ple need is more room at the bottom, not at the top. What they have a right to expect, in view of our enormous natural progress, is better room at the bottom and not more luxurious room at the top.

Mr. J. B. Johnston, a Chicago gentleman, has written to the Conservative a thoughtful essay on privileged classes. Mr. Morton publishes it with the editorial announcement that "it demonstrates thoroughly well the fact that there is a privileged class in this country." But he adds that "there always will be a privileged class, so long as some men have better intellectual ability by inheritance and better development thereof by schooling and discipline than other men." Inasmuch as Mr. Johnston "demonstrates," to use Mr. Morton's language, "that there is a privileged class," by showing that the law creates these privileges, through the establishment and maintenance of monopolies of national resources, Mr. Morton's comment leads to a queer conclusion. For if Mr. Johnston has demonstrated his proposition, as Mr. Morton admits, and it is true, as Mr. Morton explains, that the privileged get their privileges through superior intellectual ability, then their intellectual ability must be superior in the direction of securing legislation for selfish ends. In other words, it must be sly predatory ability that the privileged class inherits and develops? Now, pray, what is the moral difference between predatory ability of the intellectual order and predatory ability of the physical sort? If systematic robbery by law is commendable, why not sporadic robbery with a club?

The plutocratic press of the country made itself merry a few weeks ago, both in news and editorial columns, over a newspaper interview attributed to ex-Senator Charles A. Towne, in which Mr. Towne was credited with saying in substance that the bottom had fallen out of the silver issue, that Bryanism had collapsed, and that Hill, of New York, would probably be the next democratic candidate for president. Mr. Towne has in a most public and emphatic manner denied the authenticity of this interview, denouncing it as a fabrication from beginning to end. We have consequently watched for corrections in the plutocratic papers that were presumably misled by the faked interview, but thus far we have watched in vain. The confiding readers of those papers are allowed still to suppose that Mr. Towne said what the interview attributed to him. If grocers were to deceive their customers in a similar manner about the genuineness of butter, the grocers would be accounted swindlers. But is it not a worse swindle to sell false news at full price than to sell oleomargarine for the price of butter?

AUSTRALASIAN TAXATION IN COLORADO.

A political campaign is now beginning in the state of Colorado which will last 14 months and culminate in a momentous decision—momentous not alone to the people of Colorado, but, only in lesser degree, to the people also of all the other states. It is a campaign to determine by popular vote whether Colorado shall introduce the Australasian system of taxation.

I.

Like every other American community, Colorado is cursed with great inequalities of taxation, imposed by burdensome methods and producing inadequate public incomes. After some experience with the usual variety of familiar "remedies" for curing this revenue disease without disturbing its cause, the state senate adopted a resolution on the 27th of March, 1899, providing for a senate committee to investigate the "state and local revenue laws, and, so far as possible, discover their defects and a just, wise and complete remedy therefor." The resolution particularly instructed the committee "to investigate the tax laws of New Zealand and the Australian colonies and the effect of such laws."

Credit for securing the adoption of this resolution is due especially to James W. Bucklin, of Grand Junction, one of the most prominent lawyers of western Colorado. Some 15 or 18 years ago Mr. Bucklin was a republican member of the lower house of the Colorado legislature. About that time he came across Henry George's great work, "Progress and Poverty," which made him a thorough convert to its doctrines. His political sympathies thereby revolutionized, he withdrew from his party and for a long time afterwards had no party affiliations. But with unflagging enthusiasm, yet patiently and by common sense methods, Mr. Bucklin impregnated his community with the doctrines that meant so much to him; and when the wave of populism swept the state it carried him back to a seat in the lower house. That was in 1896. While in the house at this time Mr. Bucklin procured the passage of a measure for local option in taxation, but it was defeated in the senate. At the end of his term he was nominated for the senatorship jointly by the populist and the democratic parties, and elected in 1898 by an extraordinary vote. Though opposed by a regular republican and a silver republican, he carried every voting precinct of his own county, every voting precinct of the adjoining county, and 19 out of the 26 voting precincts of the third county of his senatorial district. Even the voting precincts where his adversaries lived gave him a majority. Upon coming into the senate Mr. Bucklin renewed his efforts to establish local option in taxation in Colorado, meantime securing the enactment of a very important franchise law which recognizes the fundamental distinction between property in personalty or improvements and property in mere legal privileges. The result of his efforts to advance the local option movement was the adoption of the resolution quoted from above.

Senator Bucklin was, of course, appointed chairman of the committee called for by that resolution, and with him upon the committee were named Senators William A. Hill, silver republican, and Thomas J. Ehrhart, democrat. As there was no appro-

priation for the expenses of the committee, it would have accomplished nothing but for the personal determination and pecuniary sacrifices of Senator Bucklin. The committee having been particularly instructed to investigate the tax laws of New Zealand and the Australian colonies, Mr. Bucklin determined to make the investigation thorough, though at his own time and expense. Accordingly he spent the winter of 1899 and 1900 in visiting the colonies of Australasia and examining into the character, operation and effects of their tax laws. Upon his return he presented a report which has been widely circulated and forms the basis for the campaign in Colorado which we mention above.*

In his preface to this report Senator Bucklin says:

One of the most persistent objections to a system of land value taxation has been the claim that such a system was a mere theory and not practical. The system of land value taxation now existing in the colonies of Australasia forever silences all such contentions. The practical working success of that system can no longer be questioned. All that I claim for this report is strict accuracy in detailing facts, and that the conclusions drawn therefrom are conservative. My hope is that the American states, and first of all my own state of Colorado, may likewise find relief from intolerable fiscal and economic conditions, by adopting the rational system of taxation which has been so successful in the progressive colonies of Australasia.

II.

To gather the materials for that report the now distinguished Colorado senator traveled more than 20,000 miles. He was everywhere received with great courtesy and kindness by the Australasian officials, who took all pains to facilitate his researches and enable him to make his investigation thorough.

That he did this is evident. But he makes no attempt either to describe all the different schemes of taxation in Australasia which he studied, nor to point out theoretical defects in any. Most of them are neither novel nor valuable. He confines his report to that one of the Australasian tax systems which differs from any in America, and "which, owing to its extensive adoption, prospective extension and radical departure from other methods, may properly be called the Australasian land value tax."

This appears to be—

a law taxing land according to its value, excluding all personal property and improvements therefrom. It draws a sharp, clear line of distinction between the products of labor and capital as a source of public revenue, and the unearned increment or rental values of land. Such a tax, therefore, is not in any degree derived from wages, nor from the natural increase of capital, but comes wholly from ground or land rent, excluding all improvements. It is a tax on the privilege of owning social values, which are not produced by individuals, but which spring up, increase and decrease with the existence, condition and growth of society, and the character of its government. In short, the Australasian land value tax is simply a tax on the benefits or privileges which governments confer on land owners, in exact proportion to the benefits so received; in other words, the application of the betterment principle, that the owner of the property benefited by law should bear the burden of paying for the benefit so received. It is in no sense a class tax, but rests upon all in proportion to the benefits received from the existence and growth of society and government. It is not a tax on the area of land, but rests on city lots and on all land according to its value and irrespective of its size. The Australasian system does not interfere with nor tax any industry in any of its processes, nor anything which industry produces, but leaves them free from any fines or burdens of government, thus giving to each and every industry equal and impartial encouragement and protection. It is not a general property tax nor a real estate tax, as both personal property and improvements are exempt under its provisions. In fact, there is no direct taxation of personal property in any of the Australasian colonies, nor any constitutional or other restrictions on the power of the legislatures to establish or enlarge the land value tax.

Yet the Australasian land value tax is not identical with the system known as "the single tax," which is associated with the name of Henry George. "The single tax is not in operation in any of the Australasian colonies," says the Bucklin report, which continues:

The single tax is a philosophy, and covers the question of political economy, while the Australasian land tax is simply a small land value tax in practical operation. The single tax would abolish all other forms of taxation and raise all public revenue from one source; while the Australasian land tax is only one of many kinds of taxes. None of the colonies derive their entire revenue from this tax, but, on the contrary, the greater portion of their revenues are raised by other tax laws. The Australasian land tax does not abolish private property in land, and only converts into the public treasury a small proportion of the rent of land. In short, it contains only a small part of the single tax ideas. The great majority of the advocates and supporters of the Australasian law have made but little if any investigation of the single tax, and some of them violently denounce it. Having been formulated and placed on the statute books of New Zealand before "Progress and Poverty," or any of the principal works of Henry George were issued, this law does not owe its origin nor its original establishment to the books of George. In fact, it owes its origin to the failure of all other systems of taxation, to the work of Sir George Grey and other New Zealand statesmen, many of whom were students of political economy, and to such books as those of John Stuart Mill and Judge Thomas M. Cooley. Its subsequent establishment and progress has been greatly aided by Henry George and his disciples, and it is significant that since "Progress and Poverty" has been known to the world no land value tax law has been repealed. The Australasian land value tax is not a law of the "Commonwealth of Australia," but is a law of the several states or colonies, and can be fully adopted by any of the several American states; while the single tax could not be put into full operation here without an amendment to the federal laws and constitution. While each is a tax on land values exclusively, still to identify the Australasian land tax with the single tax is to do great injustice both to the philosophy of George and to the existing law.

Besides the differences which the Colorado report enumerates between the single tax and the Australasian land value tax as proposed in Colorado, another difference is to be noted. The single tax is a fiscal system, whereas the Colorado measure goes no further than to give constitutional permission for the adoption of a fiscal system. Even if this measure were adopted, it would still remain

* Report of the Revenue Commission of Colorado. Appointed by authority of the senate. Senator James W. Bucklin, Senator Thomas J. Ehrhart, Senator William A. Hill, commissioners. Second edition. Copies to be had of the Australasian Tax League, 312 Jackson block, Denver, upon remission of five cents for postage.

with the people to determine whether or not to adopt the system it permits.

The Australasian land value tax, according to the Bucklin report, is used for both local and state purposes, and in some form and degree is in operation in four out of the seven colonies or states.

III.

New Zealand, South Australia and New South Wales raise part of their general taxes by the land value tax.

It was first established for general purposes in 1878 by New Zealand. Before its effects could be observed it was repealed and the general property tax substituted for it. But the general property tax worked so disastrously and consequently became so unpopular that in 1890 a parliament pledged to reenact the land value tax was elected. In 1891, therefore, the land value tax was reenacted. It has ever since remained in force, and could not be repealed. Says the premier, R. G. Seddon, in a letter embodied in the Bucklin report:

Those who in former years opposed this policy have gone the length of saying that they would not disturb it, and there was not a single candidate [at the recent parliamentary election], so far as I know, who advocated its repeal.

On this point Mr. Bucklin himself reports:

After having thoroughly tested the general property tax, and compared it with the Australasian land value tax, the former system was deliberately abolished and the Australasian system finally established; thus, after a thorough trial, rendering a complete judgment on the relative merits of the two methods of taxation. So completely are the people of New Zealand convinced of the superiority of their system that no political party advocates a return to the general property tax, but, on the contrary, practically a unanimous sentiment exists in favor of retaining their system.

Between the first and the second adoption of this system by New Zealand it was adopted by South Australia to secure additional revenues. That was in 1884. In 1894 New South Wales adopted it to reduce tariff taxes. In both countries it has proved satisfactory. The Daily Telegraph, one of the two or three papers of largest circulation and influence in New South Wales, predicted in its issue of January 8, 1900, that Senator Bucklin could have "nothing but good to report of the working of land value taxation" in that state; and the premier of South Australia, F. W. Holder, writes:

There is no prospect of its repeal, and no general desire that it should be repealed. The trend has all been the other way. It was first one-half penny in every pound value. In 1893 it was altered to one-half penny in the pound up to $25,000 owned by any one taxpayer, and one penny in the pound for all excess over $25,000 value so held. The probabilities are all in the direction of another half penny being added when any one holding exceeds in value, say, $100,000.

Of the operation of this system of taxation in the three Australasian states mentioned above, the Bucklin report has this to say:

Under the Australasian system there is no difficulty in assessing property at its "full cash value," and but little if any complaint of unjust or unequal valuations. These valuations are used as a basis of taxation, and for various other public and private purposes. In marked contrast to the conditions in Colorado and other American states, there is a general acquiescence in the fairness and accuracy of the assessments. The reason for this is clearly evident. The Australasian system does not attempt to assess property which can be removed or hidden from sight. Nor is it inquisitorial nor complicated. Nor does it attempt the impossible task of arriving at the value of property of infinite form and variety, each class of which would require a thorough expert to determine, even aproximately, its fair value. On the contrary, the Australasian system only taxes that kind of property which cannot be hidden or removed out of the country, the existence of which is known to everybody, and the value of which is the most widely known, the most easily and accurately ascertained of any form of property values. For these reasons, the valuations being simple and easy, the difficulties inherent in assessing and collecting the general property tax are largely avoided, and the operations of the Australasian land value tax are full, fair and complete.

The Australasian tax cannot be avoided by perjury or any other fraudulent or evasive acts of the taxpayer. Whatever inequalities exist thereunder result from a wrong formulation of the laws or from incompetent assessors, and are not inherent in the system itself. This conclusion is illustrated by the fact that the only colony in which any serious trouble has arisen over the operation of the land tax is New South Wales, where considerable complaint and litigation arose over the operation of the law for the first year or two of its existence. This trouble arose through the crude and incompetent formulation of the law, ignorance by both friends and enemies of the principle involved, inexperienced valuers, the unusually bitter opposition of large land owners, and the lack of any previous experience in direct taxation. These evils have now been overcome, and the law is working smoothly and satisfactorily.

A very significant piece of testimony to the success of the system is that of the Bucklin report where it avers:

The operation of the Australasian land value tax has always been satisfactory after its effects were once known, as is shown by the following facts: There has been no effort to repeal it, but, on the contrary, it has been extended and improved; as soon as it has come into operation in any degree in any colony or locality, all opposition to it ceases, and it is then accepted even by the conservative parties as a permanent institution; the people of the colonies never vote against it nor against those who are identified with the principle established; it has extended from colony to colony, and from state to municipal affairs, after the trial of numerous other revenue schemes. If these facts applied only to one isolated colony, or to the taxation of values of a special or local character, they would not be so convincing. But when the principle of taxing those values which exist wherever civilization extends has been tried for more than 16 years, under different laws and conditions, by different countries and peoples, with one uniform successful result, the question of the practicability and wisdom of the law as a fiscal measure is placed beyond the region of successful controversy. My conclusions are, after careful observations and the most minute and painstaking examination of all data which I could procure, that the Australasian land value tax is the best fiscal measure, and the greatest fiscal success, ever adopted by any country or community.

IV.

That unqualified indorsement and recommendation refers not alone to the system in its general applications for state purposes, but also to its special applications for local purposes in Queensland and New Zealand.

A local option law, authorizing

land value taxation for local purposes, was first proposed in 1887, in South Australia, and adopted there in 1893. But it was not in operation at the time of Bucklin's visit, because its enemies had managed to get obstructive conditions into the law which made it a dead letter. In one municipality, for example, these conditions prevented the adoption of the land value tax for local purposes, though the proposition received a majority of nearly 11 to 1 of those who voted. The sick, dead and absent all counted against it. Since Senator Bucklin's return to this country the South Australian law has been corrected.

In Queensland the system is in full operation. It is not optional there, but compulsory. Every local division is compelled to raise practically all its local revenue by taxes on land values only.

The law went into operation in 1891, and after an experience of a decade, the town clerk of Brisbane, Queensland's capital city, writes of its success in these words:

The object of the legislation of 1890 was primarily to fix the incidence of taxation more equitably, and that object has in the main been secured. The system of taxing improvements is undoubtedly defective, in that it tends to retard true progress. Prior to the adoption of the valuation and rating act of 1890, the owner of land who erected extensive improvements thereon was, in a sense, penalized for his temerity, while the owners of vacant lands, and lands whose improvements were not in keeping with their surroundings and the situation generally, benefited more or less at his expense. I am of the opinion that the effect of the act has been to induce greater activity in building operations, and that it is a distinct advance upon the previous system, though still open to improvement. . . . . I believe that the workings of the act give very general satisfaction, and there is no intention to have it repealed. So far no amendments have been made, though several have been suggested, but these are of a very minor character and do not affect the general principles of the statute.

The New Zealand local tax law differs substantially from that of Queensland in only one particular. Whereas the Queensland law makes local land value taxation compulsory, the New Zealand law makes it optional. Each municipality decides for itself by popular vote whether or not it will derive local revenues exclusively from land values.

This law went into operation in New Zealand in 1896, after having been four times passed by the lower house and thrown out by the legislative council. Up to February 19, 1900, 25 local bodies had voted under this law, on the question of adopting land value taxation for local purposes. Over 82 per cent. of all the votes cast were in the affirmative, and in only two instances did the negative poll a majority of the votes cast.

But prior to 1899 the details of the law were so far defective that in only 14 out of the 25 local bodies referred to was the proposition carried. Since then the law has been improved, and now the question is determined by a majority vote. Had that been so from the start, 23 local bodies out of 25 voting on the question would have adopted the land value tax at the time of Bucklin's visit.

Palmerston North, a borough on the north island of New Zealand, was the first body to adopt the new tax by popular vote. This was in March, 1897. The vote stood 402 for the land value tax and 12 in opposition.

And so satisfactory did it prove to be when in actual operation that three years later the road district bounding the borough of Palmerston North on three sides—and this road district is a farming community—followed the example of the borough by adopting the land value tax by a vote of 105 to 10.

"I found no opposition to the law whatever," Senator Bucklin reports; "but found that it gave general satisfaction." He adds that the satisfactory experience of the borough of Palmerston North "is the general experience throughout the colony, no local body having repealed the operation of the law after once having adopted it." Mr. Bucklin's judgment is confirmed by subsequent events. Down to the 1st of last April the land value tax had been adopted in New Zealand by a total of 60 local bodies—46 more than had elected to adopt it at the time of his visit. Its popularity is further attested by the large majorities it received. At three elections last March it was adopted by 350 to 193, by 140 to 69 and by 140 to 8. The places so adopting it were all country districts in a farming region, which goes to show that in New Zealand the farmers have "caught on." Later still, Fielding borough, the center of the butter-making district, and the next station on the railway from Palmerston North, adopted this land value tax by 268 to 56, after a year's campaign, in which the subject was fully discussed.

V.

In consequence of Senator Bucklin's observations in Australasia a majority of the tax committee of which he was chairman recommended that "the legislature permit the people of Colorado to amend their state constitution so as to allow the gradual adoption of the Australasian land value tax system, or any part thereof." Even the minority report recommended substantially the same thing. It proposed "to allow the gradual adoption of the Australasian land value tax system, or any part thereof, or to reject it, as the people by their votes shall determine for themselves."

In harmony with the majority report Senator Bucklin drew and introduced a constitutional amendment authorizing the exemption by the legislature of personal property and improvements, when providing for taxes for state purposes, and empowering any county to exempt by popular vote all personalty and improvements in the raising of revenues for local purposes.

Some provisions of that bill were objected to by enough senators to prevent its commanding a two-thirds vote. To meet those objections Senator Bucklin substituted another amendment. It is as follows:

Section 1. There shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the state of Colorado at the next general election for members of the general assembly, for their approval or rejection, the following amendments to the constitution of the state of Colorado, which when ratified by a majority of those voting thereon, shall be valid as a part of the constitution.

Sec. 2. Section 9 of article X of the constitution of the state of Colorado shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 9. Once in four years, but not oftener, the voters of any county in the state may, by vote at any general election, exempt or refuse to exempt from all taxation for county, city, town, school, road and other local purposes, any or all personal property and improvements on land, but neither the whole nor any part of the full cash value of any rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, exclusive of improvements thereon, shall be so exempted; provided, however, that such question be submitted to the voters by virtue of a petition therefor, signed and sworn to by not less than one hundred resident taxpayers of such county, and filed with the county clerk and recorder, not less than thirty nor more than ninety days before the election.

Sec. 3. Section 11 of article X of the constitution of the state of Colorado shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 11. The rate of taxation on property for state purposes shall never exceed four mills on each dollar of valuation; but the provisions of this section shall not apply to rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, the full cash value of which may be taxed at such additional rate, not exceeding two mills on each dollar of assessed valuation, as shall be provided by law, after exempting all personal property and improvements thereon from such additional rate of taxation.

Sec. 4. Each elector voting at said election and desirous of voting for or against all the said amendments as a whole, shall prepare and deposit his ballot whereon shall be printed the words "For Australasian Tax System" and "Against Australasian Tax System," and shall indicate his choice by placing a cross opposite one or the other of said group of words. Any elector not voting as aforesaid, may express his approval or rejection of any one or more of said amendments by similarly designating any amendment so approved or rejected by number in the order in which it appears in this act. The official ballot shall be so prepared as to afford the electors the opportunity to express their choice as herein provided.

Sec 5. The votes cast for the adoption or rejection of said amendments, or either or any of them, shall be canvassed, and the result determined in the manner provided by the laws of the state for the canvass of votes for representatives in congress.

Summarized, that amendment would allow—

1. The people of any county to vote once in four years, if petitioned by 100 resident taxpayers, upon the question of exempting from all local taxation any or all personal property or landed improvements, except franchises in public ways.

2. For state purposes the tax of four mills on the dollar may be increased to six mills, provided the extra two mills is levied upon rights of way, franchises in public ways, or land, to the exemption to the extent of that additional rate of all personal property and landed improvements.

This constitutional amendment, now generally known in Colorado as "the Bucklin bill," received the necessary two-thirds vote in both houses. In the senate the vote stood 26 to 6, and in the house 50 to 11. The question is now before the people of the state. They are to vote upon its adoption at the general election in the autumn of 1902. A majority of the votes then polled on this question will, if affirmative, make it part of the state constitution.

The agitation for the popular adoption of this measure is the political campaign referred to at the beginning of this editorial.

VI.

That campaign is not merely a local one. Nor is it one that interests tax reformers alone. So important in the direction of freeing all industry from tax burdens is the step proposed, that it demands the attention of the public-spirited men of every state. Whatever may be the opinions one may hold on the subject of taxation, this amendment and those who are promoting its adoption deserve the support of everybody who believes in direct legislation or local self-government. Next to the constitutional provision in South Dakota, it is the largest measure of direct legislation yet proposed in this country with possibilities of adoption. In this Colorado campaign the advocates of direct legislation, and advocates of local self-government, as well as advocates of tax reform wherever they may live, have an unusual opportunity to further the civic principles they cherish. By helping the Australasian tax reformers of Colorado in their campaign, with intelligent speakers, instructive literature and funds for the work during the next 15 months, they will avail themselves of an opportunity to render a public service of greater magnitude and at less cost than often presents itself.

The way for doing this can be opened by corresponding with Jabez Norman, president of "Australasian Tax League of Colorado," 312 Jackson block, Denver, or sending funds to the treasurer, Dr. C. S. Elder, who is treasurer also of Arapahoe county, and lives in Denver.

Assistance of this kind ought to be proffered promptly. The plan of the opposition in Colorado to the Bucklin amendment is quite evidently to maintain absolute silence upon the subject until the election is near, and then to make a short and sharp campaign of misrepresentation. To break up this conspiracy of silence, not a year hence, but now, by immediately educating the people of the state upon the merits of the measure, is of the utmost importance.

It is not remarkable that single tax organizations—notably the Ohio Single Tax league, of which William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, is president, and J. B. Vining, of Cleveland, is secretary—are first in the field as supporters of the "Bucklin bill." For while its adoption would not be the adoption of the single tax, not even in the slightest degree, yet it would open the way for the single tax for local revenues in any Colorado county whose inhabitants desire it. The campaign in behalf of the bill, though not a campaign for the single tax, is a campaign for permission to vote for or against local trials of the single tax in modified form. But other tax reforms, together with the principle of home rule, are involved in the fate of the "Bucklin bill."

From any point of view its acceptance by the people is the one thing to be worked for at this time. Home rulers should work for it because it involves the question of home rule at the most vital point—taxation. Direct legislationists should work for it, because it permits direct legislation to an important extent and in the vital matter of taxation. All who oppose the absurdities of personal property taxation should work for it, because it would enable them to propose the local abolition of those absurdi-

ties. Single taxers should work for it, because it would enable them to bring their theory to the forum of popular opinion and probably to local tests; and they should work for it with good judgment, having in view primarily the adoption of this permissive measure, rather than loose agitation in behalf of the mere label which distinguishes their cause, or even of the profound principles that underlie it. That labor organizations should work for it, is sufficiently attested by the action at its recent convention of the Colorado State Federation of Labor, which has coupled it with the eight-hour amendment in a series of resolutions urging "all unions and labor organizations, and all members thereof, to support these amendments with their votes at the next state election, so that a unanimous vote may be cast by organized labor, assuring the enactment into law of these beneficent measures." Last, but by not means least, every person should support the "Bucklin bill" who is opposed to government by monopoly corporations. This is a negative reason, to be sure, but at a time when corporations are reaching out to "grab everything in sight," it is not a bad plan, if in doubt, to work against what these corporations want and in favor of what they oppose. The monopoly corporations fought the "Bucklin bill" in the legislature bitterly though hopelessly; and such opposition as it may meet before the people will come from them. That fact alone is a high tribute to the merits of the bill. What may endanger the monopoly corporations is pretty certain to benefit the people.

Since in all these respects, and in others that have escaped enumeration, the result of the vote on the Bucklin bill will be national in its effects and influence, the campaign should be national in the support it receives.

NEWS

The steel strike has furnished abundant material during the week for gossippy newspaper articles, but no important change in the situation has yet been made public, except that a vote upon peace propositions is being taken by mail through the lodges of the Amalgamated association. The propositions submitted are given out as follows:

1. That the New York offer of July 27, made by Messrs. Schwab and Morgan, be accepted. [This provided that the tin-plate mills resume under the scale signed for the year beginning July 1; that the hoop company sign for all mills signed for last year, and that the sheet steel company sign for all mills signed for last year, except Old Meadow and Saltsburg.]

2. That a provisional scale be arranged, but not signed, for Painter's, Lindsay & McCutcheon's and the Clark mill, leaving recognition of the union open.

3. That the United States Steel corporation formally declare its attitude toward organized labor, this declaration to take such form as will have a reassuring effect upon the men in mills.

It is understood that these propositions have been assented to by President Shaffer. If approved by the referendum vote, the American Civic Federation, which has interested itself in bringing the strike to an amicable settlement, purposes to endeavor to secure their adoption by the steel trust. In a speech at Pittsburg on the 27th, Mr. Shaffer seemed to allude to this phase of the situation when, as reported, he said:

We will settle the strike if the trust signs the scale for all mills signed for last year, agreeing not to discriminate against men who left the mills on strike and guaranteeing to pay union rates in those mills in which the men have proved they want to organize.

"Government by injunction" has been invoked in behalf of the Allis-Chalmers concern against the machinists, whose strike was last referred to in these columns at page 298. The injunction was granted ex parte, on the 23d, at Chicago, by Judge Kohlsaat, of the United States circuit court, the 28th being fixed by him for the first hearing. It forbids the strikers—

from in any manner hindering by violence or threats of violence, or interfering with any of the business of the—

Allis-Chalmers plant; also from—

compelling or inducing or attempting to compel or induce, by use of threats or intimidation of any sort, or violence, any person to leave the employment of said company or not to enter its employ if desirous of so doing.

Also from—

congregating at or near the premises of the company with the purpose or in such manner as to intimidate any of the employes of said company or persons seeking employment from it, in going to, remaining at or coming from the premises of said company.

Also from—

picketing, besetting or controlling the streets, alleys, or approaches to the premises of said company, with the purpose to intimidate, threaten, surround or coerce any of the employes.

Since the granting of this injunction the striking machinists are reported to have been "picketing" the Allis-Chalmers plant by taking photographic snap-shots of nonunion workmen as they go into or come out of the place. The hearing upon the injunction, originally set for the 28th, has been postponed until September 16.

On the 24th another strike injunction was reported. This was issued at Goshen, Ind., by Judge Baker, of the United States circuit court, in connection with a local strike of long duration, which is still in operation against the W. B. Conkey Co., a printing concern at Hammond, Ind. It restrains the strikers and all their abettors—

from in any manner interfering with, hindering, obstructing, or stopping any of the business—

of the Conkey company. Also—

from entering upon the grounds, factory or premises of said W. B. Conkey company for the purpose of interfering with the business of the said company.

Also—

from compelling or inducing, or attempting to compell or induce, by threats, intimidation, persuasion, force or violence, any of the employes of said W. B. Conkey company to refuse or fail to do their work, or discharge their duties as such employes; and also from compelling or inducng, or attemptng to compel or induce, by threats, intimdation force, or violence any of the employes of the said W. B. Conkey company to leave the service of said company; and also from attempting or attempting to prevent any person or persons by threats, intimidation, force or violence from freely entering into the service and employment, or continuing in the service and em-