

of saving to the people their rights to the land of their country, even though it has passed into private hands, and that is by abolishing taxes on industry and collecting taxes exclusively from land ad valorem. While this would not get the old horse back into the stable nor the spilt milk back into the pail, it would accomplish even better results. For, dropping metaphors, it would leave the land in private control while taking annually for social uses its annual social value.

* *

Child Labor.

Among the insidious excuses for child labor is the plea that children ought to do useful and remunerative work. Proceeding from this major premise it is easy to state as the minor premise that factory work is useful and remunerative, and then to draw the conclusion that children ought to work in factories. But the syllogism is chock full of holes. In the first place, the major premise is all in confusion. It is not true, unqualifiedly, that children ought to do useful and remunerative work. The truth of the statement depends upon the kind of work. Children ought, truly enough, to do some kind of useful and remunerative work; but if we classify useful and remunerative work we shall soon see that the kind that children ought to do is not the kind that the great factories offer them. While children ought to do useful and remunerative work, the work ought to be attractive in character, developing in effect, moderate in amount and mild in intensity. But factory labor for children answers to none of those requirements. It is intense, monotonous, grinding toil, and it wears out the body, stunts the mind, and paralyzes the affections. There is a vast gulf between the deadening drudgery of the factory, to which children are subjected, and the rational industry by which they would be stimulated.

* *

Expert Witnesses.

The exhibition of conflicting opinions of experts in noted trials always calls out newspaper criticism, as if the fact of diversity of expert opinion proved bad faith on one side or the other. An instance is a recent newspaper suggestion to the effect that experts should not be permitted to testify if they are paid. This suggestion utterly confuses experts, who elucidate opinions, with witnesses, who narrate facts. The witness happens to be familiar with facts connected with the question on trial, and it is his duty as a good citizen to apprise the jury of these facts. To pay such a witness more than the statutory fee would be

in the nature of a bribe. But the expert knows nothing of the question on trial until he is employed to investigate it. His relation to a lawsuit is less like that of a witness than of a lawyer. As the lawyer assists the judge in reaching conclusions as to the legal aspects of the case, so the expert assists the jury in arriving at conclusions as to its scientific aspects. And it is no more significant of bad faith if experts disagree on novel scientific propositions or novel applications of scientific principles than that lawyers should disagree regarding unsettled principles or novel applications of the law. Precisely as the wrangling of opposing lawyers of intelligence tends to lead an honest and intelligent judge to a sounder legal conclusion than either lawyer would come to or than he himself would come to without the wrangling, so do the conflicting opinions of experts tend to lead a jury of honest and common-sense men to sound conclusions regarding scientific questions at issue. To prohibit the payment of fees to experts would be to practically rule out experts and thereby withhold from juries the benefit of scientific advice and controversy.

* *

Death of Helen Taylor.

To many Americans still living, Helen Taylor's name is more than a name. They remember her as the step-daughter of John Stuart Mill, who assisted him in the preparation of his book on the "Subjection of Women," and of whom he wrote after the death of her mother: "Surely no one ever before was so fortunate as, after such a loss as mine, to draw another prize in the lottery of life." Upon her step-father's death Miss Taylor threw herself into active political work, for which woman suffrage in school-voting afforded her an opportunity. From 1876 until 1885 she was a member by election of the London school board, and in 1885 she became a Parliamentary candidate but was refused recognition by the election officials because of her sex. She was intensely a democrat, and from the democratic point of view she advocated woman suffrage and land nationalization and sympathized with socialism. She was an ardent supporter of Henry George's work in Great Britain in the '80's and a personal friend of whom he often spoke in terms of respect and affection. Miss Taylor died on the 29th of January in her seventy-sixth year.

* *

In every country the nation is in the cotten if the light of your legislation does not shine on your statesmanship is a failure and your statesmanship a mistake.—Canon Farrar.