

gan in a mistake—the mistake of supposing that reforms are to be accomplished by a union of reformers of all shades and colors. Such unions, like the colored figures in a kaleidoscope, though picturesque, are frail. They are not true unions, but only aggregations. Some one said of the Detroit conference that there were 200 delegates there with 400 imperative reforms. That was an exaggeration. But it was only an exaggeration, as the resolutions finally adopted show. These resolutions seem to be an omnium gatherum into which all the reforms represented at the conference were chucked indiscriminately, upon the assumption that each delegate whose particular reform got this honorable mention would stay with the movement. Nothing justifies that assumption but the probability that each may recommend the movement as showing a tendency to go his way. But that does not really justify the assumption. It only indicates that the movement will be pulled and hauled in as many directions as it represents causes, until it loses all cohesiveness and disintegrates. Even if all reformers could unite organically they could not thereby carry through their reforms. For at no time are reformers more than a small fraction of the masses. Public opinion must be influenced in favor of a reform, to make it win; and public opinion cannot be influenced permanently in favor of a mere mess of reform pottage. In such a conglomeration good flavors are neutralized by bad, and the public rejects the whole dish.

If any man believes that he knows a way of improving social conditions, let him hesitate about uniting with other men who know other ways. In other words, let a reformer of one kind hesitate about making organic unions with those who differ radically. He will find it as impossible to convert them as they will to convert him. Even if he does convert them he will have made no great gain; for they, like himself, are apt to be men apart

from the common thought and common impulse. But let him go direct to the masses of people. If his reform is vitalized by the truth, it will make its own way, slowly, perhaps, but surely, in public opinion. The reform that wins must be capable of converting the masses, rather than adaptable to a unification of reformers. This does not mean that the reformer with a true reform must isolate himself and his cause. Quite the contrary. There is no greater certainty of isolation than in a mosaic union of variegated reformers. It means that he must make himself a fellow among his fellow citizens, and his cause one of the vital subjects of common thought.

In the Australian Commonwealth the political situation is beginning to clear. Trustworthy correspondents assure us that the protection ministry has been forced to throw protection overboard. If they had not done so they could not have remained three months longer in power. The worst law they can possibly secure now is one with extensive tariffs along revenue lines and only a few protective features. It is doubtful whether even so much protection as that will be left to the commercial exclusionists. Though such a bill can be carried through the lower house, which came in with a protection majority, the free trade majority in the senate may not sanction it. Protection as a system is, in the language of our correspondent, "as dead as a door nail in Australia."

But that is only a beginning. The glamour that surrounded the Barton ministry is rapidly disappearing. Mr. Reid, the free trade leader in New South Wales, where he was premier and upon whose policy he has deeply impressed his personality, has jumped into the same commanding position in the parliament of the commonwealth that he occupied in the parliament of his state—a position of influence far and away above that of every one else. That was settled by

his first speech in the federal parliament. When compared with the reply of Barton, the premier, no room was left to question Reid's superior powers of statesmanship. And now that he is a national instead of a local character, the protection newspapers outside his own state are no longer able to misrepresent him as successfully as before. He has consequently made tremendous advances in Victoria. Even the protectionist workmen of that state are falling under his sway. So obvious is all this, that the protectionists are already saying that the next election will make Reid "dictator." Meanwhile it has become fairly certain that only a part of the revenues needed by the Commonwealth (possibly \$40,000,000) can be raised by customs and excise, and that the states will have to raise a large amount by land value taxation.

A federal judge in Ohio, of the name of Wing, has outflown all competitors in the judicial race for government by injunction. When issuing a sweeping injunction against "picketing" by striking molders in Cleveland, Judge Wing made this bold reply to the objection that the "picketing" consisted only in arguing with non-strikers with a view to peaceably persuading them not to work: "Persuasion of itself, long continued, may become a nuisance and unlawful." He therefore issued an injunction broad enough to include peaceable persuasion in furtherance of the strike.

With reference to this class of injunctions, persons who are neither sympathetic with nor tolerant of strikes, jump hastily to the conclusion that the injunctions tend to preserve order and peace, and are therefore quite desirable. It is a dangerously thoughtless way of looking at the matter. Something more far-reaching and important is involved than the judicial regulation of strikes. Think of it a moment. When state