though you do not make good citizens of all, you will make the good ones as effective for useful citizenship as the bad ones are for evil citizenship.

EMMA BOOTH-TUCKER.

The tragic death of this leader in one of the great religious movements of the time, recalls circumstances in her life from which a profound civic lesson may be drawn.

Her charms of wifhood and motherhood are the cherished remembrances of her immediate

friends. Her devotion to the Salvation Army is the pardonable pride of her associates in that organization. With none of these things have the outside public any concern, beyond their generous appreciation of such qualities and their tender regard for the memory of this woman by whom those qualities were so signally exemplified.

But everyone should have a direct and deep personal interest in the fact that Mrs. Booth-Tucker's devotion to an exacting public service did not interfere with the fulfillment of her duties as a wife nor the performance of her obligations as a mother. On the contrary, she was doubtless all the better and stronger as wife and mother for being also a tireless leader among right-minded men and women.

There is a superstition that the good wife will have no inclination to participate in public affairs, and that the good mother will have no time for it. So wives and mothers among the poor let their brains run fallow while they bend over washtubs, and wives and mothers among the rich allow theirs to run fallow while they minister to family pride at social functions. With unconscious irony all this is called "making the home."

Women must not vote. That onerous burden would break in upon the marital and maternal duties of the washtub and the afternoon tea and so destroy the home! They must not hold public office, no matter how crying the need in our public service for feminine thought and feminine action. For with women in politics our children would be neglected, and our husbands would go unkempt and unloved, while the home would disappear from our civilization!

Against this barbaric superstition Mrs. Booth Tucker's busy and useful life was a daily protest.

True, she took no part in civic affairs. Her case cannot be cited, therefore, as a precedent for woman in politics, identical at every angle. But no possible pub-

lic service in civic affairs could be more exacting in its demands upon a woman's time and energy, or more disturbing to wifely and motherly duties, than the public religious work which Mrs. Booth-Tucker did perform so long and so successfully. Yet she leaves seven children, who have never lacked their mother's love and care.

Without detracting in the least from the particular public service to which Mrs. Booth-Tucker's life was devoted, may not that life be fairly cited as a shining instance of the perfect compatibility, with women no less than with men, of private and public service. May we not point to her career as another notable demonstration of the intimate relationship of wifely and motherly functions with the functions of citizenship, of the perfect compatibility of home-making with community-building?

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Nov. 5.

Election returns are not yet reported with sufficient completeness for tabulation, but they are full enough to reveal general results.

Ohio and Rhode Island are the only States in which the State election or its result was of special interest to democratic-Democrats generally, for in those States alone did the campaign involve vital principles of democracy in any aggressive form.

In Rhode Island (p. 424), the present governor, Lucius F. C. Garvin, whose fame has become national in consequence of his election last year as a Democrat to the highest office in a New England Republican State, and of his admirable administration, is re-elected. As his Republican opponent is a trust magnate, and as Senator Aldrich lead the Republican campaign with exceptional vigor and an extraordinarily liberal campaign fund, Gov. Garvin's re-election is regarded as a triumph not only for himself personally,

but for the clean and progressive democratic politics for which he is recognized as standing. But the Republicans have reduced his majority of last year, and again tied his hands with a ring legislature.

In Ohio (p. 472) Tom L. Johnson has been so badly beaten, both in his home city and county and in the State at large, that his defeat might be regarded, not only by his enemies but also by his friends, as an overwhelming disaster, if they looked upon him as seeking the gratification of personal ambition instead of personifying in his State a progressive political principle which, no matter how often it may be checked, can never be disastrously overwhelmed. The reported pluralities adverse to Johnson as the gubernatorial candidate are: In Cuyahoga county about 4,000; in Hamilton county about 30,000; in the State at large about 125,000. Although the vote for members of the legislature is not yet fully reported, the majority in that body on joint ballot is given as about 75 or 80. Inasmuch as Johnson made no campaign for the governorship, having devoted all his energies to the contest between Clark and Hanna for the Federal senatorship, this legislative result is the true test of the Ohio election; and it is an unmistakable victory, of great magnitude, for Senator Hanna and the friends of President Roosevelt who stumped the State in his behalf.

Mayor Johnson has issued the following statement:

The result is due to several causes, of which the chief was the successful attempt of Senator Hanna to impress on the people that a continuance of undisturbed business conditions demanded his return to the Senate.

In the last few weeks of the campaign the closing of mills and discharge of thousands of workmen, together with bank and business failures throughout the country, gave color to Senator Hanna's claim.

I hope Senator Hanna's statement that his reelection will preserve the industrial and business situation from disturbance will be verified, and that confidence, which he believes to be the basis of prosperity, will be preserved.

The Republican party used a fund larger in amount than any other fund in the history of State politics. This campaign fund was furnished by privileged

interests throughout the country, they not unnaturally feeling that Senator Hanna was their national representative.

The ultimate success of Democratic principles is only postponed by this defeat, and I urge the people of Ohio to begin now the campaign for the election of the next legislature, the selection of which will not involve the election of a United States senator, or any other national question. It can be chosen solely with reference to the questions of home rule and just taxation, in which an overwhelming majority of the people of Ohio now believe.

The New York municipal election (pp. 393, 417, 425) is next in importance to that of Ohio, and in its bearing upon the presidential politics of next year probably more significant. Under the shrewd management of Wm. C. Whitney, secretary of the navy under President Cleveland, the Tammany Hall Democracy has won a startling victory. The Tammany candidate, Geo. B. McClellan (son of Gen. Geo. B. McClellan, the Democratic candidate for President against Lincoln in 1864), was elected Mayor over Mayor Low, the fusion candidate, by the plurality of 61,615.

In Kentucky (p. 251) the Democrats re-elect Gov. Beckham by about 16,000. In Mississippi the Democratic ticket, headed by James K. Vardaman, was elected without opposition, the contest having occurred within the Democratic party at the party primaries, and there being no opposition party. In Virginia there were some Democratic gains on the vote for members of the legislature, no State ticket being in the field. In Maryland (pp. 377, 466) Senator Gorman's Democratic ticket, with Edwin Warfield for governor, was elected by about 9,000 plurality, and the legislature will be Democratic on joint ballot, thus assuring the election of a Democratic senator in place of Senator McComas, Republican. In Massachusetts (p. 424) Gov. Bates, Republican, was re-elected by a plurality of about 36,000, not far from his plurality of last year. In Iowa (pp. 377, 404), where the Democratic party was united, the "sound money" faction having dominated the convention, the Republican governor, Cummins, was re-elected by a plurality of about 81,000, about the same as last

year. Nebraska (p. 327) is claimed by the Republicans by a plurality of 8,000 on the candidate for Supreme Court justice. Colorado (pp. 394, 411) elects the Republican candidate for Supreme Court Judge by about 7,000. New Jersey elects a Republican legislature, but in Union county there was a Democratic landslide in favor of public ownership of municipal utilities. New York also elects a Republican legislature. Pennsylvania (p. 346) rolls up a majority for the Republican candidate for auditor general of 250,000. In San Francisco Mayor Schmitz, the Labor candidate, is elected over Henry J. Crocker, Republican, and Franklin K. Lane, democratic Democrat, Crocker being second and Lane third.

The only reports of side-party votes relate to the Socialists of Massachusetts (p. 411). Their vote on the State ticket is reported to have fallen off about 8,000 (about 24 per cent.) from last year (vol. iv., p. 486). The party also loses two members of the legislature, one of them being James F. Carey of Haverhill, who had been elected five times in succession. It elects one member.

In New York State a referendum proposing to bond the State for \$101,000,000, to convert the canals into deep water ways, so as to compete with the railroads, was carried by 175,000.

Ohio also had referendums. There were the following five for amending the State constitution:

1. Giving the governor the veto power.
2. Doing away with double liability on stock in corporations.
3. Separate representation for each county in the State legislature.
4. Classification of property for purposes of taxation.
5. Classification of cities for purposes of municipal legislation.

The Chicago traction question (p. 468) was revived last week by the publication of a "tentative ordinance" agreed upon in secret sessions by the sub-committee of the transportation committee of the city council. It offered a franchise for 20 years to the City Railway Co. The apparent design of the sub-committee is that this and similar ordinances be passed during the Winter in order to estab-

lish vested interests in new 20-year franchises before the people vote next April on the adoption of "the Mueller act" (p. 458), authorizing cities adopting it to establish municipal ownership. Aroused by this act of what they regard as treachery by city officials, the leaders of the municipal ownership movement have begun a brisk agitation for municipal ownership immediately.

A large mass meeting was held in this connection in Handel hall on the 1st, at which resolutions making the following demands were adopted:

1. Open meetings of the council committee on local transportation.
2. In place of granting franchise extension ordinances the council to allow the companies to run under licenses revocable at will.
3. Nothing to be done regarding extension ordinances until the Mueller act has been voted on at the next city election.
4. The council to discharge the hold-over committee on local transportation and substitute a committee of the new council, on municipal ownership with power to employ counsel and experts.

These resolutions were offered in the council on the 2d by Alderman Beilfus. With a proposed amendment to the effect that no ordinance shall be reported to the council by the traction committee until a public hearing on it shall have been had and all citizens interested have been given an opportunity to discuss it, these resolutions were referred to the traction committee. But not until a motion to suspend the rules and pass them had been defeated by the vote of 41 to 22, as follows:

Yeas—Dixon, Alling, Stuckart, Daily, Rooney, Novak, Moertel, Cerveny, Zimmer, Scully, Moran, Beilfuss, Kunz, Jozwiakowski, Dever, Sitts, Finn, Leachman, Bradley, Burns, Johnson, Race—22.

Nays—Coughlin, Kenna, Jackson, Foreman, Sloan, Mavor, Young, Snow, Bennett, Jones, Moynihan, Fick, Preib, Sindelar, Cullerton, Maypole, Conlon, Brennan, Moran, Patterson, Minwegen, Palmer, Dougherty, Sullivan, Werno, Schmidt, Ehemann, Williston, Dunn, Kuester, Blake, Butler, Raymer, Larson, O'Connell, Butterworth, Badenoch, Eldmann, Bihl, Ruxton, Hunter—41.

Meanwhile petitions for the submission of three questions, under the "public policy" or advisory referendum, are being widely circu-

lated by the Referendum League of Chicago for the signatures of voters. The questions are—

1. Shall the city of Chicago proceed, under the powers conferred in the Mueller law, to immediately acquire the present traction properties, thereby making the Mueller law effective at once?
2. Shall the city of Chicago proceed, under its police powers, and other existing laws, to license the present traction companies, in lieu of further franchise grants, and to compel immediate improvements in the service?
3. Shall the board of education be chosen by direct vote of the people?

The petitions are endorsed by the Turnverein, the Municipal Ownership League, and the Federation of Labor.

The recent stubborn civil war in Colombia (vol. v., p. 539), is now about to be supplemented by another; and it is not improbable that in the latter the United States may become involved. It relates to the reported secession of the Department of Panama from the Republic of Colombia.

Circumstances, as far as reported, indicate that the secession of Panama is part of a plan to force the preference for the Panama route over the Nicaragua route for the Isthmian canal. When Colombia rejected the Panama canal treaty (pp. 309, 311) last August, it became the duty of President Roosevelt (vol. v, p. 199) to abandon the Panama route and turn to Nicaragua. But no steps in this direction have been taken. Reports have occasionally reached the public from Washington, however, to the effect that the people of Panama were greatly excited by the refusal of their national authorities to accept the treaty. Similar reports have reached the American public directly from Panama. For instance, on the 13th of September an Associated Press dispatch from Panama stated that the Colombian government had "awakened to the seriousness of the situation on the Isthmus, and was about to take energetic steps to check the movement toward secession." Another dispatch from Panama, October 25, reported:

It is known here that a revolutionary force consisting of about 70 men landed on or about October 11 at Catalina, the port at the mouth of the Calovebora on the Atlantic coast of Colombia. This

expedition, according to information in the hands of Gov. Obaldia, is under the leadership of Federico Barrera, Lugo, and Juan Antonio Caicedo. Barrera was one of the Liberal revolutionists who took part in the capture of Colon in 1901; Lugo was one of the military chiefs in the Domingo Diaz expedition of 1901, which was defeated by forces under the late Gen. Carlos Alban after considerable fighting along the railroad between here and Colon. It is believed that the revolutionists were expecting reinforcements, but that they were disappointed and consequently returned to the coast.

On the following day Walter Wellman, whose facilities for getting "inside" information at Washington appear to be exceptional, wrote on the subject from Washington to the Chicago Record-Herald. He began:

Is the American government getting ready for the much talked-of pro-canal revolution on the Isthmus of Panama? From all appearances trouble of some sort is expected by the administration, and President Roosevelt is moving energetically to meet it, whether it be secession from Colombia by the department of Panama or an outbreak in some other region bordering on the Caribbean sea. Evidently something is up in the waters to the south of us, but just what it may be is a state secret which is being guarded most jealously. On Saturday the auxiliary cruiser Dixie was dispatched from Philadelphia with 400 marines on board. . . . Orders came from Washington for the Dixie to put to sea regardless of her condition. . . . Officials who were asked to-day where the Dixie was going said in a vague way that it "was somewhere in the Caribbean Sea." When asked to tell the exact destination or the precise object of sending her south at this time they refused to talk. A high official, who is familiar with inside naval affairs, said: "The Dixie has been sent to the Caribbean under sealed orders, which precludes me from saying anything about her cruise or the necessity for it at this time. All that I feel at liberty to say is that marines have been sent south as a proper precaution."

A week later comes news that the independence of the Isthmus of Panama was proclaimed on the 3d. This independence proclamation is reported to have been shortly preceded by the imprisonment, in the name of the "Republic of Panama," of two Colombian generals, Tovar and Amaya, who had arrived at Panama in the morning of the same day. On the 4th the city of Panama, on the Pa-

cific side of the Isthmus, was in the hands of the revolutionists, while the city of Colon, on the Atlantic side, was still in the hands of loyal Colombian troops.

From Washington the following official statement regarding the Panama revolution and the action of the American government in reference to it, was issued on the 3d:

A number of confused and conflicting dispatches have been received from the Isthmus indicating rather serious disturbances at both Panama and Colon. The navy department has dispatched several vessels to these ports with directions to do everything possible to keep travel open and maintain order along the line of the railroad.

This was in explanation, apparently, of orders reported in press dispatches on the 3d to have been—

dispatched to the cruisers Dixie and the Atlanta on the Atlantic side, and the Boston on the Pacific coast, to proceed with all possible speed to Isthmian waters to aid the Nashville in protecting American interests and maintaining a free transit across the Isthmus in accordance with the treaty of 1846. Orders also were sent to Rear Admiral Glass, commanding the Pacific squadron, consisting of the cruisers Concord, Marblehead and Wyoming, at Acapulco, to coal immediately and hold itself in readiness to proceed on a moment's notice to Panama. When the cruiser Baltimore reaches San Domingo orders will be cabled it to go to the Isthmus. The most explicit instructions are being cabled to-night to the American consuls at Panama and Colon and to the commander of the Dixie, who will be in charge of the vessels on the Atlantic side.

On the 4th Commander Hubbard, of the United States gunboat "Nashville," sent the following notice to the prefect of the city of Colon, where Colombian troops are marshalled under orders from the national government to recover the city of Panama from the revolutionists:

The condition of affairs at Panama, I am advised, is such that any movement of the Colombian troops now at Colon to that neighborhood must bring about a conflict and threaten that free and uninterrupted transit of the Isthmus which the United States is pledged to maintain. I have, therefore, the honor to notify you that I have directed the superintendent of the railroad that he must not transport on his line troops either of the government or of the opposition party.

NEWS NOTES.

—Prof. Theodor Mommsen, the famous historian, died at Berlin on the 1st.

—Ex-Congressman John E. Russell, of Massachusetts, died on the 28th of heart disease.

—President Roosevelt has appointed Thursday, the 26th, as the day of general thanksgiving.

—At an "employers' convention" held at Chicago on the 31st, a "Citizens' Industrial Association" was formed, of which David M. Parry was elected president.

—The Forward Movement, 305 West Van Buren street, Chicago, Miss M. E. Dix, superintendent in charge, will present a series of radical lectures in November by John Z. White, Judge William Prentiss, Prof. H. B. Loomis and Prof. George C. Griffith.

—John Z. White, lecturer for the Henry George association, and A. M. Simons, editor of the International Socialist Review, debated the Single Tax versus Socialism at Maplewood Opera House, Chicago, on the 1st, before a pay-audience of 1,000 people.

—Sanford B. Dole, Governor of Hawaii, was on the 31st appointed judge of the United States District Court of Hawaii by President Roosevelt, to succeed the late Judge Morris M. Estee. George R. Carter, secretary of Hawaii, was appointed governor to succeed Gov. Dole.

—The Colorado court-martial on the 2d (p. 458) convicted Gen. Chase of "technical disobedience of orders" by a vote of 6 to 4. The disobedience consisted in refusing to obey an order of the Governor directing the release of an imprisoned striker from the military prison at Cripple Creek.

—During the Democratic street campaign in Cincinnati, on the 29th, William Everett Hicks, a New York newspaper man, spoke uninterruptedly at an open air meeting at Fifth and Race streets from 2:45 in the afternoon until 11 at night. At no time did he have an audience of less than 100, and frequently it was as large as 300 or 400.

—The men's club of the Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul, corner of Washington boulevard and Peoria street, Chicago. Rev. J. D. Haslam, rector, intends to present a series of lectures by well-known radicals. The speakers announced for November are Jacob C. LeBosky, John Z. White, H. H. Hardinge and Margaret Haley.

PRESS OPINIONS.

OHIO POLITICS.

Salem (O.) Daily Herald (Dem.), Nov. 2.—The thought of accomplishing the political death of Mayor Johnson, by defeating him at the polls in a State normally Republican by eighty thousand, is an idle dream, born only in the vain ambition of the monopolist and trust magnate, as a forlorn hope to

save his class privileges and dividend watered stocks for a season indefinite.

Chicago Inter Ocean (Rep.), Nov. 5.—The overwhelming defeat of Tom L. Johnson in Ohio must be regarded as the collapse of Bryanism. Mr. Johnson was Mr. Bryan's designated heir and the chosen representative of the Bryan method in national politics.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Nov. 4.—The average Democrat is in accord and sympathy with the "reorganizers," the disciples of the Cleveland-Olney-Parker school. Messrs. Hanna and Herrick thus had very effective, if silent, support in the ranks of their nominal opponents.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Nov. 4.—The Republicans have the legislature, which the Democrats thought they might possibly be able to carry. Consequently Senator Hanna's reelection is assured. That is as it should be. Republicans generally would much dislike to see a man with Mr. Hanna's business abilities and other notable good qualities leave the Senate. He is needed there.

Chicago Chronicle (pluto-Dem.), Nov. 4.—In Ohio the defeat of Tom Johnson as a Democratic candidate for governor was plainly enough foreshadowed weeks ago when his habitual demagoguery and vituperation many of the best Democrats of the State. He no doubt gained some Republican and Socialist votes by the tactics which he pursued, but he lost much more than he gained by the operation.

Chicago Record-Herald (ind. Rep.), Nov. 5.—Johnson's burial in Ohio was so complete as to suggest that Democrats, as well as Republicans, cheerfully assisted at the obsequies. Evidently Johnson is far too radical for any party at the present time, and possibly the returns from New York, Ohio and Nebraska may presage a return of the old conservative Democracy to the command of the party organization.

(Chicago) Farmers' Voice and National Rural (ag'l), Nov. 7.—Johnson made two fights, or at least had two distinct forces in the field arrayed against him. His most bitter attacks were not directed against Hanna, Herrick and the Republican party, but against the political bosses of his own party, who he declared were disloyal to the principles of democracy and therefore infinitely more to be feared than honest Republicans who were true to their own convictions, no matter how widely those convictions might differentiate from his own. The result was that Johnson had two "machines" of tremendous power against him from the start, and his frank admission of certain defeat when he accepted the nomination, coupled with his declaration that he purposed to make the campaign an educational one for the spread of the true principles of democracy, gives to the apparently overwhelming defeat quite another character.

THE SANCTITY OF JUDGES.

Liberty (phil. an.), November.—A boodler is a boodler and a fool a fool, whatever public office he holds, and we are entitled to tell the truth about official knaves and clowns and misfits. Why, then, must an exception be made of judges? If we think they are corrupt, or ignorant, or biased, why must we nevertheless speak of them with the utmost deference? If we libel them, they have redress at law, like other folk. If we tell the truth, it is their misfortune, not our fault. How preposterous it is to maintain that we owe deference to contemptible persons when they happen to occupy the bench! . . . The greatest danger in the United States is in the usurpation and audacity of the judges. They are nullifiers of the law, not interpreters, and they go to lengths of aggression and iniquity of which ordinary legislators never dream.

MISCELLANY

From an English contributor.
FREE TRADE.

Established in Great Britain, 1846.
Attacked by a British Conservative Government, 1903.

On every sea, in every port,
Our British flag's unfurled;
Our ships, in countless thousands,
Go beating 'round the world,
They sell our goods o'er all the earth,
In every shop and stall;
And they say: "*These goods are English.*"
And Free Trade has done it all.

And the thing that made us wealthy,
And the thing that made us great,
Is the thing they now are crying down,
Our Ministers of State;
And our tribe of traitor traders
Is arising, at their call,
In the hope of robbing Englishmen,
Behind a tariff wall.

There are men so short of vision,
There are men so full of greed,
They would sell their souls forever,
Could their passing plans succeed;
They would put a price on Paradise,
And, as the coin was told,
Would find their present heaven
In the thinking of the gold.

So they cry: "Free Trade's a failure;"
And would copy other lands,
Which have tried in vain to meet us
With the labor of their hands—
The nations we have driven
From the fair and open field,
To prey on their own populace,
Behind protection's shield.

Who can call Free Trade a failure,
But the blind that lead the blind?
God send us many failures more
Of such another kind.
It's a failure that has stood a test
Two generations long;
It's a failure that succeeded,
And has made us rich and strong.

It has flourished like a British oak;
Its top the heavens keep;
It has strengthened with a hundred storms,
Its roots have stricken deep;
It has been our pride and profit,
From the morning of its birth;
It has grown, until our commerce
Has o'ershadowed all the earth.

It's the heritage our fathers' fathers
Left to us in trust,
To be handed down, untouched,
When we are dust among the dust;
We must cheat our children's children
On the day we let it go.
Shall we lend it? Shall we spend it?
Shall we basely steal it? NO!

On every sea, in every port,
Our merchant flag's unfurled;
Our ships, in countless thousands,
Go beating round the world,
They sell our goods o'er all the earth,
In every shop and stall;
They just say: "*These goods are English.*"
And Free Trade has done it all.
BERTRAND SHADWELL.

* Let all Britons rejoice that the principal offender is now only an ex-minister, and that only a few British traders have become traitors.

AN INDIAN VIRTUE.

That "there is no good Indian but a dead Indian" is accepted by many who know little or nothing of that race beyond the quoted sentence. How good the smooth white rascals are who swindle the red men by utilizing their authority as Federal officials is a question that doesn't receive much consideration at the hands of that class whose credulous members may be surprised to learn that experienced whites have formed the highest opinion of the honesty of Indians. Stewart Edward White, in a recent number of "The Outlook," relates that Mr. MacDonald, of Brunswick House, once discussed with him the system of credits carried on by the Hudson Bay company with the trappers. Each family is advanced goods to the value of \$200, with the understanding that the debt is to be paid from the season's catch.

"I should think you would lose a good deal," said Mr. White. "Nothing could be easier than for an Indian to take his \$200 worth and disappear in the woods. You'd never be able to find him."

Mr. MacDonald's reply struck him, for the man had 20 years' trading experience. "I have never," said he, "in a long woods life, known but one Indian liar."

That would be proud testimony to give concerning any class of white men.—City and State.

OCCIDENTAL CIVILIZATION ILL-MANNERED.

The gaucherie of the foreigner, many competent observers agree in stating, is a constant offense to the Oriental, and goes far to account for the fact that outward subservience under compulsion only intensifies the antagonism of hidden contempt. A contributor to the London Spectator has pointed out, in a somewhat minute study of race antipathy, that "the manners of the European always strike the Asiatic as plebeian." He expects in an equal or superior "a kind of smoothness which few Europeans possess." Even in minor details, the European "grates" on the Asiatic, his laugh being "as disagreeable as the laugh of the uncultivated is to the refined European." To the Asiatic "very few Europeans appear to be gentlemen, and those few only when they are not familiar."

This wide difference in point of view is encountered at every turn. What in the strenuous life of our great cities is a too trivial incident for notice, the continual jostling against one another in our hurry, is in Japan a serious act of rudeness constituting a personal tres-

pass. The "rush hour" of our crowded street cars, when human beings, regardless of sex, are rounded up and herded for conveyance, would there be held simply intolerable.—Scribner's Magazine.

EXPENSIVE.

It was a beautiful evening in the Spring of 2001. The moon shone pale and transcendent in the clouds above, and as the two lovers sat close together, no sound was heard save the stealthy tread of the one spectator to their tryst.

The young man pressed the maiden to his heart, and turning her face to his, was about to kiss her, when she drew back.

"Darling," she asked, anxiously, "what is the tax on kisses?"

"One dollar each," he observed, grimly, "but I don't care if my salary is mortgaged up to next Christmas. I'm desperate for a kiss."

"Don't!" she said, pleadingly. "The tax assessor is watching our every movement and is ready to chalk it down. You know, even now, it is costing you 50 cents an hour to be with me."

"I know it!" exclaimed her lover, "but, my darling, aside from our own cramped finances, you know the trusts must live. The head of the Lovers' Trust is only worth eight trillions, and suppose we should go out of business! Why, his dividends might be cut down. No, no. Let us love, even if the tax is raised to a dollar an hour and there is no bread in the house. I must be true to my country's best interests."

"You are right," she said, yielding to his superior mind.

And as their lips met in a long, lingering dollar kiss, the registering machine, planted 20 feet back of them, clicked out its ominous sound, showing that Jack Jones, American citizen, had been docked for one kiss by the United States Amalgamated Lovers' Trust.—Life.

THE HOUSEMAID'S STRUGGLE FOR EMANCIPATION.

Extracts from an article on "The Servant Problem," by Miss Jane Addams, published in Good Housekeeping for September, 1902.

At the last Lake Placid conference it was contended that future historical review may show that the girls who are to-day in domestic service are the really progressive women of the age, who are blindly fighting against conditions which limit their freedom. They are demanding avenues of self-expression

outside their work, and that this struggle from conditions detrimental to their highest life is the ever-recurring story of the emancipation of first one class and then another. It was further contended that in this effort to become sufficiently educated and able to understand the needs of an educated employer from an independent standpoint, they are really doing the community a great service, and did they but receive cooperation instead of opposition the whole position of domestic service would lose its social ostracism and attract a more intelligent class of women. And yet this effort, perfectly reasonable from the standpoint of historic development and democratic tradition, receives little help from the employing housekeeper, and there is no room for doubt that the mass of them would be content with the old regime if it only ran smoothly. They not only fail to make conscious effort to readjust their household affairs, but they complain bitterly when they are overwhelmed by the increasing difficulties experienced in procuring and retaining domestic employes. The underlying causes of the difficulty remain a mystery to most of them, although some light could be thrown upon it by a perusal of the immigration bureau report.

The problems of food and shelter must in every age be considered in relation to all other mechanical and industrial life, quite as the family morality and intellectual life must finally depend for its vitality upon its relation to the spiritual and intellectual resources of the rest of the community. Fullness of life can be secured for the family as for the individual only when it embodies a demand for like opportunity for all other individuals, even including those engaged in its service, and brings us back at last to the ever-recurring problems of democracy.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL.

HE IS DISSATISFIED WITH PROSPERITY.

Printed from the original Ms.

Dear John: What's the matter with my Republican party, anyway? It's got the President. It's got both houses of Congress, and the Supreme Court. It can do anything it wants to, and yet labor has to strike to get enough to eat. I never had so many strikes since '76. It has Shaw standin' at the treasury door a-shovelin' gold into Wall street with a barn shovel; and banks is a bustin' all over the country. What the dickens ails things!

It can't be that Theodore has "shackled" trusts. He has never shackled a grasshopper. The trusts have their own

Attorney General, their own Congress, their own President, their own Federal courts, and yet they bust. They have the gold standard, but it does 'em no good. They'd like to have free silver if they could get it without ownin' up, so they demand asset currency. Assets are not a money metal, but "something just as good," and the roast is only just begun. Fact is, some of 'em will be howlin' for Bryan to put water on their tongues before they get through, but that won't aid 'em. They are beyond the aid of sound, silver and gold, money. Assets may aid them, but don't now, and what's the matter?

I believe I know, John. It's lack of wit. When a country has cowboys for statesmen, and thieves and grafters for office holders, it must pay the penalty. Where I now have that kind of cattle I used to have men of standing and ability. They might be wrong, but they were men of standing where they lived, and had reputations. Where I used to have Webster and Hayne, and Sumner and Benton, and Lincoln and Giddings, and Ben Wade and Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, I now have a pack of nobodies that you must look up in the pages of "Who's a-Whoopin' Himself," or the lists of indicted in the criminal courts.

You mind, John, the story of the Spartan boy who stole a young fox or wolf, and hid it in his bosom, and let the thing gnaw him till he dropped dead, rather than own up he was wrong? I never took no stock in him—too much of a coward. Now an old-fashioned American boy would a-dropped the fox when it first bit him, and kicked it over a stone wall; but my modern boys ain't that kind. I have 7,000,000 Republican Spartans now, lettin' their wolf trusts and combines eat the very daylight out of 'em, rather than own up they are wrong, and a-huggin' 'em up till they die. It's lack of sound sense, that's all there is to it. They'll go on in the same way votin' for Abraham Lincoln and the party of A. Lincoln, till they drop. Now, A. Lincoln is dead, at least so I've hearn tell, and Republican wolves have been a-wearin' his clothes and worryin' the sheep, nigh on to forty year; but the old moss-backed Republicans—they'll never find out—not in this world. It's lack of wit.

UNCLE SAM.

THE SOUTHERN (NOT THE NEGRO) QUESTION.

A portion of an editorial with the above title, which appeared in the New York Nation of October 22.

Human nature being what it is, a community in which the population is divided not very unequally between two dis-

inct races is, other things being equal, at a disadvantage as compared with another in which there is no such division. This is true where the two races are as closely allied as Czech and German, and where language is the principal and perhaps the only badge of distinction. Where the two races are separated by as wide a physical gulf as divides the Caucasian and the Negro, the resulting loss of effective strength in the community as a whole will be much greater. There would be much race friction even if the two races were, morally and mentally, substantially equal. There will be still more when one race, whether because of racial peculiarities or as a result of the operation of historical causes, is on the average, morally and mentally, markedly inferior to the other. The overwhelming majority of the white men of the South believe that the Negro as a race is incapable of attaining to the moral and intellectual level to which the white race may ascend. If they are right, the South will fall far short of making as much of its resources as will be made by the other sections of the country out of such natural advantages as they may have. In the long run it is men, rather than things, which tell. If it be true that the average Negro not only is not, but never can be, as valuable a member of the community as the average white man, it is still of enormous importance to the South that he shall be as useful as it is possible for him under any conditions to become. Nothing else is quite so vital to its future. Its direct interest in the problem of making the Negro as high a type of man as he is capable of becoming is far greater than that of the rest of the country, because in large part its own future depends upon the successful solution.

It is easy for one race or people to push down another, and there are many ways of doing it. There is only one way to reverse the process, and in that no one outside of the race which is struggling upwards can be of much help, although it is easy to hinder. Climbing up is a slow and painful process. If a whole race is to be elevated, there must be many weary workers slowly and coggedly struggling upwards. Whether they will so struggle depends upon whether, in their view, the prizes which await them at the top are worth the effort to get there. The future prospects of the South in very large part depend upon its Negro population (now in large measure thriftless, immoral and unenlightened) becoming industrious, virtuous and intelligent. It is going to be very hard for these Negroes so to elevate themselves. Can the South afford to say to them: "Strive as you choose,

succeed as you can; but, whatever you do, so long as there is a discernible drop of African blood in your veins, you shall never be allowed to obtain many of those things which men of all races and in all ages have most keenly longed for?"

THE FARM LABORERS AND THEIR VISITOR.

G. A. Ring, in the London Speaker of October 30.

A DIALOGUE.

"I am prepared to go into any labourer's house."—Mr. Chamberlain, May 28.

In pursuance of his plan, Mr. Chamberlain recently visited two farm laborers, William and John.

William—What do you think of this here notion of Measter Chamberlain's for raising our wages, Jack?

John—Why, Bill, I'm thinking 'twould be a good job to raise the wages of farm laborers of the likes of you and me, as we have got barely enough now to keep a family decent on; but how's he a-going to do it?—that's what I should like to know.

William—Well, Jack, I suppose he told you about the corn that's going a-using in this country, and how there's twice more brought from foreign ports, mostly America, than's grown at home?

John—Yes, I know that.

William—Well, you see, what Master Chamberlain wants is to put a tax on all the corn that America sends into England, so that'll make corn dearer.

John—How would making corn dear give us more wages?

William—Well, I don't rightly understand, but from what I hear some of them are arguing like this: The farmer, they say, pays the wages out of the money he gets for his crops, and if he could get more money for his crops he could pay more wages.

John—Maybe he could, Bill, but I doubt that he would, though.

William—Do ye?

John—Yes, and I'll tell you why. Suppose Farmer Brown over yonder gets a bigger price for his corn. Well, for him it's just like as if he got more corn out of his land.

William—Will you explain that, Jack? I don't quite understand.

John—It's like this, Bill. Take an acre of land. If it's real good land the farmer will get, maybe, five quarters of wheat out of it, whilst another farmer with poor land, like enough, will not get more nor three quarters with the same labor and manure.

William—Yea! that's Gospel truth.

John—Well, you see, wheat is now selling at 27s. 6d. a quarter, and one

farmer will have two quarters of wheat more than the other out of an acre, and he can sell this for twice 27s. 6d., which is £1 15s.

William—I know two farms, Jack, about the same size which goes to prove what you are saying. There's Whiteacre, rich low-lying land, and Blackacre, up towards the downs, which is poor land. They've got the same number of men working on each farm, but Whiteacre grows far more to an acre than Blackacre.

John—I know those two farms well. Now, Bill, I'm going to ask you a question. Do the farm laborers on Whiteacre get more wages than the laborers on Blackacre?

William—Not a copper. For I've worked in my time on both farms and know what the wages are.

John—Now, you see that a laborer doesn't get any more wages because the farmer gets more money for an acre of corn.

William—That seems so.

John—Well, supposing Measter Chamberlain puts a tax of 5s. on foreign wheat, then Farmer Brown here will sell his wheat dearer, and he won't have to pay any tax.

William—So that for every quarter he would get 5s. more?

John—Yes, something like that, and the same, too, with all the farmers in this country; but would you and me get any more, Bill?

William—I don't believe we should get any more, seeing that the men at Whiteacre get no more wages than those at Blackacre, although the farmer gets more from the land.

John—And what's more, Bill, when wheat is dearer up goes the price of bread. No doubt of that, and no more wages to buy it with either.

William—I see now what I didn't understand before, that dear corn would not mean more wages, but less bread for the poor farm laborer and his wife and children.

John—And the tenant-farmer would be no better off either, because the landlord would be wanting more rent when the corn was selling for more.

William—That's true, too, for they're telling me the rent of Whiteacre is twice that of Blackacre.

John—So, you see, the only one who gets good out of a tax on corn is the landowner.

William—Yes, I see that now; but somehow or other 'tain't the same as Measter Chamberlain was a-saying.

In some quarters, crime seems to be regarded chiefly as raw material for journalism.—Puck.

A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW.

"I am tired of all this talk about child labor!" exclaimed Mrs. Chauncey Ballew to a small gathering of friends around her afternoon tea table.

"How on earth are the lower classes to learn to work if they don't begin young? The mill is really a great benefit to the children, because it keeps them off the streets where they learn all kinds of mischief."

"But—wouldn't it be better," seriously inquired a young lady who was known to be a college graduate, and who had been carefully trained to ask very deep questions and to be perfectly content with the most shallow answers—"wouldn't it be better for the children to be in school?"

"The lower classes do not need a higher education," replied Mrs. Ballew, soaring into high irrelevance. "The whole trouble with them is that they have too much education already. It makes them dissatisfied and unfit for their duties in life. I think this is now becoming generally recognized everywhere."

"And besides, the associations are so bad in the public schools!" said a handsome young matron with an air of deep concern. "I heard a woman—a lady, she was, but somewhat eccentric—who insisted on sending her children to the public school—and she had to take them out—almost immediately! They picked up the most terrible expressions and wanted to associate with children of dreadful people—blacksmiths and painters and carpenters! Oh, the associations in the public schools are beyond expression!"

"The idea of sending one's children to the public school!" exclaimed several voices at once. "How shocking! What could she expect? What made her do it?"

"Would the associations be better in the mill?" asked the college bred girl, as she took out her notebook.

"I should think—yes, I am quite sure—the conditions in the mill are much better for the children of the poor than the public school," said Mrs. Ballew benignly. "To begin with, they don't allow much conversation in the mills nowadays—so my husband says. The operatives can work much faster if they are not allowed to talk—so, of course, you see, the children cannot hear as much evil as they would in the schools."

"Oh, Mrs. Ballew! I am so glad!" cried the fair college graduate, with enthusiasm—"I am so glad to hear a practical, common-sense view of this question! And, of course, Mr. Ballew

knows! He has had so much experience with all those mills he controls! I've been troubled over this question of child labor! One sees it talked of in every newspaper and magazine!"

"Yes," yawned the young matron, who was the mother of two beautiful, golden-haired cherubs—"I wish they'd begin to talk about something else!"

"My dear!" cried Mrs. Ballew, taking the college-bred girl's hand impulsively in her own. "my dear, there is one thing you must learn—you must never fall into the mistake of judging the poor by ourselves! They're totally different!"

"In every respect!" murmured the young matron, raising her tiny silver teaspoon in emphasis.

"All these things are regulated by a Divine law of compensation," continued Mrs. Ballew. "The poor do not suffer as we imagine, because they are made differently! They have not the same nerves or sensibilities—or anything else!"

"How wonderful!" cried the college-bred girl, opening out her note-book with fresh zeal. "Do you really mean, dear, that they have not the same nervous system that we have? Have the doctors discovered any radical differentiation in their nerve centers—or do you suppose it is in the cerebellum? Or could it be merely a matter of circulation—or heart pulsations?"

(She had been through a course in physiology and felt competent to take an intelligent part in the discussion.)

"I don't know about that," answered Mrs. Ballew, a little doubtfully, "it would be a very interesting question to put to a physician—I only mean that they don't feel things as we do—such things as hunger and cold, for instance."

"Oh, I think this is most interesting! Do you mean that they really don't mind being hungry?"

"Don't be a goose, Edith!" laughed the young matron. She happened to be the elder sister of the college-bred girl.

Mrs. Ballew paused and thought deeply for a second. She then expressed herself with firmness.

"Of course they feel hunger in a way—they have to eat to live, you know—but I doubt if they begin to feel the cold as we do! Now, I can tell that by my own servants. They never know the state of the weather—never! When I come down in the morning—and ask my waitress if it is colder than the day before, she never knows! Not one of them ever knows—not even my butler!"

"One can never depend on one's servants to tell anything about the weather!" said the young matron, contemptuously; "they are absolutely insensible to changes of heat and cold—all mine are!"

"That's just what I said!" cried Mrs. Ballew, triumphantly, "and that is why we have so much trouble keeping our houses properly heated—the servants can't tell heat from cold!"

The college-bred girl leaned forward anxiously.

"Do you suppose their working and moving about actively could have anything to do with it? I don't feel the cold myself when I take much exercise."

The matron laughed scornfully. "Servants, my dear Edith, never take too much exercise! They're the laziest set of creatures in the world—what on earth have they to do but sweep and dust? Nothing!"

"Then," concluded the college-bred girl, reopening her note book and writing down each word with firm emphasis as she spoke, "then, it's proved that the working people are differently made from ourselves—and we don't need to worry about them at all!"

"Except to be charitable—and to try to elevate them," sighed Mrs. Ballew.

The meeting then broke up and they all rustled off to five o'clock church, for the bells were ringing.—Caroline H. Pemberton, in *The Comrade*.

WHICH AN' T'OTHER,

OR

A SINGLE TAXER, WILLY NILLY.

For The Public.

"If you were the owner of a claybank, an acre in extent, and I owned a diamond mine of equal size, adjoining, which of us ought to be taxed the higher?"

"Why, you, of course."

"Why so?"

"Oh, come off!"

"But I wish to know why."

"Know why!" Any blamed fool knows why!"

"Perhaps so; but different persons have different ideas as to the cause, or ground of taxation. I beg to know yours."

"Well, the dyanon' mine's wuth the most, ain't it?"

"Certainly."

"Well, that's my idee why it ort to be taxed th' most; see?"

"Yes, I see. But how much the more ought it to be taxed?"

"W'y, 'cordin' t' its vally, o' course."

"Oh! Then, in your opinion it is the VALUES of these two pieces of land,

and not their extent, that should be taxed?"

"W'y, sut'nly. What d'you think about it?"

"I agree with you perfectly."

"Course ye do. Whut blanked fool wouldn't?"

"Exactly. Now, assuming that you own an acre of land that is so poor that it would barely pay you to work it, provided it was not taxed at all; how much tax ought you to pay on it?"

"Ha, ha! ha!—I'd give the blamed thing away!"

"Couldn't pay any tax on that kind of land, eh?"

"Whut! Work on t'other land to git money to pay taxes on such a piéce o' good-fer-nothin' ground? Blamed 'f I wouldn't donate it t' the church, an' done with it!"

"Yes; but we are supposing that it would pay you to work the land, provided you had no tax to pay."

"Oh, well; that hein' the case, 'f I hadn't got no tax t' pay, 'course I'd wuk the land; that is, 'f I could make as much a wukin' it 's I could at suthin' else."

"All right. That is what I call sound philosophy. But now, suppose that you own a hundred acres of land that is a little better than this one acre; could you afford to pay a little tax on it?"

"Wall, mebbly; jest a leetle."

"Suppose this land was ten per cent. better than the one acre; could you stand taxation to that extent?"

"Don't b'lieve I could, 'squire; sca'cely."

"But suppose the law demanded that much tax; you'd pay it, rather than donate the hundred acres to the church, wouldn't you?"

"Well, sence ye put it thataway, I reckon mebbly I would, 'squire; I reckon mebbly I would."

"Very good. Now I want you to try and imagine that I own a hundred-acre farm, adjoining you on the south. And imagine, too, that my land is ten per cent. better than yours,—what would be a fair tax assessment against my land?"

"Wall, lemme see, 'squire, lemme see. (I used t' be putty peart at figgers, putty peart.) Lemme see. My farm is ten per cent. better than that there acre that wouldn't stan' no tax, an', by gum, the law taxes it all away from me. Now, your land is ten per cent. better'n mine, w'ich makes it twenty per cent. better'n that there acre thet wa'n't taxed at all. Bein' as such is the case, t'won't be no fair shake 'f they don't sarve you the same, 'squire."

"What! make me pay twice as much tax as you, on an equal extent of land?"

"I allow, 'squire, it don't look quite nateral, but value is value, whether it's a di'mon' mine, or fertile farm land. What's sass fer the goose is sass fer the gander. How'll ye trade farms, 'squire?"

"Trade farms?"

"Yes."

"How will you trade?"

"Even, by gum."

"I don't see that either of us would gain anything by trading upon that basis, so long as your plan of taxation is in force."

"Jest about which an' t'other, ain't it, 'squire?"

"That expresses it nicely, as I view the question."

"Well, 'squire, s'pose I let ye off at the same rate of taxation that I pay; then how'd ye trade?"

"I should ask a premium to boot."

"More'n likely, 'squire; more'n likely. S'pose we swap farms, 'squire, then would ye consent to cut my taxes to the ten per cent. level?"

"Not I! That would give you an advantage over me."

"What! ye don't mean to say ye'd make me pay twicet as much tax as you, on an ekal amount o' land?"

"I confess, it does make a difference whose ox is being gored. But, say, if we tax land values on this plan, we shall have enough to run the government without levying any other kind of taxation whatever; let's do it."

"Might as well, I reckon. It's plain that 'f we don't tax in this way, some will have an unfair advantage of others, and it's jest as plain thet 'f we do tax in this way, we'll have all the public moneys we need. But, then, 'squire, what about them there millionaires? We must tax them, 'squire."

"Isn't it the present plan of taxation that makes millionaires on the one hand, and poor men on the other? The millionaire will dodge his personal taxes in spite of all we can do. Our present plan of taxation makes millionaires faster than we can catch them for personal taxation. The millionaire laughs in his sleeve every time he hears a poor man insist upon taxing the rich man's personalty. He knows we can easily find, and value, his railroad rights-of-way and immensely valuable terminals, his mineral lands and enormously valuable city sites. He knows that so soon as we stop hunting for his elusive personal property, and turn to levying equitable taxation solely on his land values, that moment his unrighteous gains will cease, his monopoly of the mines will end, the excessive tax burdens of honest industry will be lifted, and under the beneficent influences of

equality of opportunity, all men will have a chance to rise in affluence, corresponding to their industry. The single tax on land values would stop the making of millionaires, and start the making of prosperous millions—"

"Hold on, 'squire! Shake! I'm with ye!"

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

"LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET.

A PLUTE WHO HAD IT FIXED.

Going through New Zealand I had made the acquaintance of Jim Merritt, who was traveling out of Pittsburg. Jim was one of the easiest men on earth to get next to. We met first at the dinner-table after leaving Onehunga for Wellington, and Jim was the life of the party. He passed everything, from pickles and jam to good-natured remarks. There was a good sea running after leaving the Heads, in consequence of which many a poor hod ducked before pie time. When we went on deck we found nearly everybody regretting something—some more, some less, depending on how strong their appetites had been before we got outside the Heads. Jim and I went into the smoke-room, lighted cigars, ordered a little of what made Kentucky famous, and proceeded to discuss things. In about two minutes he told me he was a Henry George man, whereupon I pressed the button for more goods from Kentucky—I felt like annexing the State. We traveled together as far as Christchurch, where he was delayed, so he couldn't take the next train for Dunedin. We parted with the understanding that we would meet on the Steamer Omaru—from Bluff, New Zealand, to Hobart, Tasmania—four days later.

The first two days after leaving New Zealand the sea was pretty rough. The Omaru was a 2,000 ton boat, but with less than 40 tons of freight aboard we were tossed about like a man out of a job.

The first evening out the dining-room was well filled—probably 125 passengers were fed and watered. The next morning only seven showed up. The third day the sea calmed down: the sun came out, and quite a few came on deck. Among them were a family we had met before—an elderly man and his wife, and their daughter. For two days they had been under the weather, but were feeling all right now. I sat down near them, remarking as I did so that we had evidently taken on more passengers during the night. The old lady smiled and said: "I fancy a lot of them would have been glad to get off yesterday."

"Well," said I, wrapping my rug about me, "I wish I could have stopped in New Zealand altogether. It's a delightful country."

"I've just one objection to it," put in the man; "it's too much of a laboring man's country."

"How's that?" I asked.

"Everybody has a right to vote there. Why, even the women vote!"

"And you object to that?"

"I certainly do. I went there looking for an investment, but I'll be blowed if I put my money into a country where every irresponsible has as much to say about the laws as I have."

At first I thought he was kidding, but soon concluded he was handing it out proper.

"How would you have it?" I asked, as Jim came up dragging his chair and rug after him.

"I would have people vote according to the value of their holdings," he replied, warmly. "If you own stock in a corporation do you let outsiders determine its policy?"

"Not on your life."

"Well, what's the difference between that proposition and the other?"

"To start with," I ventured, "it would be dangerous to regard a man as an outsider simply because he don't own property."

"Why?"

"For instance, in case of war you wouldn't want it said you were asking outsiders to defend your country, would you?"

"N-no, I suppose not."

"Nor pay your taxes?"

"Oh, I suppose there is some difference," he admitted, side-stepping the question; "and really I wouldn't object if the voters had a little sense."

"Ah," put in Jim, as he lighted a cigar, "you are in favor of restricting suffrage on the basis of intelligence."

"I would favor that in the absence of a property qualification."

"Who would decide who is intelligent enough to vote?" asked Jim, puffing away at his weed.

"Oh, we could have a board decide," replied the old fellow, confidently.

"That would be a great scheme," laughed Jim; "who'd choose the board?"

"The professors could attend to that," I observed.

"Or the hot-air cadets," murmured Jim.

"I fail to understand the occasion for apprehension in that regard," urged the old gentleman. "What would be simpler than to have such a board appointed by parliament?"

"Nothing," replied Jim, "that would be an easy graft—like getting money from home."

"I wonder what kind of a bunch they'd deal out," I mused.

"Mostly lalapatusers," returned Jim; "preachers, professors and wise guys. The people would stand about as much show as a snowball in Cuba."

"You gentlemen are unduly prejudiced," put in the old fellow. "Such a board could be thoroughly representative. Investigations could be conducted as civil service examinations are, and everybody would be fairly treated."

"There is this difference, Mr. Fotheringham," said Jim, re-lighting his cigar; "if you ask a man, for instance, how he would determine the area of a circle, it's a cinch, and no private interests are involved in the answer; but you ask him who has to stand a tax on imports, and the board might rule him off for handing it out straight."

"I don't agree with you," returned the other; "you must remember there would be a board to decide, instead of one or two men."

"That's all right, but the board would be chosen by parliament. If it was a protectionist parliament they'd choose a lot of sausages; and if the fellow being examined said that protection was a fraud and a robbery, they'd rule him off the track."

"Well, they ought to."

"That's what you think," retorted Jim. "Your crowd would disqualify me; but if the board was composed of fellows like me, they might disqualify you."

"Now, take the question of prison labor," continued Jim; "a lot of people think convicts should not work—"

"If I had my way, convict labor would not be countenanced," interrupted the old fellow.

"I'm with you, there, sir," said I; "if I had my way they'd rest easy after they got behind the slats."

"Surely you would have them do something," exclaimed the old lady. "Otherwise they might become insane."

"Oh, mamma!" cried the daughter; "what do you know about it?"

"Sakes alive, Beatrice, don't I know people must have something to occupy their minds?"

"Mrs. Fotheringham is quite right," said I. "People must do something. When I said I would have them rest easy, I meant so far as doing useful work is concerned. If they were compelled to play golf or football, we on the outside would have more work to do."

"That's a fact," cried Jim. "What the people want is work. And that reminds me of the objection Admiral Pierson made the other day to international disarmament. 'You saw that, didn't you, sir?' looking toward the old gentleman.

"No, I don't believe I did."

"Why, he said it would be the worst thing that could happen; that it would throw thousands of men out of work who are now employed in the armies and navies."

"That certainly seems reasonable," yawned the old fellow.

"I never thought of it in that light before," said I.

"I never did either," proceeded Jim. "But since the admiral mentioned it I've been thinking if it came to a show down we might pension the soldiers."

"That would help some," I agreed.

"And if that didn't solve the labor question, we could pension the rest of the unemployed," continued Jim. "And, to show we know a good thing when we see it, we could increase the pensions occasionally. I tell you there are a lot of ways to keep the people busy."

"Oh, I don't know that we need to worry much about the people," drawled the old gentleman; "they're getting along all right."

"Do you think the stokers on this ship ought to be satisfied with their layout?"

"I think they're getting about all they're worth."

"Why, man alive," shouted Jim; "if we had just conditions the wages of a stoker would be equal to a captain's."

"Pshaw," laughed the other; "who'd be a captain with such a choice?"

Just then the Captain came around the corner of the wheelhouse where we were sitting.

"Good morning, ladies and gentlemen," said he, bowing pleasantly.

"Good morning, Captain," we chorused.

"We've just been having a discussion, Captain," said Jim; "and we want you to help us out."

"What is it about, astronomy or callisthenics?"

"Neither," responded Jim. "It was stated that if the pay of stokers and captains were equal no one would want to be a captain. If you had your choice, at the same pay, which would you choose?"

"Captain, of course."

"What!" cried the old gentleman, about two jumps ahead of a fit, "do you mean to say that if you had your choice between being a stoker, with no responsibility, and captain with all of its responsibilities—the responsibility, for instance, of safely piloting this great

ship about on the high seas with its cargo of human freight, not to mention the thousand and one other responsibilities involved—if you had your choice of those positions, at the same pay, do you mean to say you would choose to be captain?"

"I certainly do. Why, sir, these responsibilities require of me nothing but experience and knowledge. Having acquired these I have the easiest time of any man aboard ship. On the other hand, a stoker's life is a veritable hell on earth. I wouldn't take his place if they gave me the ship for once across."

"Why is it, then, you can hire a stoker for two pounds a week?" inquired the old gentleman, as if he had a half-nelson on the Captain.

"Because I can get about three stokers for every one I have a place for," returned the other.

"That's it exactly," put in Jim; "and I say it's as unnatural for two or three men to be bidding against each other for a job as it is for a man to walk on his head."

"How would you prevent it?" asked the old fellow.

"By increasing opportunities."

"How?"

"That's where I live," replied Jim. "Did you ever stop to think how the world lives? The houses we live in, the shops we trade in, the factories we work in, the ships and trains we travel in, all come from land. No man can work on anything else, and hold his job. Now, if you don't let men use land, ain't it a cinch they can't make Sunday clothes?"

"That seems plausible as far as it goes."

"Well, then, wouldn't it be a good play to frame our laws so no man could profit by owning land he can't use?"

"I don't see how that would help matters any."

"Why, sir," persisted Jim, "it would force all unused land on the market. If you make it unprofitable to hold land idle it will be cheap. The less labor and capital have to pay to use it, the more they will use, and the greater will be their demand for help. Why, there is room for 10,000,000 people in New Zealand, with land put to its best use."

"And how would you manage to put it to its best use?"

"By compelling land owners to pay annually into the public treasury what the privilege of using it is worth."

"But that wouldn't be practical," said the old gentleman, determined to have the last word.

"You mean you hope it wouldn't be practical," returned Jim, with a grin. "Let's go down to dinner; that will give you strength to pray to God it won't be tried."

And we went down to the board where it isn't good manners to hold seats you don't use.

M. J. FOYER.

Oh, ye can hold the rivulets of the plain
A little while from nuptials with the sea,
But the fierce mountain stream of Liberty
Not edicts and not hosts may long restrain.

—William Watson.

"Why, they've been sellin' the post office all sorts of things at all sorts of prices."

"Yep. It's a wonder somebody didn't sell a lot of two-cent stamps at three cents apiece."—Puck.

Hereupon the man gave himself up to despair.

"I shall starve! There is nothing in the house but breakfast food, and I am thoroughly committed to the no-breakfast cure!" he exclaims, the tears trickling down his bronzed cheeks.

Of course, he is too proud to beg.—Puck.

Out of the beam in his own eye, and the stumbling-block which he puts in his neighbor's way, man builds himself an ugly house in his heart and for eternity; and this house is called hell.—Adolph Roeder, in *The New Christianity*.

Gambling is so deadly because it almost always means avarice. Every other interest is swallowed up by the greedy desire of getting—of getting, without work rendered in return, and always at the expense, often the ruin, of one's neighbors.—G. F. Watts.

Lawyer (to promoter)—Is this your signature on this check for \$234,000,000?
Promoter—How much?

"Two hundred and thirty-four million dollars."

"Let me see the check. Oh, yes; that's my signature all right, but I hadn't noticed the amount when I signed it."—New York Press.

Jim Dumps is sad and grieves all day;
And Force no longer makes him sunny.
The tariff trusts that on him prey,
Have taken all his surplus money.

Jim Dumps will ne'er be Sunny Jim,
Till tariff trusts stop robbing him.

The Professor of History—In the great rebellion, how many soldiers fought on the Union side?

The Pupil—About 15,000,000.

"Great Scott, man! You must have got your information from the pension lists!"—Life.

"If I had my way," said the man of high principles, "there would be no money in politics."

"But," said Senator Sorghum, "if you didn't put any money in politics, it isn't likely you could have your way."—Washington Star.

BOOKS

THE WIND TRUST.

One of the cleverest pamphlets that has appeared in some time is Rev. John Snyder's *The Wind Trust* (James H. West Co., Boston).

It was during the reign of the Caliph Omar. In some combat the life of this Pearl of the Universe had been saved by one Hossein ben Osman. On being asked to name his reward, this brave and humble Ben asked only that he be made the owner of the winds blowing over his lord's spicy realm. They laughed him to scorn and the Pearl of the Universe remarked that he wished all his creditors were as easily satisfied.

How the laugh was turned is the story here told; for not only did ships and windmills pay tribute to Hossein's trust, but by a majority of one the supreme court decided in a test case that the terms of the franchise included air.

Finally comes the revolution, and the wind barons are overthrown after a fierce conflict. It is hard to see why the author makes "Buffalo" the leader of the revolutionists.

J. H. DILLARD.

M'NEILL'S POEMS.

George E. McNeill's long and distinguished service in the American labor movement is recommendation enough for this collection of his poems. The subjects are varied, however, comprising such topics as Nature, Religion, Patriotism and Men, as well as Labor. (*Unfrequented Paths*.) James H. West Co., Boston. Price \$1.50. Yet they harmonize in spirit with the opening verses, "As we walked through unfrequented paths," which give title to the book.

McNeill's patriotism is not of the "right or wrong" kind. He has no boasting rhymes for his country's wickedness, as may be inferred from his prayer for our "people vain and proud, and false to the high trust by Thee imposed" in which this patriotic confession occurs: We've sinned against the Indian in our greed;

We've sinned against the black man in his woe;
We've sinned against the poor man in his need;

Shall we not reap the harvest that we sow?

The poem on William Jennings Bryan, included with others on Lincoln,

Webster, Tolstoy, Burns and Bruno—is an encouraging tribute to the son of Nebraska who dares to "be free to speak the old time word," when "Mammon's king owns pulpit, press and court," and—

The arrant Wrong is garbed in Freedom's suit,
Her chains concealed 'neath garlands of sweet flowers.

On the subject of Labor, the final stanza of "The Poor Man's Burden" (after Kipling's "White Man's Burden") climaxes the sentiment of the whole:

Lift off the poor man's burden,
My country, grand and great!
The Orient has no treasures
To buy a Christian state.
Our souls brook no oppression,
Our needs—if read aright—
Call not for wide possession,
But Freedom's sacred light.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—History of Socialism in the United States. By Morris Hillquit. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Company. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

Even the New York Independent, in its issue of October 22, sings a little psalm in praise of the National Civic Federation. There are, however, a number of its and Lowthers in the editorial. "Perhaps the most significant fact of all," it says, "is that the labor leaders to a man are committed to the union shop. The union shop is the keystone of trade unionism, and the leaders declare it will never be abandoned short of the union's utter annihilation." What does President Barry, of the Manufacturers' Association, say to that?

J. H. D.

If there is one thing against which the people of a republic should set their faces steadily it is official secrecy. And so the Springfield Republican is entirely right, speaking of the arrest of the Englishman, John Turner, as an alleged anarchist, in insisting that "the evidence against him should at least be made public and be subjected to the public criticism of the defendant or his counsel." No matter who the man is that is accused, the beginning of secret examinations in his case will be the beginning of secret examinations in other cases. Nothing is easier or more insidious than the spread of such evil practices in "strong governments."

J. H. D.

The article in the Outlook of October 24 that will be most read is that by Dr. W. W. Keen on the Cheerfulness of Death, the object of which is to inspire the idea that we should cease to think of death with fear. In an editorial notice of the article the saying of Jeremy Taylor is very aptly quoted: "Of all the evils of the world which are reproached with an evil character, death is the most innocent of its accusation." Dr. Keen argues that on the physical side death is not an unpleasant process, and that on the spiritual side it is the great freer. "The weary and the heavy laden," he says, "make up the mass of mankind."

J. H. D.

Lecky, whom the Springfield Republican aptly calls the historian of thought and morals, died on the 22d of October at the age of 65. His "History of European Morals" and "England in the Eighteenth Century" will long remain among the remembered and valued works of the Victorian age. He was one of the distinguished group of liberals who opposed Mr. Gladstone on the home rule issue, and yet he had no use for imperialism on the Cecil Rhodes plan. It is not, however, as a politician but as a writer that he will be remembered; and as a writer, while he is to be considered a great chronicler of thought, he impresses many as not having got to "the root of the matter."

J. H. D.

Dr. James M. Buckley, in the Century

for November, calls attention to the Present Epidemic of Crime. "Indeed," he writes, "the number of crimes committed by the highly educated is an alarming feature of the situation. The list of defaulting bookkeepers, bank tellers, clerks and college graduates constantly lengthens, reflecting a lurid light upon the theories of those who attempt to account for the origin of all sin, vice and crime by ignorance." Dr. Buckley mentions, among the causes, war, intemperance, and city life; but he has not a word to say of the two causes which seem to many to be fundamental, the growing consciousness of our unjust social system and the loosening of the restraining influences of a belief in vital moral principle.

J. H. D.

Perhaps Life is quite near right in attributing the aggressiveness of labor unions to "the protracted exhibition of success in the great financial game of getting something for nothing. Men who worked for a living were demoralized by the spectacle of a vast distribution of money to persons who had, apparently, done nothing to earn it." It might have been as well to leave out the word apparently, for the distribution has been going mainly to those who cannot be shown to have done any useful service whatever; and the baneful influence of this process of wealth getting is sure to demoralize more or less all forms of useful labor and business. As to the aggressiveness of labor unions, this is as it should be when it aims at fuller justice, and what there is of wrong has been learnt from the spirit of the great financial game.

J. H. D.

"A Plea for the Children," by Mina Price, being No. 13 of the Junior Why series (Frank Vierth, Cedar Rapids, Iowa) is an excellent little pamphlet to circulate, in order to arouse people not only to the heinousness of the evil of child labor, but also to the consideration of the real cause. That the cause is at bottom, as the writer holds, a question of "monopoly of things which in their nature belong to all," is perhaps to be seen more directly in the South than elsewhere. For there the rapidly growing cotton mills have found their cheap labor in the wives and children of the poor whites, whose landlessness has been their curse for all generations. It is both futile and unjust to level accusations only at the mill owners, who are probably quite right in holding that the mills have

on the whole been an uplift to this class of labor.

J. H. D.

Secretary Moody is advocating the spending of \$100,000,000 in 1904 for the support and increase of our war fleet. This outdoes the President himself, and doubtless makes the Secretary a most popular official in the eyes of naval officers and snipbuloers. "To judge by Secretary Moody," says the Nation, "a visiting Martian might think this country in the Middle Ages, surrounded by hostile neighbors, and threatened with wars lasting 20 years."

—J. H. D.

Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly for November shows a notable enlargement, and if it keeps up its present standard will take rank among the best publications of the day. The first article in this number is a refreshingly plainspoken exposition of the state of legislation in Washington, entitled "Our National Lobby, Members of Congress as Servants of the 'Trusts.'" The very worst sign of the times is that such an article could be published without striking every reader with thundering astonishment. Yet we read it, shrug our shoulders and go on, with a sort of hopeless indifference, voting for the same old crowd. Another striking feature of this number of the magazine is a series of full-page football pictures entitled "Our College Education."—J. H. D.

That clever little magazine, What's the Use? published at East Aurora, N. Y., says many good things. The following, for example, about the average politician, has a world of truth in it: "In a political platform, therefore, any variation from the ancient and nebulous generalities about 'democracy' and the 'rights of labor,' any clear-cut intelligible pledge to destroy some specific abuse, conveys a shock to his nervous system which almost unsettles his reason." The same is true of many great newspapers. They will write grandly of the great principles of democracy and equal rights; but let a specific proposition be made in their own neighborhood to do away with or prevent some definite special privilege, desired by this or that corporation, and then it becomes evident what the grand writing is worth. Nineteen centuries ago, Epictetus, the wisest of philosophers, said: "The cause of all human evils is the not being able to apply general principles to special cases."

J. H. D.

READY NOVEMBER 10, 1903

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society.

By LOUIS F. POST

SUBJECTS TREATED: Part One—"The Democratic Optimist." Part Two—"Individual Life." Part Three—"Business Life." Part Four—"Economic Tendencies." Part Five—"Politico-Economic Principles." Part Six—"Democratic Government." Part Seven—"Patriotism." Conclusion—"The Great Order of Things."

This book applies fundamental democratic principles (generic, not partisan) to the greater problems that baffle men as the glowing optimism of their youth gives way before the trials and disappointments of mature life. It holds up the standards and obligations of a rational democracy and a sane optimism to the individual as he emerges from school or college into the whirlpool of business and civic experiences, and leads him on and up toward a realization of the invincible optimistic philosophy of a great and beneficent order in the universe.

CLEVELAND, O., Oct. 26, 1903.—Moody Publishing Co., 35 Nassau St., New York City: Gentlemen: I am delighted to know that you are publishing "Ethics of Democracy," by Louis F. Post. Send me a copy as soon as it comes from the press. Never was the time more opportune for the appearance of such a work, and no writer on ethical, political and economic affairs is more competent than Mr. Post to do justice to the subject.

Very truly yours, TOM L. JOHNSON.

The volume is beautifully printed on high-grade dull-finished paper, uncut pages, gilt top, etc. and bound in fine blue cloth with gold lettering. Pp. 386. Price per copy, \$2.00. (Net, delivered.)

MOODY PUBLISHING COMPANY, Publishers, 35 Nassau Street, NEW YORK 1601 Unity Building, CHICAGO



"FOR I AM A 'CONFIDENCE' MAN."

Hanna—"Confound that fellow. He never fights me without having a mean advantage—he's always in the right of it! But Bluff and Boodle ain't obsolete yet."

BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PUBLIC
 Can all be purchased through the Purdy Publishing Company
 New Book of Kings, a Republican counterblast, by J. Morrison Davidson 50c
 HENRY D. LLOYD'S WORKS:
 Newest England \$2.50
 A Country Without Strikes, by mail 1.10
 Labor Copartnership 1.00
 Wealth Against Commonwealth, by mail 1.14
 The Chicago Traction Question, (his last work,) by mail 13c
 Order anything that has ever been reviewed in THE PUBLIC; will fill order promptly. Henry George's books in paper and cloth binding and other Economic Literature on sale.
 PURDY PUBLISHING CO., McVicker's Building, CHICAGO

NOTICE TO READERS.

If you have been reading The Public on trial, this notice may interest you. Your regular subscription for three or six months or a year, if sent in before January 1, 1904, will begin at once and continue until three or six months or a year, as the case may be, after January 1, 1904. Thus \$2 will give you the paper from receipt of your subscription until January 1, 1905; \$1 will give it to you from receipt of subscription until July 1, 1904; and 50 cents will give it to you from receipt of subscription until April 1, 1904. The same offer is open to all persons not already on the regular subscription list of The Public.

ATTORNEYS.
EWING & RING,
 ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
 HOUSTON, TEXAS.
 Presley K. Ewing Henry F. Ring
FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
 COUNSELOR AT LAW,
 BERNETT BLDG.,
 99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
 Tel. Call, 4094 Cortlandt, Rooms 1011-1012,
 NEW YORK.
HENRY B. TAWRESEY,
 ATTORNEY-AT-LAW,
 1106 Real Estate Trust Building, S. E. Cor. Broad
 and Chestnut Sts., Philadelphia.
CONTRACTORS.
G. H. ATKINSON & CO., CONTRACTORS,
 JERSEY CITY, N. J.
 Electric Light, Telephone and Municipal Work.
 Trolley Roads Built and Financed
 Progressive Religious Literature free,
 Apply Mrs. C. F. Wetmore, 4432 Sidney Avenue,
 Chicago.

The Public
 is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.
 TERMS:—Annual Subscription, \$2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.
 Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

How Are You Going to Vote ?

We elect a president next November. Are you going to vote with the Democrats, the party of the little capitalists, and try to put things back where they used to be? Or are you going to vote with the Republicans, the party of the big capitalists, and help keep things as they are? Or will you vote with the Socialist Party, the party of the workers, and help change things so that those who do the work will own what they produce? But possibly you do not know about the Socialist Party. Then send four cents in stamps, and receive by return mail three books, **Easy Lessons in Socialism, The Socialist Party, and What to Read on Socialism.** Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
 58 Fifth Avenue, CHICAGO, ILL.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

The Henry George association will present the subject of Municipal ownership at its various lecture centers during the month of November. Speakers: Mrs. Corinne S. Brown, Thomas Rhodus, Judge William Prentiss, Wiley Wright Mills, Hon. Michael E. Maher, George A. Schilling, Daniel L. Cruice, Miss Nellie Carlin, Henry H. Hardinge, W. Charles Tanner, Wallace Rice, Hon. Thomas G. McElligott, Prof. R. E. Cutler, Edward M. Winston, Leon Hornstein, Abram E. Adelman, M. L. Staunton, Western Starr, L. P. Straube, Raymond Robins, Prof. George C. Griffith, J. R. Cummings.
Sundays—3:30 P. M., Handel Hall, 40 E. Randolph St.
Sundays—8:00 P. M., Woodlawn Universalist Church, Kimbark, near 64th.
Sundays—8:00 P. M., Labor Hall, 92nd St. and Erie Ave., So. Chicago.
Mondays—8:00 P. M., Sokups' Hall, Cor. Milw'kee Av., No. Av. and Robey St.
Thursdays—8:00 P. M., Handel Hall, 40 E. Randolph St.
Saturdays—8:00 P. M., Temperance Hall, 330 W. 63rd St., Englewood, Ill.