

dispose of the "surplus" more easily and quite as profitably by throwing it into the sea. That it will not be paid for with money is evident, for but little money is ever imported. Considering silver and gold together, we export much more than we import. If paid for, then, our exported "surplus" must be paid for chiefly if not altogether with "pauper goods." But in that case what becomes of our workingmen? Will not this influx of "pauper goods" take the bread out of their mouths, so to speak? Or were the Republicans mistaken when they taught us to believe that importations of goods are only a little less injurious to American labor than importations of cholera?

In a book called "English as She is Taught," a story may be found which contains a subtle lesson on "trade-balances." A pupil being asked to define the meaning of the words "imports" and "exports," wrote this answer:

The imports of a country are the things that are paid for; the exports are the things that are not.

That boy's idea of exports was evidently derived from the American statistics of foreign trade, which show such enormous "favorable" balances that are not paid for.

"Confidence begets confidence," says a Chicago paper in discussing the possibility of an end to the present era of prosperity. Its essential idea is that prosperity will last while confidence lasts. That is true of a confidence game. So long as the victim is confiding, the buncoer flourishes; and to the extent that the prevailing prosperity is confidence-prosperity, it will doubtless continue as long as confidence does. But people don't eat confidence, nor wear confidence, nor live in confidence houses. The things they need are substantial things produced by human labor; and unless they get these things—not merely see others have them in abundance but get their share themselves—no amount of confidence, however begotten, will be an acceptable sub-

stitute. The basis of genuine prosperity is not confidence, but comfort.

That there is less comfort than confidence in the prosperity which now prevails is evident from the signs. Colored census figures may indicate a flourishing condition for workingmen, but obtrusive facts grimly refute these rose-colored statistics. One instance is typical. The Johnstown Democrat, which advertised recently in a trade paper for a printer, ordered the advertisement out, saying—

Overwhelmed with replies. Your medium is too good. We're out about \$2.00 in stamps notifying applicants that the place is filled.

If multiplying experiences of this kind were not enough to convince reasonable persons, the cry that some labor organizations are making about the "dead line" which large employers have established—refusing to hire men who are over 45 years of age—should do it. In one Chicago labor union the bafflement over this found expression in a bitterly satirical proposal to shoot every man of that age who is dependent upon his labor for a living. No such "dead line" could be maintained if opportunities for employment were really abundant; none would have been set up if the employers did not find workers in excess of demand. This makes prosperity, of course, for some persons. No one doubts the prosperity of the trusts. These exploiters say they are prosperous, and all the indications confirm them. But what is prosperity food to the trusts may be adversity poison to everybody else.

It is not an easy fight that the home rulers of Colorado have entered upon in their movement to secure constitutional authority to each county to raise its own revenues by taxing land speculators, if the inhabitants of the county so decide by popular vote. Of course the land speculating fraternity are resisting with all their might. Of course the land-grant railroads are joining in. Of course the Republican papers are behind them all. And of course an attempt will be

made to commit the Republican party at its state convention against the movement. But the supporters of the movement are working, too. Handicapped as they are for want of funds, they have, nevertheless, placed 100,000 copies of the Bucklin report in the hands of as many Colorado voters. Although much of the work necessary to this accomplishment has been contributed without pay, the funds for printing and incidental expenses are exhausted, with 118,000 voters not yet reached. But hope rises high that so important and promising a movement will not be allowed to languish.

An example of the kind of opposition this Colorado home rule movement arouses is furnished editorially by the Denver Republican, which describes the Bucklin amendment as "a menace to all real estate investments in any part of Colorado," and urges that—

it should be defeated by so overwhelming a majority that no such crazy proposition would ever again present itself for the consideration of the people of this state. There is no element of good in it, and the fact that we had a legislature foolish enough to submit it to the voters has brought all Colorado into disrepute among intelligent people of other parts of the union. . . . When they go to the polls next fall the people should reject each and every one of these amendments. They should not risk making a mistake by trying to vote for some and against others. All should be condemned. They are all the spawn of a legislature made up of cranks and irresponsibles of every species and degree. No one had a right to look for any good from that conglomeration, and no good has come from it. The answer of the people should be a condemnation of all that was done. There should be no hint or suggestion of approval in any degree whatsoever; and especially should anything like approval be withheld from the proposed constitutional amendments. Each and every one of them should be voted down.

A pointed reply to that startled exclamation of Colorado plutocracy is made by the Monte Vista (Col.) Journal, when it says:

The Republican undoubtedly voices the sentiment of its party, and yet that party will hardly dare to express its position at the next state conven-

tion. What is the object of the Bucklin amendment which menaces the welfare of Colorado? It simply provides that any county in the state may be permitted to raise its revenues as a majority of the voters may determine. It means majority rule in local affairs. This the Republican fears and takes the position that majorities are not competent to manage local affairs.

But even if under home rule in taxation, which the Bucklin amendment would allow, the people of any or all the counties of Colorado should adopt the Australasian tax in place of the present property tax, how would all real estate investments be injured? As taxes on improvements would be abolished, investments in real estate improvements certainly would not suffer. On the contrary, such investments would be benefited. The only kind of real estate investments to be injured would be investments in vacant land for the purpose of monopolizing it. But that would not be prejudicial to the true interests of Colorado. It is not investments in land, which is already there, that Colorado needs; but investments in improvements, which would utilize the land and are not already there. The latter kind of investments would be encouraged by the Bucklin amendment; for whenever its permission was availed of by the people, improvements would be exempt from all local taxation.

An agitation appears to be in progress among orthodox Jews, who observe Saturday as Sabbath, to secure the legal right to pursue their regular vocations on Sundays. Regarding this right, Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists are in the same category as the Jews. The restrictive legislation upon these religious sects has been sustained by the courts by the most absurd reasoning imaginable. Conceding that the legislatures cannot make laws in the interest of any religious worship whatever, and therefore cannot legalize any sect's holy day for religious reasons, they have decided that laws forbidding labor on Sundays are police regulations for the preservation of

the public health, and not religious enactments. It would be as reasonable to enforce generally by law the Dunkard rite of feet washing as a police regulation in the interest of the public health. These Sunday laws clearly violate the rights of religious worshippers whose holy day is not Sunday. Bound by their own religious convictions to abstain from labor on one day in the week, and by other people's religious convictions to abstain on another, they are put at a peculiar disadvantage by unwarranted legislation. It may be said that the Sunday laws violate the rights also of persons who recognize no holy day; and that, too, is true. While a regular weekly rest day is doubtless a valuable social inheritance, and everyone who desires should be protected in its enjoyment, it is a very different matter to enforce by law its observance upon those who object, no matter whether they observe another rest day or not.

When Senator Beveridge, of imperialistic ambition and fame, spoke before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in session last week in New York, he gave voice to the following extraordinary composite of pagan piety and pinchbeck patriotism:

The flag and the cross are alike in one respect. They never retreat. You may temporarily close a church here and a flag may be withdrawn there, but only in order to advance more permanently their interest. They have one common purpose—the cross to advance Christianity, the flag to make this Christian country the greatest power on earth.

The religion which breathes through that sentiment is akin to the piety of the profane Rhode Island colonel in the civil war, of whom it was told in Harper's Magazine that upon being informed by his adjutant that the chaplain of a neighboring Massachusetts regiment had baptized 25 converts the previous Sunday, exclaimed: "Order out a detail of 50 men for baptism next Sunday. No blankety-blank Massachusetts regiment shall get ahead of ours, even in religion!"

EDWIN L. GODKIN.

No one who believes in maintaining moral standards in public life could wish to have the death of Edwin L. Godkin pass unnoticed. For Mr. Godkin was one of the few champions of civic righteousness who have become distinguished in this generation of materialistic utilitarianism.

In many respects we disagreed with him. In some respects the disagreements were fundamental and irreconcilable. His perceptions of moral principle often differed from ours. But that he had moral perceptions, discerned with intelligence and adopted with sincerity, by which he was guided and for which he fought, was evident to all who read his trenchant reviews of current events. For this we should honor his memory though we had differed from him at every point.

Mr. Godkin had the courage and the vigor of his convictions. He has left behind him no evidence of any disposition to minimize anything in which he believed, from fear of consequences either personal or logical; and he was capable of indulging that righteous wrath at essential wrong and deliberate wrongdoers which is as necessary to a sound character as the spirit of toleration toward accidental wrong and unwitting offenders. Good people forget too easily that the considerate: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!" was no more characteristic of the life of the Galilean than the wrathful flagellation in the temple.

Nordid Mr. Godkin flabbily reserve his wrath for the sin and let the sinner escape. He realized that evil is done by individuals, and that if you would bring it to the bar of human justice you must bring it there in the person of an individual. It is as necessary to make criminals unpopular as it is to make crime abhorrent. And this is as true of crime against public rights as it is of crime against private rights. Accordingly he was always ready with his potent and dreaded, "Thou art the man!" He did not content himself with denouncing public theft; he also denounced public thieves. He was not satisfied to denounce vicious public policies; he denounced just