

The Public

LOUIS F. POST, Editor

Volume IX

Number 424

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1906.

EDITORIAL:

Bryan and the Presidency.....	145
Carl Schurz	146
Roosevelt and the Railroad Ring.....	146
A High Example of Civic Conscience.....	147
Corruption Corporations and Woman Suffrage.....	148
Standard Oil Exposures	148
Curious Extradition Laws.....	148
Charity—Palliative or Cure	149
An Economic Cure for Consumption.....	149
Superstition and Personal Liberty.....	149
Mayor Dunne's Latest Victory.....	150
Appointments and Disappointments.....	150
What Is a Democrat? (Wood).....	151

NEWS NARRATIVE:

President Roosevelt and the Railroad Rate Bill.....	154
The First Russian Parliament.....	157
The British in Egypt.....	157
News Notes	158
Press Opinions	158
In Congress	159

RELATED THINGS:

Incompleteness (verse)	159
The Politician and the Newspaper.....	159
State and Municipal Ownership in Sweden (Oberg).....	160
The Competition which Produces Brotherhood (Briggs)	161
Democracy in Education	162
The Teacher (poetry)	164

BOOKS:

Race Prejudice	165
Books Received	167
Pamphlets	167
Periodicals	167

CARTOON.—Consolation for San Francisco (Bensough)	166
---	-----

EDITORIAL

Bryan and the Presidency.

Mr. Bryan's attitude with reference to the Presidential nomination in 1908 has been disclosed by a St. Louis friend, M. C. Wetmore, who publishes a letter just received from Egypt, where Mr. Bryan wrote it. In this letter, as reported, Mr. Bryan says:

I am satisfied that the things I have been fighting for are growing, but who will be most available in 1908 is a question that cannot be answered now. I shall not do anything to secure another nomination, and do not want it unless circumstances seem to demand it. Time alone can determine that.

In that frank declaration there is nothing new to Mr. Bryan's more intimate friends. When the tide of popular sentiment began a year and a half ago to break away from the plutocratic channels

in which it had been flowing, and its trend toward democratic ideals became more and more obvious, Bryan's popularity as a national leader visibly grew. So his friends naturally turned to him as their candidate for the presidency in 1908. But his invariable response was in the same spirit and to the same effect as his recent letter to Mr. Wetmore. He recognized the tendency of public opinion to accept the ideas for which he had been fighting; and he was not insensible to the fact, equally plain, that the popular tendency toward his cause was running also toward himself. But he firmly refused to forestall the future. He would not consent to make his personality an object of contention to the possible detriment of his cause, nor assume the responsibility of entangling his friends in any premature campaign for his nomination. Time might develop a better or more available candidate, he said, and he wished in that event to be free in his own mind and to leave his friends free in theirs, to decide in the interest not of a man to whose personal fortunes they were bound, but of the common cause to which they were devoted. This is one of the things that honorably distinguish William J. Bryan in American politics. He is a leader and not a place hunter.

* *

Carl Schurz.

With the death of Carl Schurz there passes away the most distinguished of the democratic exiles whom we received from Germany upon the collapse of the popular uprisings of 1848. No puritan New Englander of two hundred years before contributed more to the democratic spirit in American life. Carl Schurz was a man of ideals and convictions, whose convictions never lacked courage and whose ideals were instinct with democracy. It has been said that he was uncompromising and therefore impracticable. He was uncompromising, as every man has been whose memory has survived his funeral wreaths. But he was not impracticable—in any worthy sense. He was indeed impracticable when crime was afoot and he was wanted for a partner. But in adjusting differences of policy for worthy ends, he was one of the most practicable of men. Being human, he did not always clearly distinguish between eddies and currents in the great stream of democratic progress. He consequently misread the popular unrest of 1896, and like other genuine democrats similarly deceived by superficial

appearances, gave his sympathies and his influence to the plutocratic side in that contest. But no one doubted his sincerity, and four years later he stood where from the convictions of a life time he naturally belonged. From boyhood he was a democrat. It was devotion to democracy that placed his life in jeopardy in Germany in 1848, and that made him a Republican in the United States in the '50's, and a Democrat in the '70's and since. His life has been a long one, and always a sincere and useful one. But in nothing else has it been so useful as in the democratic character he developed as an American citizen and servant, the example and influence of which he leaves as a rich legacy to the country of his adoption.

* *

Roosevelt and the Railroad Ring.

The important consideration is not whether Mr. Roosevelt's or Mr. Chandler's version of their interviews over the Hepburn bill is the true one. Although the circumstances, so far as disclosed, indicate that Mr. Roosevelt did send for Mr. Chandler, that he did solicit Mr. Chandler's mediation for an alliance with Senator Tillman, and that he did say to Mr. Chandler that certain Republican senators were bent on frustrating his rate regulation policy, yet these are only incidents in a general situation. The essential thing about it all is not the verity of Mr. Roosevelt's version of these incidents, but Mr. Roosevelt himself as a factor in the general situation. And as to this there is neither dispute nor any room for dispute.

*

Certain senators were implacably hostile to the Hepburn bill. Mr. Roosevelt was committed to the principle of this bill. The bill would have been smothered in senatorial committee but for the union of Mr. Roosevelt's supporters with the Democrats of the committee. When this bi-partisan majority of the committee had defeated those of their Republican colleagues who represented the railroad interests, the latter proceeded to humiliate Mr. Roosevelt and his supporters in the Senate, as party men, by placing the bill in the hands of a Democrat as floor leader. The intended humiliation was personal as well as political, for the Democrat they named was Senator Tillman, whom Mr. Roosevelt had deliberately and publicly insulted. Between the two, therefore, a long-standing enmity notoriously existed. These facts, dependent upon nobody's veracity, imply obviously that the enemies in the Senate of Mr. Roosevelt's rate-making policy had declared open war against him and his policy.

Mr. Roosevelt's enemies then transferred the seat of their warfare from the committee room to the Senate chamber. If Mr. Roosevelt did not by this time recognize them as irreconcilable enemies to his rate-making policy he was singularly obtuse; and if he did not say so, he was unusually reticent. But whether he did say so, as Mr. Chandler informed Senator Tillman at the time, or did not say so, as he himself now protests, makes little difference; the fact of the determined hostility of these senators to Mr. Roosevelt's rate-making policy is undisputed and indisputable. One of their methods of warfare was to make of every act of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the bill, which might be unsatisfactory to the railroads, a football for the courts. Thereby they hoped to destroy the effectiveness of the Commission. It was to be done by giving unlimited powers to the courts to review the acts of the Commission. Mr. Roosevelt and his friends were opposed to granting such powers. They insisted upon limiting the power of court review to such acts of the Commission as might be in excess of their authority under the law or in derogation of property rights under the Constitution. In this position Mr. Roosevelt and his friends were supported by the Democrats. And they welcomed the support; not cordially, to be sure, but as a harrowing necessity. The railroad interests were thereby checked, and the success of Mr. Roosevelt's policy was practically assured. But just as he was on the point of winning a victory for his policy, and so for the people if his policy would produce the results its supporters claim for it, he suddenly changed front. With his party supporters (Senator La Follette alone excepted) he went over to the other side, over to the side of the railroad ring, and in union with the railroad senators agreed to an unlimited court review clause. The facts bearing out this generalization are as indisputable as those already alluded to as leading up to it; and not only does nobody dispute them, but Mr. Roosevelt's own letter bears them out.

*

When so much is told the whole story is told. Mr. Roosevelt may have accurately narrated the details of interviews between himself and Mr. Chandler, after the climax and in self-defense, or they may have been stated accurately by Mr. Chandler as they occurred. That raises an issue of veracity between Mr. Chandler and Mr. Roosevelt. But regardless of that issue, Mr. Roosevelt stands out in full public view, simply upon the historical facts that need no personal verifica-

tion, as a man who has run away from his own fight for the people and against the railroad ring, his co-partisans trailing behind him and his allies left in the lurch. He has compromised with the railroad ring when his own non-partisan alliance with the Democrats made compromise unnecessary. And in his compromise he has surrendered his cause and given himself away. He appears from this episode to be the boaster and "quitter" that his critics who knew him best have all along accused him of being.

* * *

A High Example of Civic Conscience.

An event of extraordinary significance in municipal affairs occurred in Springfield, Illinois, at the meeting of the City Council on the 14th. Alderman Bode, the single tax Democrat who had carried a Republican ward (p. 7), was about to be confronted with the necessity of voting on a question of high license for saloons, a question not at issue at the election. Personally he was opposed to high license, his position being that if the saloon business is illegitimate it should not be licensed at all, and if legitimate it should not be discriminated against in taxation. But, regarding himself as a representative of the people of his ward, he addressed them on the subject and solicited a postal card referendum. Out of 1,639 voters he received replies from 652, and of these 437 voted for the thousand dollar license. Mr. Bode thereupon declared that as alderman he would vote for this measure.

*

Accordingly, at the meeting of the Council at which his vote was called for, he cast it as his constituents had voted, but with an explanation which throws a great light upon the influences that business men exert upon public officials to tempt them to betray the people they represent. After narrating the circumstances outlined above, Alderman Bode, who is the senior member of a wholesale grocery house in Springfield, proceeded:

Those of you who have read my letter to the citizens of the Fifth ward will probably remember that I claimed that the crowning evil of this license system is the demoralization of our politics—that such demoralization is the natural result of this socialistic policy of governmental interference with private business, and that we should not be surprised when men affected by such interference do everything in their power to control the political machinery of this country. Just the day before yesterday I was given the most striking and direct proof of the painful correctness of this argument. It is because I am convinced that this proof is a matter of direct interest and deep concern to every citizen of this community

that I consider it my solemn duty to publicly expose every word that I can safely substantiate with witnesses. I deeply regret the personal nature of the remarks I am about to make and wish to say in advance that it is not from malice but entirely from a conviction of civic duty that I am impelled. Last Friday I received a telephone message from Mr. George Reisch, Sr., of the Reisch Brewing Company, asking me to call at his office that afternoon. I replied that as city salesman for our firm my regular route would bring me in his neighborhood Saturday morning. Accordingly I called about noon: As he is the owner of the building which our firm occupies I assumed that he wished to see me on ordinary business. What he did wish to see me about was this question of high license. He accused me of being a party to what he called a conspiracy to pass a high license measure which he claimed Mr. Devereaux and others had planned last summer. I denied being a party to such conspiracy if it existed. . . . He then notified me that unless I voted against high license he would order our firm to vacate his building in twenty days, viz.: by the first day of June, that if we did not move our rent would be raised \$125 for that month, and if we had not moved by July 1 it would be raised again until we could not bear it and would be forced to get out. This in spite of his verbal agreement to allow us to remain five years from July 1, 1904, without raising the rent. He went so far as to threaten to do all he could to ruin our business not only in Springfield, but in the surrounding towns as well, taking pains to remind me of the great influence he possessed. He ended by accusing me of having "sneaked" into office—that if he had known that I intended to be influenced by the wishes of the majority on the license question he would have accomplished my defeat; to which I replied that if he had the power to boss this city he had more power than he ought to have. He replied that he did not want to boss the city, but that he must protect his business, and insisted that whatever he did to gain control he did honestly. Is it not evident that, as a community, we have tempted this man to constantly endeavor to control every candidate for public office until, from constant practice, he has actually become deadened to any realization of the enormity of endeavoring, by oppressive methods akin to bribery, to coerce a public official into betraying his constituents? Thus, in a sense, we can hardly blame him, although now that he is so wealthy even he should be unwilling to resort to such methods as I have described. . . . But I do not wish to give the impression that I consider myself persecuted. It was no temptation to me. I do not believe he can injure us financially to any great extent, and even if he can, I value some things more than money. As I said before, it is entirely without malice and with a charitable recognition of the fact that we, as a community, must share the blame, that I have felt it my duty to publicly expose these facts with the hope of awakening the citizens of Springfield to a realization of the danger to popular government here at home, which we simply augment by agitation for further encroachment on the liquor traffic or any other private business.

*

The high license measure was defeated, as it

ought to have been; but Mr. Bode was right in heeding the wishes of his constituents. His act will educate them in civic intelligence, as well as strengthen his colleagues in municipal democracy and honesty. The greatest service he has rendered, however, is in exposing the manner in which officials of honest purpose are coerced by business men and business interests. For Mr. Reisch, the Springfield brewer, is only a specimen of "the business man in politics," and comparatively a small specimen at that. What he tried unsuccessfully to do with Alderman Bode, of Springfield, business men of greater financial interests and a higher grade of respectability are all the time doing successfully in every city, in every State, and in the national government. If the same courage and candor that Alderman Bode has shown were shown throughout the nation, from the White House to every city hall in the land, a tale would be told that might startle the people into retaining political power in their own hands, by referendum and recall, instead of placing it irrevocably in the hands of representatives who are constantly under temptations from cupidity or fears of coercion.

* *

Corruption Corporations and Woman Suffrage.

That organized opposition to woman suffrage originates with and is supported by the great grafting corporations, has been shrewdly suspected. It seems now almost to have been proved. The evidence comes from Oregon, where a referendum campaign for woman suffrage is now under way, and is in the shape of a circular letter ostensibly from the "Oregon State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women." This letter declares that—

One of the serious objections to the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment at the June election, is the injury which it would undoubtedly bring to the business interests of the State. In connection with the Initiative and Referendum, it would result in much bad legislation. Its adoption would alarm the cautious investor, and would discourage the construction of new lines of railway and other enterprises which promise much for the prosperity of the State. For these reasons the O. S. A. O. to the Extension of Suffrage to Women invites an expression from the business interests of the city of Portland in opposition to the proposed amendment. For this purpose our representatives will call upon your house within a few days, and we write you to request you to join with other business houses of the city in a public statement of the attitude of the business interests of the State on this subject. We believe such a statement will be of the greatest value in the campaign against the amendment.

No extraordinary experience with the dark and

devious ways of grafting corporations is necessary to spot the authorship of that circular letter. It is as clearly traceable as a time-table, to the Southern Pacific railroad combine. Significant as well as curious is the fact, that opposition to woman suffrage lines up with the interests of the great plundering corporations, as naturally as ducks take to water.

* *

Standard Oil Exposures.

Mr. Monett, the Republican attorney general of Ohio whom his party refused to renominate because he had set the machinery of the law in operation against the Standard Oil Company, has been investigating Standard Oil affairs before the Interstate Commerce Commission at Chicago, and with gratifying success. The exposures have been sensational, but no denial is raised. Standard Oil representatives call it "muckraking," a term which has been on the tongue of every criminal about to be exposed, ever since Mr. Roosevelt perverted Bunyan's meaning in order to defend rich grafters from exposure. One of the minor exposures before the Commission was the fact that the Standard Oil Company systematically bribes clergymen with petty gifts.

* *

Curious Extradition Laws.

It appeared at the Standard Oil hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission at Chicago on the 12th, that it makes a difference in criminal cases in some circumstances whether the accused is a labor union leader or a Standard Oil official. Two years ago, it seems, the Tazewell County, Illinois, grand jury indicted C. T. Collings and Guy B. Taylor for suborning Charles Kercher to commit perjury. The indicted men were officers of the Standard Oil Company resident in Ohio, and had not been personally in Tazewell County. So when a writ of extradition was about to be applied for, the attorney general of Illinois advised the prosecuting attorney of Tazewell County that Gov. Deneen should not grant extradition because the law is clear that extradition proceedings lie only against persons who were physically present in the State when the alleged crime was committed, and at the time of its commission. Doubtless this is the law. It was applied also by the Governor of New York when the Governor of Texas made requisition for a New York officer of the Standard Oil Company under whose instructions a crime had been committed in Texas. But when the Governor of Idaho recently made a requisition on the Governor of Colorado for cer-

tain trade union leaders charged with having in Colorado hired a man to commit a crime in Idaho, the extradition was granted and the accused were rushed across the border, although they had not been in Idaho when the crime was committed. If this is the law as to labor unionists, why is it not the law as to Standard Oil officials? If it is not the law as to Standard Oil officials, why is it the law as to labor union leaders?

* *

Charity—Palliative or Cure.

One of the best effects of organized charitable work, perhaps the very best, is its lesson to the workers—such as are genuine in their pretensions of generosity and love. They learn in time that charity is a necessity only of disordered industrial conditions; that social injustice, not individual unthrift, is the cause of most of the poverty that organized charity somewhat mitigates. This effect was observable even in that hard-shell organization, the Charities and Corrections Conference, which was in session at Philadelphia last week. One speaker, Dr. Frankel of San Francisco, after roundly though considerably denouncing the attitude of mind which regards poverty as normal and permanent, noted a hopeful change. He observes now a mental attitude which regards the grinding poverty that eventually spells dependency, as eradicable and preventable. To quote this speaker as reported in the Philadelphia Ledger of the 11th—

It is not assumed that an ideal state of society may develop, in which all shall be rich and none shall be poor. It is, however, possible to conceive of a condition of affairs in which each social unit shall be economically independent, and be able to maintain such independence through his own brain and brawn, provided his environment is made sufficiently favorable by the safeguards which government as represented by the nation or the State or the community may throw around him.

What method the speaker had in mind is not inferable from the meager report; but his particular method is by no means so important a consideration as the fact that in organized charity circles the idea is getting lodgment that true charity means the eradication of the industrial causes of poverty rather than the distribution of alms.

*

Another speaker at the same conference, Judge Mack of Chicago, president of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, was remarkably pointed in his criticism of mere alms-giving.

“What good,” he asked, “are all our remedies for social wrongs if we do not root out the underlying causes, tear down the hovels that breed disease, and sweep aside the landlord’s greed, standing in the way of the new light for our children and our children’s children? While not neglecting the problems of our own generation, we should never forget that all our work, to be effective, must be also preventive.” Judge Mack doubtless had in mind more superficial measures than would reach the root; but it is much that such men as he should begin to turn from the idea of ameliorating effects to that of eradicating causes. Such an attitude of mind would have been scoffed at in the Charities and Correction conferences of a decade or more ago.

* *

An Economic Cure for Consumption.

We notice in the Jewish Comment of the 12th, in the course of a report of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, that S. Solis Cohen, a distinguished physician of Philadelphia, who is described as an authority on tuberculosis, declared to the conference that the problem of tuberculosis is no longer medical, but social. “The doctors,” he said, “have shown the path which must be followed, and it is the duty of the community to cope with the situation. Tuberculosis is primarily a housing problem, and in the end analyzes its causes into two economic factors—high rents and low wages. Cause rents to be low and wages high, and you solve the tuberculosis problem.” But Dr. Cohen did not explain the possibility of making rents low and wages high without making workers rich and grafters poor. This is fatal. Most grafters would rather be rich without working and take the chances of contracting consumption from impoverished workers, than to abolish consumption by relinquishing their “vested rights” in graft.

* *

Superstition and Personal Liberty.

We sometimes read of superstitious performances in benighted regions or times, which fill us with contempt for the low grade of intelligence that has tolerated them. Yet right here in this enlightened country we foster superstitious observances quite as absurd in character and even more intolerable in their interferences with personal liberty. For instance: Early in the present month of May, in the enlightened city of Philadelphia, 16,000 persons were held prisoners in an area comprising nine squares of that city, because within that area there was one incipient case of

smallpox. If they had been so imprisoned by a mob in a panic of fear the wholesale outrage might well be excused. Fear knows no reason. But they were imprisoned deliberately by public officials for the purpose of performing upon them, or such of them as had not yet gone through the ordeal, a medical rite as superstitious in character as any savage hoodoo or rite of ancient priest. As soon as a bit of diseased animal matter had been injected into their blood, or they had proved by the scar that this had been recently done, they were all allowed to go free. This was not done by a mob in a panic of fear, we repeat, but by policemen and doctors acting under superstitious influences. For vaccination is a superstition. Possibly in some mystical manner it does prevent smallpox. We do not know, and neither do the doctors. They are unable to trace any rational connection between the rite and the possibility of its preventive virtue. So far as rational medicine is concerned, those board of health doctors in Philadelphia might as well have compelled the victims of their imprisonment to drink rattlesnake soup. Chinese doctors use this in some cases with as good results, experimentally, so they say, and with as little reason, as our doctors use diseased animal matter for the prevention of smallpox. Yet 16,000 persons were imprisoned on that May Sunday in Philadelphia, for half the day and deliberately by officers of the law, not to prevent their carrying the smallpox germs of one case outside the area of their imprisonment, but for the purpose of compelling 1,000 of them to submit to the superstitious rite of vaccination and the rest to prove that they had submitted to it!

* *

Mayor Dunne's Latest Victory.

Despite obstruction by the traction interests and their beneficiaries and sympathizers in the City Council of Chicago and in both political parties, Mayor Dunne's municipal ownership policy (pp. 98, 105, 123) moves forward. One victory after another comes to him. His latest is the refusal of the Supreme Court of the United States to reconsider its decision nullifying the 99-year claim, which the traction companies and their abettors have used so long as a club to frighten the timid and discourage the hopeful. Of this claim, nothing whatever now remains. It is powerless to hurt and powerless to scare. The companies have left only a few rapidly expiring franchises, and most of their system they are operating by mere sufferance. Mayor Dunne offers them the job of reconstructing the whole system and turning it over to the city upon de-

mand. They have not yet accepted or indicated a disposition to accept the offer. It may be that they cannot come to an agreement among themselves, but that is no longer any concern of the city's. If they do not speedily agree to Mayor Dunne's eminently fair terms, a new construction company will be organized and the work of constructing a municipal traction system will proceed without further reference to them or their situation than may be involved in compelling them to give good service on the streets they continue to occupy.

* *

Appointments and Disappointments.

Mayor Dunne has recently had an experience which may be of more than local interest notwithstanding its distinctly local flavor. When he chose Walter L. Fisher as his traction counsel (p. 52), he performed a great service to the particular cause he was elected especially to promote, and to the general public interests with which as Mayor he is charged. But many of his friends, most of them genuine friends of his cause and of good government, too, sharply criticized him for this appointment. Blinded by their own partisan spirit, they could not see for the time, either that Mr. Fisher had exceptional personal merit or that the circumstances of the situation made him the best possible selection. Mayor Dunne recognized both facts, and with a degree of moral courage to which men in his position seldom rise, he made this choice in spite of the fact that Mr. Fisher is not only a prominent member of the opposite political party but was a prominent leader in opposing Mayor Dunne's election. Events are rapidly justifying the Mayor's judgment in the matter.

*

When Mayor Dunne made this selection, the Record-Herald cordially approved it, presumably because it was indeed the good appointment it is proving to be, and not because Mr. Fisher happened to belong to the particular faction in the Republican party which the Record-Herald represents. But now that Mayor Dunne has promoted William L. O'Connell, the deputy commissioner of public works for nearly three years, to the vacant office of commissioner, the Record-Herald compares these two appointments in such manner as to indicate that it is influenced rather by solicitude for its own political associations and associates than by disinterested devotion to the public good. In making the comparison the Record-Herald says complimentary things of Mr. Fisher which are well deserved, no

matter what their motive may be, but it makes sinister prognostications regarding Mr. O'Connell, and on no other apparent basis than that Mr. O'Connell "does not train in its crowd." If Mr. O'Connell's official record is bad it was right that the Record-Herald should say so and therefore criticize his promotion as unfit. But it does not denounce his record. With reference to Mr. O'Connell it does essentially what Mayor Dunne's critical friends did with reference to Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher was none of theirs, and therefore they, etc. Mr. O'Connell is none of its, and therefore the Record-Herald, etc. Merely upon its own impression that O'Connell "rises to the stature of a ward politician and no higher," the Record-Herald prophesies "a very little service at a very high price." This prophecy may turn out to be good foresight, but with the Record-Herald's editorial the wish seems to be father to the thought. Either a bad record should have been produced against Mr. O'Connell, or a reasonable time been allowed for him to justify the Mayor's judgment in his case as it has been justified in Mr. Fisher's. To denounce the Mayor for his promotion as having "made a blunder," and as "bereft of understanding," as having eyes but seeing not and ears but hearing not, as the Record-Herald does, and without producing the slightest evidence against the appointee, is only to repeat the sentiment and almost the very language with which the Mayor was at first improvidently denounced by critics of the Fisher appointment. It reads more like partisan billingsgate than judicial criticism. It is now reasonably well proved to have been unfair in the Fisher case; the same thing may possibly be proved in the O'Connell case. At any rate, common fairness demands that the Mayor's appointees be judged by their past records or by their future service, and not by personal or factional prejudices. This spirit toward public officials is especially demanded of newspapers everywhere that profess to place considerations of good administration above personal and party preferences.

* * *

WHAT IS A DEMOCRAT.

Is there any difference between a Democrat and a Republican? If not, then a political campaign should be only a question of getting the best men elected regardless of party.

If there is a difference between the two parties in principle, then candidates must be regarded as bearing the standard of the party to which they respectively belong, and the principles are

the vital things to be discussed, understood and voted on.

If you are a Democrat or a Republican because your father was, that is no reason at all. By the same reasoning you might as well wear his style of hat or coat. Every man is entitled to form his own opinions, and those opinions should be formed on good reasons which he understands and can give.

If you are a Republican because it is the party in power and gives you more chance to be elected to some office, then you'd better remain a Republican, because no decent party cares for camp followers who have no higher principle than to get office or graft.

It stands to reason that, taken as an average, Republicans are no worse than Democrats, and Democrats are no better than Republicans. The question one ought to answer is, Why am I a Democrat? or, Why am I a Republican?

Most men belong to a party from mere habit. They do not seek office. They do not believe all the bad men are in the other party. In fact, there are many Republicans who should be Democrats and many Democrats who should be Republicans, and the following may help each thinking man to classify himself.

*

The two parties might be classified in a general way by saying that the Republican party is the party of the rich, of the privileged classes, of the trusts; and the Democratic party is the party of the common people. Anyone who will stop and think this over will see it is true as a great general proposition.

For example, would a Democratic or a Republican committee have the richest people to go to for campaign funds? Think that out.

The great railroads, the banks, the insurance corporations, the trusts, all throw their weight for the Republican party. Why? Think it out.

Most people do that from which they expect the greatest benefit. Why do the privileged classes favor the Republican party? Why is the Senate, that body of trust and corporation agents, Republican? Because the Republican party favors those ideas which have created the privileged classes, and because the privileged classes can get from the Republican party that protection and those further favors they want.

The Democratic party of the South in 1861 and for some time prior thereto was thoroughly undemocratic, in so far as it protected human slavery and stood for class privilege. And the Republican party of that day was truly the demo-

cratic party of the plain people. It did a great work under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln, and many men are Republicans to-day because it was once the party of Lincoln and freedom.

But that was nearly half a century ago, and that party has been in power and making our laws ever since, substantially, and now it is the party of the Depews, the Aldriches, the Ryans, the Vanderbilts, the Goulds, the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Harrimans, the Standard Oil and the railroads. Why this change?

Is it because the Republican party, being the party in power for so long a period, has been seized by those shrewd men who want special privileges by law, or is it because the principles of the Republican party lend themselves to the creation and protection of legalized special privileges? Think it out.

In fact it is both, and the difference between the Democratic and the Republican parties in principle will be sufficiently shown by briefly examining the fundamental democratic principles.

Thomas Jefferson has been called the father of the Democratic party, and Alexander Hamilton the father of the Republican party. In fact, Jefferson did believe in the plain people and favored a government getting as close to the people as possible, and Hamilton thought the people incapable of the science of ruling, and favored a governing class and a strong central government. He was closer to a monarchical form, Jefferson closer to a democratic form. In fact, neither of these men discovered any new ideas or principles; but Jefferson in his own way announced some of the fundamental doctrines accepted in England and France and wherever the people had struggled for liberty against a nobility or governing class.

+

The two great democratic general principles were and are and always will be:

First, Equal opportunity for all, special privileges to none.

Second, That government is best which governs least—that is to say, which interferes the least with individual enterprise and individual liberty.

From the second of these two principles come two others:

(a) That every man, so long as he is peaceable and does not invade the equal rights of others, has an inalienable right to regulate his own affairs, his habits, his pleasures, his religion, and all other things belonging to his own life, and for even a majority of his fellow citizens to de-

prive him of this right is as much a tyranny as if it were the act of a despot.

(b) That each locality must be left to regulate its own affairs, not interfered with by the general government.

Thus it will be seen that if a man be truly a Democrat, he must attack every special privilege and try to give an equal opportunity to all.

*

Special privileges are known to exist in the three great domains which embrace every source of wealth and every aspect of society:

First, Special privileges in land.

Second, Special privileges in money.

Third, Special privileges in existing power created by particular laws, such as the protective tariff and public-service corporations.

All things come from the land. Commerce and manufacture are applications of labor to the products of the land, and from land and labor comes all wealth.

So whoever has a special privilege created by law in land, and in those engines of commerce, money and transportation, or whoever has the special privilege of taxing the people, really has all labor working for him. Hence it is, there are a few richer than they deserve, and so many poorer than they deserve; for it must be plain that the poverty which comes from bad habits is not the only nor the most common poverty.

The monopoly in land is created and protected by the paper title of the old feudal days by which a man can hold land for speculation and neither use it himself nor permit others to use it. Thus babes unborn will come into a world pre-empted and secured before they drew breath.

There are two remedies proposed for this: one is to make title depend on actual use and occupation of the land; the other is the single tax.* But the proposition now to be put is that no man can be a true, consistent Democrat and favor this special privilege and denial of equal opportunity. Some remedy must be found, and found by the true Democrats.

Money is the blood of commerce. It is an absolute necessity, and the control of it is the control of all industry. The rate of interest depends on the demand for money. With plenty of money interest is low.† Money is of two kinds—money of actual value, as gold and silver; money of cred-

*See editorial note (first subdivision) at end of this article.

†See editorial note (second subdivision) at end of this article.

it or representative value, as bank notes. During the civil war, in order to force a market for the government bonds, a law was passed taxing any bank ten per cent. which issued bank notes on any other security than government bonds. This gave a monopoly to national banks, which exists now. In fact, there are many bonds other than United States bonds which are just as good and safe for the purpose of securing an issue of bank notes—in fact, better, as they represent accumulated wealth and not a debt, as do government bonds. The strength of government bonds is in the power of taxation. Every bank should have an equal opportunity to issue its bank notes secured by such good and sufficient security as may be declared by a general law, and under a general supervision alike to all.

The tariff is really a tax levied on the consumer for the special privilege of the protected manufacturer. Hamilton frankly called the protective tariff a bonus given to encourage infant industries. It is a violation of the democratic principle, special privilege to none, and always was. It is an interference by government with the freedom of commerce and the right of the consumer to buy where he can buy cheapest. It has helped create the trusts and as a special privilege should be attacked by every consistent Democrat.

Every true Democrat will also declare railroads and public service corporations to be trustees for the people, and that they hold their special privilege on express condition of a performance of the trust, that is to say, to give an equal service to all at an equal and fair rate. And having no vested right in the franchise, which is the gift of the people in trust; and no vested right in the right of way, which is the public soil occupied for a public use, on violation of its trust the corporation can be turned out of control by payment (at most) for those things actually created by the corporations—rails, ties, rolling stock, etc.

*

The foregoing shows the principal denials of equal opportunity which exist by law, and which every Democrat who truly understands his creed is bound to oppose. But so long as these special privileges exist, making plutocratic barons of a few men, and practical slaves of the laboring masses, other violations of the democratic doctrine of the greatest possible individual freedom and the least possible interference by government, will of necessity occur. Such, for example, as laws regulating child labor, eight-hour laws, laws regulating working hours for miners, locomotive engineers, and so on.

If the masses were economically free as they would be under democratic principles fully applied, so that there were no special privileges anywhere, they could take care of themselves. They would not be as now slaves to capital. No man prefers to work ten hours a day, or to set his little child to work. It is necessity which compels all this, and the necessity arises because of the special privileges which give the bulk of the wealth of the country to a few. Abolish all these special privileges, and there will be room for all, enough for all. Labor will take care of itself when it is really free, and the sources of wealth, land and money† are not by law specially privileged to a few.

The interferences by government in the hours of labor belong to the economic side, and arise from necessity. Under our present economic conditions labor is powerless to help itself, but prohibition, local option,** Sunday laws, etc., are very different. They belong to the domain of personal habits or morals, and no necessity for them exists. The real test is whether law seeks to protect the health and earning capacity of those who are not yet sufficiently economically free to protect themselves, or whether it tries to regulate the habits of individuals, or a man's private morals. If the former, it must be justified for the present on the plea of necessity, till labor is free enough to protect itself. If the latter, it is wholly unjustifiable as an unnecessary interference in individual freedom.

Under the democratic doctrine every family and every man should be free to take care of himself, and it is against true democratic doctrine to prohibit those who can control themselves in order to try and save by force of law a few who cannot control themselves.

The true democratic principle is to try each case on its own merits and not legislate against all because of the fault of some. A bad saloon should be suppressed as a nuisance or its license revoked. If saloons are objectionable in a neighborhood, so are livery stables, and there is no difference in principle in prohibiting livery stables in a certain district and in prohibiting saloons; no difference in prohibiting baseball on Sunday or theaters on Sunday, than in prohibiting church on Sunday. Each interferes with the right of the individual to decide all questions of his own morals for himself. The fact that the intention is a good one, viz.: to save men from getting

†See editorial note (third subdivision) at end of this article.

**See editorial note (fourth subdivision) at the end of this article.

drunk or to save them from bad company on Sunday, does not alter the principle, and every consistent Democrat must stand by the full logic of his principles, that it is better some neighborhood be intruded on by a saloon or a baseball ground or a beer garden, or that some people go to theaters on Sunday instead of church, rather than to give up the precious principle of personal liberty in all personal matters. When any man or any business becomes offensive or a nuisance, he or it can be specially proceeded against on that ground.

*

In conclusion: If you are for the masses of the people, if you are against all special privilege in every form and wherever found, if you truly want to have as an actual fact equal opportunity for all in all the things of this life (land, money, commerce), if you believe personal liberty is better than goodness by force of law, if you believe that the true science of government is to keep peace and order and that government must everywhere and at all times and in all things be kept down to the very least possible interference with men or business, if you believe in local self government and not government by bureaus and commissions in Washington, if you believe dependent colonies and a large military and naval force to maintain them (all supported by the taxpayer) is a violation of personal liberty and of that truth that "governments are founded on the consent of the governed"—then you should be a Democrat, and not only vote the ticket, but preach its doctrines. If you do not believe in those principles, or are not willing to carry them to their full logical conclusion, then you may consistently be a Republican or a Socialist (this is not said offensively, of course), but you are not yet a democratic Democrat.

C. E. S. WOOD.

[Notwithstanding divergence of view in some particulars, the general principles of the foregoing article and their practical application in most respects are so entirely in harmony with the editorial policy of The Public that we use the article as an editorial, contenting ourselves with calling attention to the points of divergence without elaborate argument. (1) We regard the single tax, and titles to land dependent on actual use and occupation, as the same remedy and not as different remedies for land monopoly, the single tax being a method for making the competitive impulse automatically operative in causing the practical abandonment of all titles except those dependent on occupation and use and for making these secure. (2) We do not think that the control of money controls all industry, nor that the rate of interest is dependent on the relative supply of money. We think that great volumes of

exchanges could be freely made without money, and that interest springs from the relation of the element of time to the production of consumable objects. (3) Neither do we regard money as a source of wealth; our view being that land is the sole source of wealth and labor its sole producer, actual money being only a medium of exchange, and money terms (often confused in thought with actual money) mere symbols for the comparison of values. (4) By "local option" is evidently meant those laws which leave to localities the legal right, free from State interference, to determine whether or not to allow the use of liquor as a beverage within their boundaries. This seems to us democratic so far as the State is concerned. For the majority of a "local option" locality to prohibit liquor might be undemocratic, but this does not seem to us to be true of the law referring the question to the people of the locality instead of having it arbitrarily determined by superior legal authority.—Editor of The Public.]

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Wednesday, May 16.

President Roosevelt and the Railroad-Rate Bill.

The acquiescence of President Roosevelt and his supporters (p. 129) in the so-called Allison amendment to the railroad-rate bill, which would allow unlimited review by the courts of rate regulation fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a concession to the railroad interests which he had previously opposed, raised a storm in the Senate.

*

Premonitions of this storm appeared on the 11th, when Senators Bailey and Rayner accused the President of vacillation. Senator Rayner said that Senator Aldrich and his associates had tricked the President with the so-called Allison amendment, and while he would not imply that the President had walked into the trap, he was bound to acknowledge that President Roosevelt is so constituted he cannot look at a trap without fooling with the spring.

*

On the 12th the storm broke. Senator Tillman, contrary to his custom, read a paper on the floor of the Senate, in which he charged the President, inferentially, with bad faith. The paper as it appears in the Congressional Record of May 12 at page 6973, states in substance that—

Senator Tillman was informed, March 31, 1906, by ex-Senator William E. Chandler of New Hampshire, that President Roosevelt had sent Chandler a note requesting his presence at the White House that evening; that Chandler obeyed the call, and the President told him he de-

sired to get into communication with Senators Tillman and Bailey "for the purpose of ascertaining whether there could be such united action among the friends in the Senate of the Hepburn bill as would make a sure majority in its favor and against injurious amendments"; that the President stated "that he had come to a complete disagreement with the Senatorial lawyers who were trying to injure or defeat the bill by ingenious Constitutional arguments, naming Senator Knox in addition to Senators Spooner and Foraker"; that the President "stated carefully and deliberately the basis upon which he thought there should be co-operation, viz: An amendment expressly granting a court review but limiting it to two points: (1) An inquiry whether the commission had acted beyond its authority—ultra vires was his expression—and (2) whether it had violated the Constitutional rights of the carrier;" and that the President repeated that he had reached a final decision that the right of review should be thus limited.

After several interviews between Mr. Chandler (as Mr. Roosevelt's intermediary) and Senator Tillman, a conference between Senators Bailey and Tillman and Attorney General Moody, the latter representing the President, was arranged, at which there "was absolute accord from the first on the proposition that the court review should be limited to the inquiry whether the Commission had exceeded its authority or violated the carrier's Constitutional rights. After talking over the whole case, Mr. Moody said: 'I will send you what I understand to be the kind of an amendment we can agree on, and which I think he will accept.'" Mr. Moody on the following day sent a typewritten draft of a memorandum of the joint views. It is as follows: "(1) Strike out the words 'fairly remunerative' wherever they occur; (2) allow the bill to stand in the respect of providing for maximum rates only; (3) adopt an amendment which is a composite of the amendment printed in Collier's on March 24—the Long amendment—and the Bailey amendment of March 21, as follows: 'That the orders of the Commission, except orders for the payment of money, shall take effect within such reasonable time as shall be prescribed by the Commission, and shall continue for such period of time, not exceeding two years, as shall be prescribed in the order of the Commission, unless sooner set aside by the Commission, or by a court in a suit brought by any carrier, person, or corporation, party to the complaint, affected by the order of the Commission, against the Commission in the circuit court of the United States, sitting as a court of equity in the district wherein any carrier party to said suit has its principal operating office; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the circuit courts of the United States to hear and determine in any such suit whether the order complained of was beyond the authority of the Commission or in violation of the rights of the carrier secured by the Constitution; and, if upon the hearing, the court shall find that the order complained of was beyond the authority of the Commission or in violation of the rights of the carrier secured by the Constitution, it shall enjoin the enforcement of the same: Provided, however, That no order of the Commission shall be set aside or suspended by any preliminary or interlocutory decree or order of the court. Said proceedings shall have precedence over all other cases on the docket of a different character, and the court shall have power to make orders to secure the attendance of persons from any part of the United States, and the existing laws relative to evidence and proceedings under the acts to regulate commerce shall be applicable. Either party to said proceedings shall have the right to appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States, and such appeal shall have precedence in said Supreme Court over all other cases of a different character pending therein.'" At a subsequent interview with Mr. Moody some slight verbal alterations were made in the proposed amendment and everything was agreed upon, the understanding being that the Senators should work together with the President to get the necessary votes to pass it. During the period covered by the statement—March 31 to May 4—Mr. Bailey and Mr. Tillman "made constant efforts to learn the sentiments of Democratic Senators, and also conferred with a few Republicans," and "informed Mr. Chandler and Mr. Moody that there was no doubt of the passage through the Senate of the amendment under consideration if the President would adhere to his programme." Neither Tillman nor Bailey had any "suspi-

cion that any change was intended until the afternoon of May 4, when the President summoned the thirty-six newspaper correspondents to see and hear him at the White House."

+

Later in the day on which Senator Tillman read his statement, Senator Lodge got the floor and in behalf of the President said, as reported in the Congressional Record at page 6986:

Mr. President, I was unfortunately out of the chamber and did not have the felicity of hearing the statement which was read in the Senate by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Tillman]. When I returned to the chamber I was told about the statement, and there were repeated to me some of the statements that were contained in it. One of the statements attributed to Mr. Chandler in regard to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Foraker], in regard to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Spooner], and in regard to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] struck me as so extraordinary, and seemed to me on its face so unlikely to be correct and as so unjust to the three Senators involved that I took it upon myself to go to the office of the stenographers and get the sentence accurately copied out. The sentence to which I refer from the stenographer's notes is this: "Mr. Chandler said the President had stated that he had come to a complete disagreement with the Senatorial lawyers, who were trying to injure or defeat the bill by ingenious Constitutional arguments, naming Senator Knox, in addition to Senators Spooner and Foraker." I then took the liberty of calling up the White House by telephone; it was the most rapid way of reaching the President, and I took down the statement which he made to me over the telephone, and which I will now read to the Senate, because I think it is important that it should go to the country with the allegation which I have just read. I read to the President over the telephone the sentence which I have just read to the Senate, and he said in reply that the statement which I had read to him, attributed to him by Mr. Chandler, was a deliberate and unqualified falsehood; that Senator Foraker's name was never mentioned at all in conversation; that Senator Spooner's name was only mentioned by him to express a cordial approval of Senator Spooner's amendment. "As to Senator Knox, I said that I did not agree with a portion of his proposed amendment, but that I thought he had made out a very strong argument for asserting affirmatively the jurisdiction or authority of the court." I think, Mr. President, that it is a mere act of justice to allow this statement to go out with that which was read and attributed to the late Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. William E. Chandler.

+

Subsequently Senator Tillman gave out a letter from ex-Senator Chandler corroborating Senator Tillman's speech. This letter begins as follows:

On Saturday afternoon, March 31, 1906, a friend of mine came into my office and told me of the White House conference of that day in which an understanding as to a limited court review had been reached with Senator Long and others, and he told me that the President wished to get into communication with the Democrats and would shortly ask me to come and see him. While he was talking a messenger boy arrived with a letter to me from Mr. Loeb as follows: "White House, Washington, March 31, 1906. My Dear Senator Chandler: The President requests me to say that he would be glad to have you come to the White House to see him at 8:30 o'clock to-night. Will you please let the bearer know whether you can come?" I told the messenger I would be there.

The remainder of the letter relates Mr. Chandler's conversations with the President as already stated by Senator Tillman.

+

It was not until the 14th that President Roosevelt made formal reply to Senator Tillman. He then

gave out a letter to Senator Allison of which the parts relating to the controversy are as follows:

I was asked to see ex-Senator Chandler as representing Mr. Tillman, who was in charge of the bill. I stated in response that I was of course entirely willing to see Mr. Tillman personally or to see Mr. Chandler or anyone else who could speak for him, and I accordingly directed my secretary to make an appointment for Mr. Chandler to see me. My understanding was that he was the representative of Mr. Tillman. In this first interview he stated to me the views of Mr. Tillman, with seeming authority. He called on me several times. . . . I stated that the Hepburn bill was in its essence entirely satisfactory to me. . . . I also repeatedly stated that while it was entirely satisfactory to me simply to leave the Hepburn bill in substance as it was—that is, with the recognition of the jurisdiction of the court but without any attempt to define that jurisdiction—yet that I was entirely willing that there should be a definition, provided that this definition did not seek to grant a broad review, but explicitly narrowed it to the two subjects which, as a matter of fact, I believed that the courts would alone consider in case there was no attempt to define the limits of their review; that is, would limit it to the question as to whether the commission had acted ultra vires and as to whether any man's constitutional rights had been impaired. I stated that if the question of defining or limiting the review was brought up at all I personally felt that this was the way in which it should be limited or defined. . . . As to none did I ever say, either to Mr. Chandler or to anyone else, that I should insist upon having them in the bill as a condition of my approving it. On the contrary, I was always most careful to state that I was not trying to dictate any particular programme of action. In no case, either in the case of Mr. Chandler or in the case of anyone else, was there the slightest opportunity for any honest misconception of my attitude or any belief that I had pledged myself specifically to one and only one amendment or set of amendments, or that I would not be satisfied with any amendment which preserved the essential feature of the Hepburn bill as it came from the House.

+

Accompanying the President's letter was one to him (also dated the 14th) from Attorney General Moody reporting his interviews with Senators Bailey and Tillman. On the question in controversy it states:

The conference was arranged by Mr. Chandler and occurred on April 15. It was full and free. It would be impossible to state all that was said in a conference of two hours, but I think no false color is given to the conference by the following statement: "I informed the gentlemen of my belief that you desired, if the scope of the court review were to be expressed in the law at all, that it should be limited to the two subjects hereinbefore named; that in such case the so-called Long amendment was acceptable to you; that you would be glad to see a rigid limitation on the issuance of interlocutory injunction, if such limitation were possible; and I stated further that I would not assume to agree to any form of language whatever for you, but would submit any proposed amendment to you for your consideration. . . . An attempt was made to adopt phraseology which would effect the intention of the two Senators. I made some notes upon this branch of the subject and at the close of the interview said to Senator Bailey that I would put my understanding of their views upon the question of phraseology in writing, send it to him, and, if it met with his approval, submit it to you. This I did and on the next day sent the annexed memorandum to Mr. Bailey, inclosed in a letter, which read as follows: "April 16, 1906. My Dear Senator:—This rough draft is as I understood your suggestions of yesterday. I think it quite likely that this draft might be bettered, but I simply send it to see if I understood you. Very truly your, W. H. Moody." [The draft referred to is the one printed above] . . . I informed you of what occurred at the interview between the two Senators and me and you told me that you had been informed from various Democratic sources that an agreement among the Democrats upon any amendment would be impossible. The two Senators called upon me

again on the 23d or 24th of April. There was some further talk about the form of the amendment. . . . I then said that in my opinion any amendment drawn by anyone representing the executive branch of the government, even though it were inspired from heaven, would not be accepted, without change, by the Senate. That that attitude was natural and proper, and that if the exact language of an amendment which could be adopted should be agreed upon, it ought to be drawn by the Senators themselves. I suggested Senator Allison as a proper person for further conference, and the matter, so far as I was concerned, ended there.

+

On the 15th Senator Tillman replied in the Senate, saying—

I now declare most emphatically that to no human being have I ever given authority or even expressed a wish to have any conference with Theodore Roosevelt with regard to the bill now under consideration. On the contrary, I have expressed the opinion in more than one published interview that he had nothing to do with it, and that it was the business of the Senate; and while I did at his request enter into negotiations with the Attorney General, it is well known to every Senator on this floor what my attitude and feelings have been, and it is most remarkable that, while the President sent for Democrat after Democrat to confer with him about this measure, he should undertake under the circumstances to assert that I sent an agent to him to begin negotiations. The statement is absurd on its face. The other point to which I shall refer is the cavalier way in which Mr. Moody discusses the idea of the President not being bound. While contradicting in no instance, however slight, my statement of what occurred, the Attorney General seems to think that the code of honor among gentlemen is not binding upon the Executive and his cabinet. The President asked him to see Mr. Bailey and myself. We met by appointment made by Senator Chandler and talked over the vital question. He wrote and sent Mr. Bailey his understanding of our views, and when we met subsequently we reported absolute agreement, both as to the form and the substance of a proposed amendment to which he said the President would assent and help get votes for. Of course the President was not bound not to change; but he was bound under such circumstance to give notice, and this was not done. The charge I made and still make is that the President is guilty of bad faith, and that the rate bill, which will be when enacted into law a much better and stronger measure than we had hoped to get, has been emasculated of one of its most valuable and essential features by the President's action. I am ready to leave the whole question to the thoughtful and honorable men of the country.

+

Senator Tillman placed upon the records of the Senate on the 16th a written statement to him by ex-Senator Chandler, in the course of which the latter said:

As the telephonic denial by President Roosevelt sent to the Senate through Senator Lodge remains in the Congressional Record of May 12, it seems to me that I should take some notice of it, which I do now by reaffirming the essential truth of the statement I made to you and which you repeated in the Senate. Much as I regret that the hasty action of Senator Lodge and the President has forced an issue between the President and myself, the extreme language he used makes such issue unavoidable, and I cannot shrink from or evade it, although I cannot use toward the Chief Executive of the nation language like his own. Upon our respective statements I submit the controversy with confidence to the judgment of those who know me.

For the benefit of those who do not know him, Mr. Chandler reviews at length the circumstantial evidence which, as he argues, "shows that the President could not have omitted to make, in substance, the statement which he denies."

The First Russian Parliament.

At St Petersburg on the 10th the first session of the lower house of the Russian parliament, or Douma, convened. The delegates first assembled in the white marble hall of St. George at the Winter Palace, where they were addressed by the Czar. There was a dazzling display of royal and military grandeur. The Czar's speech was in royal form and devoid of substance appropriate to so revolutionary an occasion. He said:

+

The Supreme Providence which gave me the care of our fatherland moved me to call to my assistance in legislative work elected representatives of the people. In the expectation of a brilliant future for Russia I greet in your persons the best men from the Empire, whom I ordered my beloved subjects to choose from among themselves. A difficult work lies before you. I trust that love for your fatherland and your earnest desire to serve it will inspire and unite you. I shall keep inviolate the institutions which I have granted, with the firm assurance that you will devote all your strength to the service of your country and especially to the needs of the peasantry, which are so close to my heart, and to the education of the people and their economic welfare, remembering that to the dignity and prosperity of the state not only freedom but order founded upon justice is necessary. I desire from my heart to see my people happy and hand down to my son an empire secure, well organized and enlightened. May God bless the work that lies before me in unity with the Council of the Empire and the Imperial Douma. May this day be the day of the moral revival of Russia and the day for the renewal of its highest forces. Approach with solemnity the labors for which I call you and be worthy of the responsibilities put upon you by the emperor and people. May God assist us.

+

After the Czar's speech the delegates proceeded to their own chamber in the Tauride palace. The body was called to order by Baron Frisch, who had been officially designated for the purpose. Nearly every member was present. The multiplicity of races, classes and costumes is described as the most striking external feature of the assembly. There were noblemen beside simple peasants or workmen clothed in the costume of the shops or the villages, turbaned Mussulmans and Buddhists from Bokhara, idolators from the Kirghiz steppes, orthodox priests in black cassocks, Catholic bishops in purple cassocks, Circassians, Armenians, and Tartars from the Caucasus; Jews from the Pale; Buriants from Central Asia, and Lithuanians and Esthonians from the Baltic provinces. Most of these wore their national dress, but there is reported to have been a spirit of earnestness about all which augured well for the future. The members took places regardless of political affiliations, except for a small group of reactionaries who gathered at the extreme right. After a lame speech by Baron Frisch, the delegates took the oath of office and signed the membership roll. They then elected as their president Prof. Andrele Mouromtseff, the senior member for Moscow. There were but seven dissenting votes.

+

Before making his acceptance speech President Mouromtseff ordered all persons not members of the lower house of the Douma to leave the floor, an order which included a large number of government officials and clerks. His speech was brief. It was im-

mediately followed by one from Ivan Petrunkevitch, who made an appeal for those who had suffered in the cause of liberty. This was the first subject on which the Douma took official action. It was sent on the 12th to the committee to draft the reply to the Czar. The resolution referring the subject to that committee asked of the Czar full amnesty for political, agrarian and military crimes, and recommended the immediate abandonment of the death penalty for all offenses, criminal as well as political.

+

The reply to the speech of the Czar was adopted by the lower house of the Douma on the 15th. Its demands are as follows:

- 1—General amnesty.
- 2—The abolition of the death penalty.
- 3—The suppression of martial law and all exceptional laws.
- 4—Full civil liberty.
- 5—The abolition of the Council of the Empire.
- 6—The revision of the fundamental law.
- 7—The establishment of the responsibility of ministers.
- 8—The right of interpellation.
- 9—Forced expropriation of land.
- 10—Guarantees of rights of trades unions.

On the question of amnesty, the reply reads:

On the threshold of our labors one question agitates the soul of the whole Russian people and prevents us, as their representatives, from calmly entering upon our legislative work. The first word pronounced in Parliament was amnesty. It was met with cries of sympathy. The country is thirsting for it. It is a demand of the people's conscience which it is impossible to refuse or delay. Sire, the Parliament awaits full political amnesty as the first pledge of a mutual understanding in the future and concord between the Emperor and the people.

+

The Council of the Empire, or upper house of the Douma, met on the 11th in the hall of the nobles in the Winter Palace. It was opened by Count Solsky, the president.

+ +

The British in Egypt.

Considerable newspaper agitation has been recently made regarding the possibility of an outbreak between Great Britain and Turkey over the Egyptian-Turkish boundary line. Great Britain occupies Egypt in the capacity of an international guardian (vol. 1, No. 20, p. 3; vol. vii, p. 25), and is brought into hostile relations with Turkey in consequence of Turkish claims to that part of Egypt which is known as the Sinai Peninsula. The Gulf of Akabah is on the boundary line, as the British claim, but south of it, as the Sultan of Turkey claims; and the City of Tabah is at the head of this gulf on what the British regard as Egyptian territory. The Turks having occupied Tabah with troops, Great Britain objected, and on the 4th gave Turkey an ultimatum requiring the evacuation of Tabah and all other places on the Sinai Peninsula, and until the delimitation of the frontier by a commission. To this demand Turkey acceded on the 12th and on the 13th Tabah was evacuated. The boundary question depends upon whether the Egyptian-Turkish line across the Sinai Peninsula runs from the Suez on the Gulf of Suez to El Arish on the Mediterranean, as the Sultan claims, or from the Gulf of Suez to the Gulf of Akabah, as Great Britain claims.

NEWS NOTES

—Carl Schurz died at New York on the 14th at the age of 77. Arrangements are being made for memorial meetings throughout the country.

—A primary bill (p. 59) passed both houses of the Illinois legislature on the 16th, by 77 to 59 in the House and 31 to 14 in the Senate. The bill now goes to the Governor.

—On the 13th the Federal Supreme Court denied the application of the Chicago traction companies (p. 105) for a reversal of its decision nullifying their 99-year franchise claims.

—At the Democratic primary elections in Tennessee on the 12th, ex-Gov. Robert L. Taylor was named for United States Senator over Senator Carmack by a majority of 10,000.

—At the annual meeting of the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values, held in Glasgow on the 21st, James Fairlie, a member of the Town Council of Falkirk, was elected president.

—The Ferris wheel, originally in use at the world's fair in Chicago, in 1893, and finally at the world's fair at St. Louis in 1904, was destroyed on the 11th with dynamite by a wrecking company.

—The Senate committee on interoceanic canals voted on the 15th in favor of constructing a sea-level canal (vol. viii, p. 782). Senator Carmack's return from Tennessee broke the deadlock of the former meeting.

—Ten of the Democratic county conventions in Missouri on the 12th and 13 on the 14th (making 23 out of the 24 counties of the State), declared for William J. Bryan as Democratic candidate for President in 1908.

—Mary E. Byrd, an astronomer and member of the faculty of Smith College, with which she has been associated 19 years, resigned on the 15th because the college has accepted gifts from John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie.

—Maharajah Sir Sayaji Rao Galkwar Sena Khas Khel Shamshed Bahadur, of Baroda, grand commander of the Star of India, nominal ruler of 4,000,000 subjects and descendant of the Great Mogul, arrived in New York on the 13th on board the steamship Celtic.

—Decision in the heresy case against the Rev. Dr. Crapsey (p. 106), rector of an Episcopal church, was rendered against him on the 15th by a vote of 4 to 1. The majority recommends Dr. Crapsey's suspension until he recants; the minority finds his error to consist rather of unauthorized interpretation than of denial of fundamental church doctrines.

—Mayor W. W. Rose of Kansas City, Kan., who was ousted as mayor by the Supreme Court of the State, after resigning, and was promptly re-elected by a larger majority than before (p. 130), has been cited by the Supreme Court to show cause on the 4th of June why he should not be punished for contempt for accepting the office upon this re-election.

—John Ferguson, the single tax leader of Scotland, died at Glasgow on the 23d. Mr. Ferguson entered the Town Council of Glasgow in 1893 as a single taxer, and after three years' service carried a resolu-

tion asking power of Parliament to tax land values. He originated the municipal conferences on the taxation of land values. At the time of his death he was a man of advanced years.

—A dispatch of the 12th from Christiania to the Chicago Record-Herald states that "Norway is presumed here to have the distinction of possessing the only genuine woman policeman, duly commissioned, regularly patrolling a post. She is Miss Nigiren, is scarcely out of her teens, to judge by her looks, and does not give the impression of being very athletic, although she is by no means frail. Her station is on the Island of Noakim, where she owns a small farm. Her duty is to guard the government's agricultural experiment station, drill ground and quarry and especially to see that excursionists commit no depredations."

PRESS OPINIONS

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S SURRENDER.

Chicago Examiner (Dem.), May 15.—It is not the President of the United States who will be on trial this week, but rather a politician, who from the vantage of the White House has traded with this side and with that; using members and ex-members of the Cabinet as messenger boys, dealing with Democrats, and with both factions of the Republican party, and finally caught in the trap of his own mendacity and caged there for the regretful gaze of a mortified nation.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), May 10.—President Roosevelt's astonishing surrender to the railroad forces on the rate bill has aroused the self-respecting and independent press of the entire country to protest. Whether allied with the Republican or Democratic party, American newspapers that are free from corporate ownership and influence, and so free to speak their minds, are joining to point out the humiliating fact that the railroads have won a complete victory, and that the President has retreated from the brave position he held for months.

* * *

THE IDAHO CASE.

Collier's (Ind.), May 5.—The trial of Moyer and Haywood, for the murder of Governor Steunenberg of Idaho, has been postponed, and now promises to begin this month. So sharply has the public eye been fixed upon this complicated affair that we fancy a fair trial will be assured. Certainly if the forms of law are not complied with, and if the substance of justice is not done, the country will know of the failure, as plenty of first-class correspondents will watch the progress of the trial. The report of the Department of Commerce and Labor on this case was extremely damaging to the mine owners, practically accusing them not only of lawlessness but of conspiracy to fasten a crime on labor leaders by perjured testimony. In lawlessness perhaps there is not much to choose between the owners and the workmen, and at any rate the general blame is not in question. It is never wise in the long run to allow popular emotion, local or general, to interfere with the course of justice. The case of the Chicago anarchists is now looked upon rather widely by conservative men as a gross wrong perpetrated to appease a multitude. The Idaho and Colorado situation is notably different, for if the miners are a violent lot nothing better can be said for the owners. The outside world should insist sternly on justice without regard to the relative sins of capital and labor. It is a pure matter of law and evidence relating to a specific crime, and no considerations of sympathy or antipathy, for either body concerned, should be allowed the slightest weight. Idaho has the opportunity to earn considerable credit or immense disgrace. We in no degree prejudge this case. It is complicated and remote. But there are circumstances which raise suspicion of collusion between the mine owners and the

authorities, and Idaho owes it to herself that this suspicion should be removed.

IN CONGRESS

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 40 of that publication.

Washington, May 7-11.

Senate.

Debating and voting on amendments to the railroad rate bill were resumed on the 7th (p. 6600), and continued on the 8th (p. 6679, 9th (p. 6744), 10th (p. 6808), 11th (p. 6869), and 12th (p. 6964). On the last of these days Senator Tillman made disclosure of his relations on the subject with the President, through ex-Senator Chandler.

✦

House.

Miscellaneous business was done on the 7th and 8th, and on the 9th (p. 6765) and 10th (p. 6831) the naval appropriation bill was under consideration. Private bills were disposed of on the 11th, after which the House adjourned to the 14th.

✦

Record Notes.

Speech of Representative Burton on the naval appropriation bill (p. 6862). Text of statement of Senator Tillman as to conferences between himself and President Roosevelt through ex-Senator Chandler (p. 6973). Senator Lodge's reply in behalf of the President (p. 6986).

RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

INCOMPLETENESS.

Nothing resting in its own completeness
Can have worth or beauty; but alone
Because it leads and tends to farther sweetness,
Fuller, higher, deeper than its own.

Spring's real glory dwells not in the meaning,
Gracious though it be, of her blue hours;
But is hidden in her tender leaning
To the Summer's richer wealth of flowers.

Dawn is fair, because the mists fade slowly
Into Day, which floods the world with light;
Twilight's mystery is so sweet and holy
Just because it ends in starry Night.

Childhood's smiles unconscious graces borrow
From Strife, that in a far-off future lies;
And angel glances (veiled now by Life's sorrow)
Draw our hearts to some beloved eyes.

Life is only bright when it proceedeth
Towards a truer, deeper life above;
Human Love is sweetest when it I adeth
To a more divine and perfect Love.

Learn the mystery of Progression duly:
Do not call each glorious change, Decay;
But know we only hold our treasures truly,
When it seems as if they passed away.

Nor dare to blame God's gifts for incompleteness;
In that want their beauty lies: they roll
Towards some infinite depth of love and sweetness,
Bearing onward man's reluctant soul.

—Adelaide Anne Proctor.

THE POLITICIAN AND THE NEWS-PAPER.

From John T. McCutcheon's Cartoon Series—"The Diary of Congressman Pumphrey"—Appearing at Intervals in the Chicago Tribune. From the Tribune of May 11, 1906.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8.—I had a long talk with Senator Octopus the other day about the savage editorial attacks that Ed Steele has been making on me in the Minerva Junction Gadfly.

"Senator," said I, "these attacks are worrying me and I want to do something to stop them."

The Senator smiled. "Why, Pumphrey," said he, "my advice is to pay no attention to them. Let him howl. I never bother my head about the yawping of the newspapers. They've attacked me steadily for ten years, and I've got so I never worry at all about it."

"That's well enough for you to say, Senator," said I. "You can afford to take that stand, because you're not elected by popular vote. You are in a position to tell the voters to go to a warmer climate as long as you control the legislature. But with me, I have to keep in touch with my constituents. I have to jolly up every Tom, Dick, and Harry in the district, kiss the babies ever so often, know all the farmers by their first name, remember who their children married, send seeds to the entire voting population, and in every other possible way keep in touch. When a newspaper like the Gadfly jumps on to me I've got to sit up and take notice. I've got to either silence it or do something to offset it."

"Have you tried the 'scholarship' racket?" asked the Senator. "That's always a good move. Offer a hundred dollar annual prize to all school children for the best composition on 'The American Flag' or some other popular topic. Call it the 'Pumphrey Prize' or the 'Pumphrey Free Scholarship.' Lots of our Congressmen do that, and it always goes well with the voters."

I thanked the Senator for the suggestion, but told him that I must act in a quicker and more direct way. "You know, Senator, that there isn't a man in Congress who has the power you have. If anybody bucks up against you you have ways of bringing him to time that no one else has. Now, I want you to tell me how to head off this man Steele."

The Senator smoked for a few moments. Then he spoke. "Who has the county printing in your town?" "Steele," said I, and I began to see what he was driving at.

"How much is it worth a year?" I reckoned about \$3,500.

"When is the contract renewed?"

"The 1st of June each year," I answered.

Again the Senator smiled complacently. "Do you begin to see?" he asked, with a wink.

"I can catch glimpses," I answered, also winking.

The Senator's face hardened and he continued in a brisk voice. "Now, my theory is this, Pumphrey. If you can hit a man on his most vulnerable point, which in nine cases out of ten is his pocketbook, you can bring him to time sooner or later. Now I know Senator Robberson of your state very well. Robberson is indebted to me for several things. I've traded votes with him on several bills which affected

his own business interests. He also wants me to make his son an attorney on a railroad in which I am a director. Now, how strong is Robberson's influence in your town?"

"He practically owns the local Republican machine," I answered.

"Does he know any of the county commissioners—the men who give out the printing contracts?"

"Yes," said I, and at once I saw how we could act. "One of the commissioners is a former law partner of the Senator, and another is the man who made the Senator's nominating speech."

"Good!" said Senator Octopus, in a voice that said plainly that all was settled already. "I'll tell Robberson to swing his commissioners around so they'll refuse to renew the printing contract of your ram-bunctious editor friend."

A few days later Senator Octopus met me in the Senate restaurant and called out: "By the way, Pumphrey, I've fixed up that little matter for you. I had Robberson bring a little pressure to bear on those commissioners and they have decided to hold up the printing contract until they hear from him. Now, the thing for you to do is to casually let your editor friend know what you've got up your sleeve, and I think he'll soon come to time."

I could hardly speak for the gratitude that I felt, but I grasped the Senator's hand with a fervor that spoke volumes.

Octopus is a wonder, and when he starts out to get a man he usually succeeds. His methods are wonderful and his wires lead underground and over-ground to every part of the country. I'd hate to have him gunning for me.

* * *

STATE AND MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN SWEDEN.

IV. POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS.

In a great many European countries the government has considered it a duty to offer to the people to collect and care for their savings under the guarantee of the state. Experience has proven that it is a far simpler matter for the administration to conduct a savings bank business in connection with its postal service than it is to try to satisfactorily regulate private banking enterprises and thus provide for safe investment for people who can only save limited amounts. In fact the Swedish government, which has successfully tried government ownership and operation in so many different forms, seems to have concluded that wherever it was found that private business could not be conducted in the interest of the people without the constant regulation and supervision of the administration, there was a proper place for the government to conduct business itself. On such principles the postal savings bank was founded in 1884. It is not conducted with any aim whatever to bring any surplus into the state treasury, but simply to be self-supporting, and to offer a perfectly safe means of saving for the people, particularly for those who can save only small amounts.

However, to do justice to the private institutions for saving in Sweden it must be said that the government savings bank was not founded on account

of any fraudulent behavior on the part of the private banks. It was demanded merely because of its greater convenience, and, of course, also on account of the increased feeling of safety it would afford depositors in times of industrial depression. The very fact that the private institutions for saving in the country are conducting their business with so great honesty and solvency has caused the postal savings bank to not acquire such an enormous volume of business as was at first expected. Of all the money deposited in the savings banks of the country, hardly more than one-fifth is deposited in the government's institution. The cause of this proportionally small part being deposited in the postal savings bank is mostly that the government cannot, employing as strict rules regarding the investment of its trust funds as it does, pay quite as high an interest as do private banks. The postal savings bank pays 3.6 per cent. interest on deposits, whereas the private banks pay on an average about 4 per cent.

However, that the bank serves a purpose is easily understood when we note that the number of its depositors amounts to more than 550,000, or a little more than ten in every one hundred inhabitants. (The population of Sweden was, in 1904, 5,260,000.). The whole business of serving these depositors at every postoffice in the country, and to care for and invest their savings, is conducted on \$55,000 a year, a figure that fully proves that there is no need of enormous expenses in a department of public service, even if it be conducted by the government.

In regard to the investment of the trust funds the rules prescribe that only state and municipal securities are permitted for such investment. This excludes all speculative tendencies and will surely prevent the use of the trust funds for the private interest of any of the officials, should their honesty not be proof against temptations. It may be said of all the departments of government ownership and operation in Sweden that the honesty with which as a rule they have been conducted has had its greatest cause in the system itself, which in all possible cases has been worked out on the principle of removing the chance of dishonesty—that is, the temptation. The publicity of all important moves in all the governmental departments has also greatly added to the integrity of all the various offices of public ownership.

Whether or not, under well balanced conditions, it will prove to be a proper function of the government to collect and care for the people's savings, may be open to discussion. But there can hardly be any question as to the propriety of such a course in any country where it has been proven by repeated experiences that private interests have defrauded the public of their savings through the means of savings banks privately conducted. In such a case an institution, conducted under the control of the government, and under the guarantee of the state, is in its proper place. As mentioned before, there are a number of European countries which have recognized this truth, although it must be admitted that the necessity for governmental institutions for savings for the reason mentioned above is less urgent in Europe than in this country.

The repeated insolvency of savings banks in this

country has made the people hesitate to put all their savings into the hands of men who have often used them for their own speculative purposes. As a means to escape the savings banks the people turned to the insurance companies, because they were known for greater solvency, and the propositions with which they induced the public to place their money with them were seemingly more safe and profitable. How the insurance companies have taken care of their trust is too well known a fact to need any comment. It is enough to state that the small savers in the United States are not in possession of any perfectly guaranteed institutions in which to put their savings, the results of their labor; and that if in any country there is an urgent need for a governmental institution for savings, it is in this country.

In this connection a few words in regard to general banking conditions in Sweden may be proper. The government conducts a "state bank," which bank conducts practically the same business as the national banks in this country. This bank is the only one permitted to issue currency and bank notes (bills). Private banks can conduct all general banking business, but are restricted from issuing any notes. The propriety of this is evident. No private interest should be permitted to pocket the enormous income derived from the privilege of issuing bank notes, for which security the bank only pays a small percentage compared with the one derived from the interest drawn from the outstanding notes.

That banking business, especially when accompanied with the privileges conferred upon it in this country, is a very paying business, is easily understood from the fact that the income the Swedish treasury derives from the "state bank" is one of the more important of its regular incomes. It is a credit to the Swedish people that they have recognized that certain banking privileges constitute a monopoly, and thus are properly conducted only by the state itself.

ERIK OBERG.

* * *

THE COMPETITION WHICH PRODUCES BROTHERHOOD.

From a Paper on "Free Competition and the Law of Brotherhood," Read Before the New Church Society of Elkhart, Ind., Jan. 14, 1906, by George A. Briggs.

The most likely example of a human society without some industrial competition would go back in the process of evolution to that point where our supposed ancestors swung by their tails from the cocoanut palms and lived happily upon the cocoanuts which they could have for the picking. In such a condition trade would be unknown.

Suppose, however, that one of these monkeys wandered from home and found at the end of a day's journey another community of monkeys living on cocoanuts different in quality and flavor from those with which he was familiar. He would at once discover the possibility of adding variety to his diet. Others would soon make the discovery, and so the monkeys of each community would go back and forth across the intervening distance which required a day's journey to traverse, and the object of these

frequent journeys would be to satisfy a demand for variety in food.

Now, since monkeys are supposed to be our ancestors, surely our ancestral pride will permit us to suppose that some monkey would invent a device like the wheelbarrow, so he could bring together the two varieties of food and enjoy them both at the same time. When other monkeys saw him with cocoanuts which they wanted, but which required a day's journey to secure, they would make overtures to secure some of the desired cocoanuts without going after them, and thus trade would be made possible. The monkey with the wheelbarrow would argue that to get a day's picking of these cocoanuts would require three days' time, one spent in going to where they could be picked, another in picking them, and a third in returning home. Consequently, he would demand three cocoanuts of the home variety for one of the other kind. No one could dispute the logic of this argument and doubtless trade would begin on this basis.

Now a monkey who could invent a wheelbarrow would doubtless have a fair degree of intellect, and therefore this monkey would soon discover the possibilities of the situation. He would trade with both communities on the same basis, and thus effect a material saving. He would labor one day at picking cocoanuts. The next day he would journey to the other community and exchange his cocoanuts for three times as many of the other kind. Thus in two days he would secure as many cocoanuts as previously he could pick in three days. The next day he would return to his home community with one day's picking of the other kind and exchange them for three times as many of the home variety. Trading in this manner with both communities, he could either accumulate wealth or have one-third of his time for improving his mind, but being a monkey he possibly would not accumulate wealth.

Other monkeys would see what he was doing and to the degree that he had an advantage in opportunity they would be tempted to follow his example. Other traders would set up in business, other wheelbarrows would come into existence, but, more important still, competition would come into the two communities, and would continuously depress prices until the returns for labor in trading reached the level of the returns for labor in picking. In other words, two cocoanuts at home would soon buy one of the other kind, and the traders would get no more premium than enough to measure the time between the two places, plus the wear and tear on wheelbarrows. If temporarily the price went lower it would draw men from the trading field to the picking field, and thus the equilibrium would be restored.

It will thus be seen that in such freely competitive conditions, labor, like water, seeks a level, and the advantages of trade are diffused throughout the entire community. In this instance that advantage would be the ability to have either or both kinds of cocoanuts without going after them.

Suppose, however, that one monkey be granted exclusive rights to transport cocoanuts, and that all others are denied permission to cross from one community to the other. Then the price of cocoanuts would be measured by the demand for variety in food. If it should happen that both kinds were necessary to sustain life the privileged monkey would

soon have armies of monkeys competing with each other for the privilege of working for him at his own price, and cocoanuts of the home variety would be overproduced in both communities. Cocoanuts would be no harder to pick, traveling would be no more difficult, but the transportation privilege would give its owner power of an absolute character.

This is an extreme case, but differs only in degree from phenomena with which we are all familiar.

From all these considerations we see that free competition tends to establish an exchange of labor products on the basis of cost of production. This is the utmost expression of economic brotherhood.

* * *

DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION.

I. ADMINISTRATION OR TEACHING.

Portions of an Address Delivered Before the Western Section of the Northern Illinois Teachers' Association, at Dixon, Ill., October, 1905, by David Kinley, Professor of Economics, and Dean of College of Literature and Arts, University of Illinois.

We seem to have evolved in late years in this country a passion for organization for organization's sake. We have been busy in educational circles in constructing systems of administration and machinery of organization, and there has been a growing tendency for the power which formulates educational policy and administers educational organization to come into the control of a smaller number. One of the most astounding things in educational life is that it is in the most democratic country in the world and in the most democratic parts of that country that the most autocratic systems and methods of school administration have grown up and are growing up. If you go to Massachusetts, you will find the schools close to the people and managed by officers elected by the citizens in their own communities, advised and helped by superintendents and by a state board of education which has no immediate authority over them. If you go to some other states, as New York, you will find at the head of the system a state officer with a hierarchy of officers under him, having so wide an authority that the local authorities have little to say or do about the management of their schools, and the teachers have least of all to say. In some cases the organization seems to be theoretically so perfect, on paper, that no individual teacher or officer in the system can go wrong without being immediately checked up by the center or head of the system; and that no individual teacher or officer in the system can do anything without the direct authorization and approval of the head of the system. He determines the policy and method of the work; everybody in the system must conform to his standards and methods.

But it is not only in the few cases of "system" that I have in mind that the teacher and his personality seem to have been reduced to a minimum; the same thing is true, in more or less degree, throughout the country. It seems, for example, to have become the high privilege of the teachers in different states throughout the United States to attend teachers' associations to carry out the will of a ring or small

Announcements

MEETINGS, LECTURES, DEBATES, ETC.

Brooklyn, N. Y.—Fourth Unitarian Church, Church Ave. and East 18th St., Flatbush, Sunday, May 20, 8 p. m. Debate: "Socialism vs The Single Tax," between Courtney Lemmon for Socialism and James R. Brown for the Single Tax.

Cincinnati, O.—Vine Street Congregational Church, Sunday, May 20, at 7:30 p. m. Lecture by Louis F. Post of Chicago on "The Blood of the Nations."

ATTORNEYS

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
COUNSELOR AT LAW.
Rooms 811, 812, 813 and 814
258 Broadway, Borough of Manhattan.
Telephone: 4094 Cortlandt. NEW YORK

WILLIAM H. HOLLY LAWYER

1506 Tribune Building. - - - CHICAGO

Telephones: { Central 2056
Automatic 4065

"MARRIAGE AND RACE DEATH"

The Foundations of an Intelligent System of Marriage
By MORRISON I. SWIFT

"It is a daring and original book, compelling thought and reflecting a phase of public sentiment that may one day resolve itself into momentous act."—*Toronto Globe*.

Cloth, \$1; paper, 50c. Postage, 10c. extra.

THE MORRISON I. SWIFT PRESS, 136 William St., NEW YORK

THE SHASTA DAISY,

Luther Burbank's pet flower, is the largest Daisy in the world. It is perennial and very hardy and is very readily propagated by division. It is a perpetual bloomer in Southern California and other places where the winter is mild. I will send well rooted plants by mail postpaid, one for 25 cents, two for 45 cents. Stamps taken.

JOSEPH SINTON, 440 S. Los Robles Avenue, Pasadena, California

Hours: 10 a. m. to 4 p. m.

Telephone Harrison 1027

CHARLES L. LOGAN, D. O. OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIAN

Office: 45 Auditorium Bldg.

HOTEL WARNER—EVENINGS

CHICAGO

IF YOU HAPPEN TO HAVE 10c

ingdon Square, New York.

IF NOT Write anyhow and learn how men and women who need work are being organized into useful, self-supporting, co-operative industries, paying for their tools by a light tax upon their work

Enclose it for a few numbers of the breezy little "Bulletin" issued weekly from the printery of the Straight Edge Industrial Settlement, 1 Ab-

group who make the slate of officers, determine the policy of the association, make its programs, and leave the rest of us the privilege of paying the bills. It is commonly said, for example, that our own National Educational Association is controlled by a small group of leading educators; controlled, that is in the sense that the great body of members have little or nothing to say about the general policy of the association or its officers. Certain occurrences at the last meeting seem to an unbiased public to furnish evidence of the truth of this statement. What opportunity is there in that organization, as it is, for the vast body of teachers throughout the country to exert their will and make themselves felt, except by taking the disagreeable attitude of critics or rebels against the system?

The evil reaches, however, not only through the teachers' association, but into school boards, into individual schools, and into colleges and universities. Here is a city superintendent, or principal, or a president, who is an autocrat. He has the sole control of appointment and dismissal and he exercises it in a way which makes it necessary for a teacher to suppress his individuality if he would save his place; to forego initiative and spontaneity and follow slavishly the dictates of his superior officer, if he is to furnish sufficient proof of the "personal loyalty" which that kind of a man always demands. He speaks of the teachers as if they were his personal servants, and I have heard superintendents and college presidents talk about "my force," "my teachers," "my schools," "my institution," as the Czar of Russia or the Emperor of Germany talks about my people, my army, my ships, and my soldiers. I have known some who insist on the power of summary dismissal at their own wish, yet who would resent hotly the assertion of any right on the part of the teacher to terminate his contract at will; who resented any efforts on the part of other schools or colleges to get members of their teaching corps, and laid it up against a member of their corps if he was known to be making an effort to better his condition in salary or rank by seeking a new position. Too much and too strong administration almost inevitably has such results and degrades the teacher. Either he rebels against the system and takes the consequences of a struggle with some one officially stronger than himself, and usually to his detriment, or else he submits at the sacrifice of his self respect and dignity. If he does the former he is accused of being a nuisance and of causing dissension in the school, and is marked as one whom it is not safe for superintendents and presidents to employ. If he submits, the degradation which he suffers from his loss of self respect makes the teacher less of a man or a woman and impairs the influence that he otherwise could have exerted in developing the character of the boys and girls under his charge.

We hear of men agreeing to accept a superintendency, a presidency, or a principalship on condition that they may have a "free hand," as it is called, in "reorganizing" the faculty. To grant the propriety of such a request is to forget that an educational institution is an organic growth; that the continuance of its life and policy and present character depends upon its past career. They ask the right to hack and sever and cut deep into the life of the institution in order, forsooth, that they may im-

John Moody & Co.
Dealers in
Investment Securities
35 Nassau Street, New York

EDWARD POLAK
4030 Third Avenue NEW YORK CITY
**Real Estate Auctioneer
and Broker**
Investments carefully made in New York real estate for out of town clients. BEST OF REFERENCES.

THE ELKHART SANITARIUM
ELKHART, IND.
IS THE PLACE TO GET WELL.

For the price of good city board and room, you get a pleasant private room and the attention of nurse and physician.

TEN DOLLARS A WEEK
secures all but extras. Extras are Radiant Light, Massage, Electric and Mineral Baths, Vibration, etc. Send for illustrated booklet and full particulars.
GEORGE F. WASHBURN, M. D. MARION FOSTER WASHBURN.

TELEPHONE 2463 CHELSEA DESIGNS FURNISHED ESTIMATES GIVEN

JEROME O'NEILL
**INTERIOR DECORATOR
AND HOUSE PAINTER**
ESTATE WORK A SPECIALTY
Shop: 276 Eighth Avenue, Between 23rd and 24th Streets, NEW YORK
RESIDENCE: 3 MANHATTAN STREET
Orders by mail promptly attended to

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume VIII of The Public

Was complete with the issue of March 31, 1906.

COMPLETE VOLUMES
including index, but unbound, will be sent postpaid for \$1.75.

EXCELLENTLY BOUND
in half roan, with gold vein paper sides, the price is
\$3.00.

By express, prepaid in the United States, Canada, Cuba, or Mexico, \$3.50.

Only a limited number of these volumes can be furnished. Containing as they do a complete narrative history of the year, they grow more valuable with the lapse of time.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.
First National Bank Building, - - CHICAGO

pose upon it from without a preconceived policy, formed in their own minds and without reference to the continuity of the life and the historical past of the college or school, without reference to the moral obligations that have sprung up; forgetful of the fact that they are dealing with human beings and not with machines, and that any act which lowers the standard of self respect of the teachers of the school—which makes them feel for an instant that they are not regarded as responsible and trustworthy individuals—is likely, by lowering the standard of work, to lower also the standard of conduct and impair the quality of teaching.

In short, there is a tendency in certain quarters to insist that the teachers of the country shall have nothing to say or do about the organization of our educational system. The advocates of this policy insist that "It is the business of the teacher to teach"; such a statement is mere play upon words and ignores the fact that teaching cannot be isolated from administration and the tendency is to defy the machinery of organization and to forget the human element, to organize and run a complex system beautiful in its completeness, smooth in its working, but smooth because it is impelled by a force from outside that crushes and overthrows internal, spontaneous influences which, although they may not work so smoothly, would give a more human, beautiful, and life-like movement to the system. Put in plain English, the tendency of this view is to relegate the teacher to a position of subordinate importance in the educational system; and it raises the question: Which is the important thing in education, administration or teaching? Are the teachers of a country or a community, taken as a whole, incapable of giving good advice regarding educational policy? Should they be cut off altogether in the matter of giving advice from access to boards of directors, boards of trustees and superintendents, and the whole determination of the educational policy in a community be left to a single officer, like a superintendent or president or a small board? Are the teachers of the country worthy of confidence?

* * *

THE TEACHER.

With Apologies to Kipling.

A maid there was and she taught a school
(Even as you and I!)
For parents and school boards, stiff and cool
(They thought she was only a hired tool).
But she knew she was there for good or ill.
(Even as you and I!)

Oh, the years we spend, and the skill we spend,
And the work of our brain and hand
Belong to the people, who do not know
(And we sometimes think they never will know)
And do not understand.

A maid there was, and her life she spent
(Even as you and I!)
Youth and brains and a good intent
(But they never cared what the teacher meant).
But a teacher must follow her natural bent.
(Even as you and I!)

Oh, the toil she gave and the strength she gave
And the hopes—that were built on sand—
Belong to the children who didn't know why
(And of course she didn't expect them to try),
And did not understand.

To Make Our Work Better Known

We ask the attention of all friends of **THE PUBLIC** and of progressive democracy to the announcement printed below. It will interest all men and women, in all localities, who favor the principles we are contending for, or who seriously wish to know the way of justice amid the political and social controversies of our time. We wish to get this announcement into the hands of all such people, and have printed it on neat white cards, size 3 in. x 5½ in., which can very conveniently be carried in the pocket or enclosed in envelopes. All who will help to distribute them by giving them away judiciously or enclosing them in correspondence, are requested to send to us for a supply, which will be sent carriage prepaid, and we will gladly send cards to any addresses suggested for the purpose.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY

First National Bank Building, CHICAGO



We are in a turmoil of political and social discussion. The questions under consideration are of vital importance to us and to our children, who will inherit the conditions we help to create. Where can reliable publications (books and pamphlets) be obtained, dealing honestly and fairly with such questions, from the view-point of popular rights and fundamental democracy?

There is now a conscientious publishing house entirely devoted to bringing out and supplying such publications, to meet the public's great and growing need. It is The Public Publishing Company, First National Bank Building, Chicago. Its many stockholders are all real and progressive democrats, men and women.

Their catalogue of books may be had for the asking. They supply at fairest price any book published — as well as those on their list — even searching for books rare or not well known, without extra charge for such service. Whenever you send them an order for anything, it encourages the production of new and timely books of fundamental democracy.

They also publish in Chicago a thirty-two page weekly journal of fundamental democracy called **THE PUBLIC**, of which Louis F. Post is Editor. The subscription price is only \$1.00 yearly or 50c. half-yearly. Sample copies free.

And it isn't the care and the wear and tear
That rush like a steel-gloved hand,
It's coming to know that they never cared
(Seeing at last that they never care.)
And would not understand.

—Charlotte West, American Primary Teacher.

+ + +

"She's very studious," said one woman.

"Yes," answered the other.

"And doesn't seem to care for gossiping in the least."

"Oh, I don't know about that," answered the other with a sniff, "she merely prefers to talk about Helen of Troy and Romeo and Juliet, to paying attention to what is going on in her own neighborhood."—Washington Star.

+ + +

Father: "What! You a soldier? Why, don't you know the enemy would shoot at you?"

Ronald: "But I guess I'd be an enemy myself."—Boston Post.

+ + +

Is it entirely safe to assume that the pulse is the pulse of the people, though the wrist be the wrist of the fourth-class postmasters?—Puck.

BOOKS

RACE PREJUDICE.

The Curse of Race Prejudice. By James F. Morton, Jr., A. M. Published by the Author, 244 W. 143d St., New York. Sold by The Public Publishing Co., Chicago. Price, 25 cents.

Mr. Morton, an under graduate associate at Harvard of the distinguished Negro scholar, Prof. Du Bois, has forcefully, yet dispassionately and in interesting style, made a powerful arraignment of the evils of race prejudice. There is nothing narrow or sectional in his work, nor does he confine its scope to prejudices against a particular race. Writing as an American white man he surveys all the race prejudices of American white men, whether against the Negro in one part of America, the Indian in another, or the Chinaman in another. And he notes the same morbid hostility in Russia against the Jew, and in all the domineering races and nations of history against races or nations they had wronged. Regarding all this as "an extension of the subconscious feeling of the average man that the whole universe revolves around himself and was created for his especial benefit," Mr. Morton declares it to be "not merely indefensible in the extreme degree in its cruel injustice to weaker or less developed races, but a blighting curse to the dominant race itself."

It is upon the latter aspect of the matter that he puts his emphasis, considering the "curse of race prejudice" chiefly in its degrading effect upon the race that harbors it. "A highly advanced civilization is maintainable," he writes, "only on condition of weeding out from the minds of its constituent members every trace of this debasing mental poison."

When applying that idea concretely to the Negro

JUST ISSUED

ROCKEFELLER BEFORE A JURY

By JOHN A. ZANGERLE

An interesting statement of the judgment of various classes of society upon John D. Rockefeller, presented in the novel form of a record of the imaginary trial of Mr. Rockefeller in the Court of Ethics, State of Reason, County of Common Sense, before a jury composed of Mr. Banker, Mr. Tramp, Mr. Retailer, Mr. Laborer, Mr. Republican, Mr. Artist, Mr. Democrat, Mr. Socialist, Mr. Landlord, Mr. Farmer, Mr. Minister, and Mr. Philosopher.

12mo, cloth, 204 pages, with index, \$1.25; by mail, \$1.35.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
First National Bank Building, Chicago

JUST ISSUED

THE LARGER VIEW OF MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP

By JOHN A. ZANGERLE

A statement of the broad sociological aspect of the subject.

Contents: Ch. I. The Economic Question; Ch. II. Can Public Corporations Operate as Cheaply as Private Companies?; Ch. III. A Larger Question; Ch. IV. Franchise Grants Violate the Sacredness of Property; Ch. V. Bossism; Ch. VI. Home Rule; Ch. VII. Graft, Big and Small; Ch. VIII. How to Purify Politics; Ch. IX. Taxation Without Representation; Ch. X. Business vs. Public Interests; Ch. XI. Our Civilization—Its Meaning; Ch. XII. Reverse the Gun.

12mo, paper, 67 pages, 35 cents, postpaid.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY
First National Bank Building, Chicago



CONSOLATION FOR SAN FRANCISCO.

Landlordism—My dear Madam, in so far as your tears may be on my account, I assure you they are unnecessary. The ground is more valuable than ever, and the rebuilding of the city will be done chiefly at the expense of those who build. I'm all right; in fact I stand to win by the calamity!

problem of the South, Mr. Morton makes this sympathetic and wise observation: "The presence of a mass of human ignorance and brutalization, white or black, is indeed a sore trial for any people to endure in their very midst; and the South deserves the deepest sympathy in the difficult problem with which she is compelled to grapple. But she in her turn must learn to look facts in the face and not multiply difficulties for herself by seeking a wrong way out. Race prejudice only makes matters worse. Injustice breeds revenge. Hope stimulates aspiration and progress. No doubt a thousand faults of the undeveloped Negro race are unpleasantly apparent, and fearfully hard to endure. A world of patience is needed. Yet the South has only to open her eyes in order to see a multitude of encouraging facts. Instead of keeping the Negro severely down, let him be stimulated to rise as high as he proves capable of rising. Instead of a competitor with the white race, let him be adopted as a partner; and both races will reap the benefit. Break down the artificial barriers, which compel an unhealthy herding and breed ill feeling against the white race. There is no other solution to the problem. Race prejudice is merely destructive. It offers nothing but a hopeless warfare and a blank pessimism. It has no future, but clings to a dead and decaying past. It has no constructive plan of any sort. The present condition is intolerable; and race prejudice, so far

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 creditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinion 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 matter, chosen alike for its literary merit and wholesome human interest.

Familiarity with *The Public* will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by The Public Publishing Company, First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

Terms:—Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, 50 cts.; Quarterly Subscription, 25 cts.; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cts.; Single Copies, 5 cts. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of The Public Publishing Co. Money Orders of Chicago or New York Drafts are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one. Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING

Per agate line, each insertion.....	\$ 0.09
Per inch (14 lines), each insertion.....	1.20
Per column (120 lines), each insertion.....	10.00
One-quarter page (60 lines), each insertion.....	5.00
One-half page (120 lines), each insertion.....	10.00
One page (240 lines), each insertion.....	20.00
Front cover page, each insertion.....	25.00
Front cover half page, each insertion.....	15.00
Last cover page, each insertion.....	25.00
Last cover half page, each insertion.....	15.00
Last cover quarter page, each insertion.....	6.50

Advertising forms close on the Tuesday preceding the Saturday of publication.

from suggesting a way out, proposes merely to intensify the worst features of the existing evil. Its overthrow must precede the general application of any effective remedy. The issue cannot be dodged. 'A nation divided against itself cannot stand.' Two races cannot live side by side at daggers' points with one another and protect civilization or maintain a healthy state of progress in either. The perpetual feud destroys what is best and most hopeful in both. Race prejudice must die, that each of the races now cursed by its envenomed influence may truly live."

A friendlier message that, than the one which Charles Francis Adams has sent to the white people of the South.

BOOKS RECEIVED

—The Third Power. By J. A. Everitt. Third edition. Published by J. A. Everitt, Indianapolis. To be reviewed.

—Rockefeller Before a Jury. By John A. Zangerle. Published by The Burrows Brothers Company, Cleveland. To be reviewed.

—Patriotism and the New Internationalism. By Lucia Ames Mead. Published by Ginn & Company, Boston. To be reviewed.

—The Soul of the People. A New Year's Sermon. By William M. Ivins. Published by the Century Co., New York. To be reviewed.

—Man, the Social Creator. By Henry Demarest Lloyd. Edited by Jane Addams and Anne Withington. Published by Doubleday, Page & Company, New York. Price \$2 net. Sold by The Public Publishing Co., Chicago. To be reviewed.

PAMPHLETS

Under the title of "La Gran Iniquidad," Dr. Felix Vitale, of Montevideo, Uruguay, has translated Tolstoy's letter, "The Great Iniquity," which was published in the London Times of August 22, 1905, and republished in pamphlet form by The Public Publishing Company of Chicago. The characteristically forceful manner in which Tolstoy attacks the evils of land monopoly existing in Russia; his vivid portrayal of the frightful effects resulting therefrom upon the peasantry; their powerful appeal to the Czar to be allowed access to the land; the emphasis he puts upon the fact that owing to the simple methods of production in his country the people fully recognize the importance of land in its relation to humanity; his strong advocacy of the single tax as the only remedy for their existing economic ills—make his famous letter valuable in any language. Dr. Vitale's translation is an excellent rendering into Spanish.—C. L. L.

PERIODICALS

The Spring number of the Single Tax Review, which opens with a brief account of the land nationalization movement in France and Belgium, by Gustave Buescher, furnishes an interesting compendium of single tax news, comment and controversy, rather more varied than usual.

JUST ISSUED

WILLIAM MORRIS

Craftsman, Writer and Social Reformer

By OSCAR LOVELL TRIGGS

CONTENTS

- Ch. I. Introduction
- Ch. II. Developing Influences
- Ch. III. Morris, the Craftsman
- Ch. IV. Morris, the Writer
- Ch. V. Morris, the Social Reformer
- Ch. VI. His Philosophic Position
- Appendix

16mo, paper, 46 pages, 10 cents, postpaid; one dozen, \$1.00, postpaid.

The Public Publishing Co.

First National Bank Building

CHICAGO

The Changing Order

A STUDY OF DEMOCRACY

By OSCAR LOVELL TRIGGS, Ph.D.

Contents: Introduction; Democratic Art; The Esoteric Tendency in Literature; Browning; Subjective Landscape Art; George Inness; The Critical Attitude; An Instance of Conversion: Tolstoy; A Type of Transition: William Morris; The Philosophy of Play; Democratic Education; Where is the Poet?; The New Doctrine of Labor; The Sociological Viewpoint in Art; The Philosophy of the Betterment Movement; Industrial Feudalism—and After; The Workshop and School; A School of Industrial Art; The Philosophic and Religious Ground: Walt Whitman; The Outlook to the East.

12mo, cloth, 300 pages, \$1.00, postpaid.

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.

First National Bank Building

CHICAGO

NOMINATING SYSTEMS:

Direct Primaries vs. Conventions
in the United States

By ERNST C. MEYER

A work of great value and importance to all who want government "by the people and for the people." The subject is among the foremost in the public mind to-day.

The most informing work yet published upon the nominating systems of the United States. The study that is made of caucus and convention methods and of the advantages and disadvantages of these as compared with the direct primary is remarkably thorough, and the history of the movement for direct nominations covers every State where the movement has made itself felt. . . . The author's style is clear and his work may be studied with profit by every one who is seeking to purify and ennoble American politics. — *Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn.*

The Direct Primary System is succinctly but forcibly stated in Mr. Meyer's admirable volume. — *Post-Intelligencer, Seattle, Wash.*

Acting on the scientific methods he exposes the disadvantages on the one hand of the old system and expounds the advantages of the new, as demonstrated by varied experience. — *Journal, Lewiston, Me.*

His work will crystallize, systematize, concentrate and direct the efforts being made to the unerring accomplishment of its beneficent purpose—the restoration of political power to the people. — *Public Policy, Chicago.*

8vo, cloth, 501 pages, with appendix and index, \$1.50, postpaid.

The Public Publishing Company

First National Bank Building, Chicago

JUST ISSUED

MAN, The Social Creator

By Henry Demarest Lloyd

This book contains Mr. Lloyd's deepest thought on religion. It embodies his conception of man as a creator and potential god, and represents the matured work of his last years.

CONTENTS

- Ch. I. The Discovery of Social Love
- “ II. Social Progress Always Religious
- “ III. Mere Contact Making for Spiritual Union
- “ IV. Social Love Creating New Forms of Social Life
- “ V. The New Conscience
- “ VI. New Conscience in Industry
- “ VII. New Conscience Transforming Politics—Killing the Party Spirit
- “ VII. The New Conscience Manifesting Itself in Educational Methods and Aims
- “ IX. A New Political Economy Predicting a New Wealth
- “ X. The Church of the Deed
- “ XI. The Religion of Labor

12mo, cloth, 279 pages, with portrait, \$2.00; by mail, \$2.15.

The Public Publishing Company

First National Bank Building, Chicago