

### Pensions for Mothers.

Under the Illinois law, any poor mother may now receive a pension to aid her in bringing up her children. She is under no obligation to amiable persons of philanthropic instincts and means, nor to charity societies or church or other private associations. She gets the money as a right and not as a favor, out of the public treasury into which she pays money, whether she knows it or not, as a direct-taxpayer or an indirect-taxpayer. The pension is paid to her for bringing up her children at home, as money is paid to teachers for bringing them up at school. The families of dead workers and those of poor convicts will not any longer be doomed to destruction where this law applies. The family home, not the charity institution, is the ideal of this law. May its principles progress until, out of the abundance which belongs to society but which goes now to individuals unearned, all families are thus provided for—but better.

+ +

### "All in Your Eye."

In a lecture on medicine fakes, Dr. Bernard Fanlus, professor of materia medica and therapeutics at the medical college of the University of Illinois, is quoted thus by the Chicago Tribune of November 19, 1911:

I have here a bottle of "Murine." It says on the label it is a "reliable relief for sore eyes." It makes a stronger claim in the circular around the bottle. You will find this is true throughout the business. The circular claims the remedy will cure "scaly eyes and children's eyes"—everything but glass eyes. This "marvelous" remedy is nothing more than a three per cent solution of borax and water with a slight coloring of golden seal. It cost five cents a gallon to make it. It is sold at the rate of \$1.28 a gallon.

This information is peculiarly interesting in Chicago from the fact that "Murine's" other name came to the surface in public affairs in Chicago during the craze for "successful business men" in office. It now holds one of the most responsible of public offices "with one hand," so to speak, while "with the other" it very successfully sells itself as a peculiar charm for sore eyes.

+ +

### Advertisements of Food.

Professor Lewis B. Allyn, to whose modest work great effectiveness has been given by Collier's, deserves universal gratitude for his service in distinguishing the pure and wholesome among widely advertised food products. Not all advertising mediums can discriminate as Collier's

does; the cost would swamp them. But they can exclude advertisements that do not come up to Professor Allyn's fair standards; or if absolute exclusion be too drastic, advertising mediums that set up no higher claims than the introduction of sellers to buyers on a basis of good faith, can at least require that the fact of some such endorsement accompany advertisements entitled to them, so that readers may choose between the approved and the unapproved. The business of supplying factory-made foods is so general as to have made dependence upon them a public necessity. Consumers cannot investigate for themselves; few advertising mediums can investigate fully enough to become guarantors beyond the point of their own good faith and such knowledge as is perhaps a trifle better than common knowledge; and yet the consumer must somehow be protected against fraudulent misrepresentations, for the circumstances prevent his protecting himself. This is more important of course with reference to harmful adulterants than with reference to the products of such deceptive advertisers as Collier's has proved the Post concern at Battle Creek to be; but it is important in all cases, and government inspection is not to be compared for efficiency with such services in this respect as Professor Allyn's is an example or suggestive of. With that kind of work developed in modern educational institutions, and given responsible publicity by such leading periodicals as Collier's, the Philadelphia North American, and a growing list of followers, no advertising medium could be made the *innocent* agent for defrauding its readers as to factory-made foods. Similar methods might then come into use with reference to other advertised commodities.

+ +

### Death of S. J. Chubb.

Samuel James Chubb is the name of another long-time worker in the Singletax cause who has recently passed into the mysterious sphere which the veil of death conceals. Mr. Chubb was a sturdy Briton, strong of body, vigorous and clear of mind and upright and downright in moral character, who lived most of his long life in Canada, not far from Toronto. He was a cabinetmaker with a conscience that supervised every dovetail and mortise, and who used his thought and conscience as faithfully for his citizenship as at his bench. There was something suggestive of great poetry in the precise and rhythmic massing of his thought, from perception to conclusion, on any question that attracted his attention; and chief among these was the great question of the relations of man to man and of

men to the earth. He was an all-round man, a man of heart as well as mind, with emotions balanced by judgment and reason spurred on by affection.

\* \* \*

### HARMON'S CANDIDACY.

Quite often the questions that come to us for answers do not seem to warrant editorial treatment, whether for lack of timeliness or other cause, and we answer them by private letter. But here is one which nearly every reader of *The Public* may well be asking just now. It is from Idaho. "I would take it," says the writer, "that you are for Wilson for Democratic nominee for the Presidency; but out here in Idaho, Governor Harmon of Ohio is being strongly urged, and some of our democratic Democrats place him in the Progressive column. They say that Tom L. Johnson understood Mr. Harmon's position and was satisfied with it; and I have received a pamphlet which makes it appear that the Progressives of Cleveland endorse Governor Harmon. We are very anxious to have Idaho on the right side in the convention." Thereupon comes the question as to Governor Harmon's availability for democratic Democrats.

+

Before answering that highly important question, let us state that our correspondent is mistaken in supposing that *The Public* is committed to Governor Wilson. It is not committed to anybody. We believe that Governor Wilson is a democratic Democrat, that he is "on the square" and courageous, that he has all the best qualifications for the Democratic candidacy and for the American Presidency, and that at the present time he is far in the lead of all competitors both for nomination and election. But the people are making history fast these days, and many changes may occur between now and nomination time. So much for *The Public*. It is different with men in active politics who are confronted already with the necessity for making a choice. They must decide soon. They cannot wait as we can, until the convention meets. There is danger in their waiting too long. Also in deciding upon the basis of personal or local preferences. If the national convention opens with pledged delegations for many candidates, the one dangerous candidate of great present strength, or his "dark horse" double, may win the nomination through the divided opposition. This brings us to Governor Harmon.

+

Tom L. Johnson *did* understand Governor Harmon's position; he he was *not* satisfied with it.

There are probably few men of Presidential size with whom Tom L. Johnson would have been less satisfied for the Democratic candidate than with Mr. Harmon. Harmon is a reactionary, and has been such throughout the whole period of the struggle between democracy and plutocracy within the Democratic party. It is not merely that he opposed Bryan in 1896. Many democratic Democrats did that, upon the erroneous supposition that they were only opposing what they regarded as a financial heresy and a financial heretic. They did not realize that "free silver" was but the accidental and temporary shibboleth of democracy in that fight, and that the "gold standard" was the same for plutocracy. Governor Harmon did not understand this, as Grover Cleveland did. And, like Cleveland, his opposition to Bryan was only nominally for the latter's "free silverism;" it was really for the democratic spirit which Bryan's leadership represented. In other words, Governor Harmon was then, as he is yet, a reactionary Democrat such as Grover Cleveland was. Throughout Tom L. Johnson's democratic struggle in Ohio, Mr. Harmon tried to thwart his democratic policies, and often did thwart them, by co-operating with the worst "machine" elements of the Democratic party in that State.

+

In all probability Governor Harmon is supported, and will be supported, by leading Ohio Democrats—democratic Democrats. But let no one outside of Ohio be fooled thereby. No man in responsible, practical politics can do exactly as he wishes at all times; and one of the things such a man can never do except in emergencies is what democratic Democrats of Ohio must do in order to oppose Harmon. They must defy the instructions of their own party convention. By a familiar political trick, Governor Harmon's workers secured for him the Presidential nomination of his State convention when he ran for re-election as Governor. In view of that fact no recommendation of Harmon by any Ohio Democrat can be taken safely at face value. Nor ought it to be taken even if there were no coercion. Though Democrats who would want Grover Cleveland for President again if they could get him are quite right in supporting Judson Harmon, nobody else would be. Harmon is the candidate of Pierpont Morgan's group, the candidate for whom the "machines" have had "the tip" from Wall Street. Large sums of money furnished by the interests have been spent and are being spent to secure his nomination; and not by legitimate appeals to public opinion, but through the "gum-shoe" meth-