

Some of the exposures in Lawson's January installment of "Frenzied Finance," corroborated as they are by several of the implicated persons, may well lead one to ask whether government has not gone clear beyond its legitimate limitations, in undertaking to adjust private quarrels and to farm out its own functions through franchises. Would it not be far better if it confined its activities to the maintenance of public order, the regulation of land tenures, inclusive of highways, and the collection of the common revenues? This would cut out corporate charters, private monopolies, and public debt-collecting. It would leave individuals, where they should be left, to deal with one another on the basis of personal integrity. And why not? Why utilize public functions for the furtherance of rascally private schemes? Why not leave the rascals, little and big, to swindle one another to their hearts' content, until each comes to distrust the rest and swindling ceases to pay?

Not often are land speculators as candid in their operations as is a New York investment company of which Senator Depew is a director. In its advertisements it invites the investment of hundreds now in vacant lots which "will become thousands within the next few years," and then naively urges: "If you are open-minded and want to get ahead, let us tell you what the expenditure of over \$350,000,000 is doing for those who have intelligence and foresight, and"—mind this, now—"plant where others will till and you reap." Planting is euphemistic, of course; it doesn't mean seed-planting in the ground either literally or metaphorically, but money-planting in the promoters' office. The tilling and reaping, however, are in a way quite literal. And that is the trouble with industrial affairs. There is too much reaping by some where others till, and consequently too little reaping by the tillers themselves. Senator Depew's company has truly found the explana-

tion. There is only one way, fundamentally, of reaping where others till, and that is by owning the natural tillage place.

Some newspaper comments on the recent promotion of an active gentleman from the management of the harvester trust to the management of one of the subsidiary steel trusts, are not of a kind to stimulate moral progress. This man is described as successful, and his success is ascribed to his having been always busy. What he was busy at seems to cut no figure; his example is commended to the youth of the land absolutely without reference to the object or character of his incessant activity. Take, for instance, this reflection upon the matter by the Chicago Tribune:

The degree of a man's success, whether in money getting, or writing, or scanning the heavens for new stars, or running for office, usually depends a good deal more upon the assiduity with which he plies his trade than upon his opportunities or natural talents. . . . The successful man is usually busy, and the busy man is usually successful.

Every word of that would apply as well to a burglar, a forger, a sneak thief, or a political grafter, as to an honest worker. With a change of the personal pronoun to the feminine form, it would have applied as well three months ago to Mrs. Chadwick as it does to-day to the man whose success inspired the reflection. This does not imply that the activity of that active gentleman has not been well directed. He is possibly as useful as he is busy. Nevertheless, it is to be observed that big salaried heads of trusts, such as he, are usually selected less for their productive than for their appropriative skill.

With the death of Clinton Furbish, which occurred in New York on Christmas, there passed away a remarkable man. Mr. Furbish was intensely political in his tastes and associations, and, although never a candidate for elective office and but once an office-

holder, was widely intimate with public men. His participation in political movements dated back to the Free Soil convention at Pittsburg in 1852. He was an active Republican until the Greenback party, with Peter Cooper at its head, came into politics in 1876. For this party Mr. Furbish was one of the most effective stump speakers; and he never abandoned its doctrines, although he subsequently supplemented them with the land-tenure doctrines of Henry George, of whom he was a personal friend, and in whose campaign for mayor of Greater New York in 1897 he was a worker and adviser. With Mr. George he had become a supporter of Cleveland in 1888; and in 1892, having meantime engaged in journalism in Chicago, he was Ben T. Cable's chief assistant in managing the Western branch of Cleveland's third campaign. It was as a result of effective political work in this connection that Mr. Furbish became chief of the Bureau of American Republics at Washington, an office which he vacated soon after the close of Cleveland's administration. Although thus closely associated officially with the administration of President Cleveland when the influence of that administration was exerted against the election of Bryan, Mr. Furbish made speeches in the campaign of 1896 both in support of Bryan and of the bimetallic theory of money for which Bryan stood. To Mr. Furbish, however, bimetallicism was less attractive in itself than as a step toward the greenback doctrines which he had never relinquished. By occupation he was a patent expert, and after his retirement from office he pursued this vocation until his death. As a newspaper man, Mr. Furbish's principal work was done on the Chicago News and the Chicago Times, as editorial writer, and for the Chicago Leader, a weekly political review of which he was editor in the early 90's. A man of tireless industry, of inexhaustible resource, and of singular devotion to his convictions, Mr. Furbish was also a man of notable loyalty to his friendships.