

makes the following unequivocal declaration:

We favor the municipal ownership of public service corporations, the principle of direct legislation, and home rule in local taxation.

We believe that the interests of labor can best be conserved by organization, and we demand for every man who labors an equal use of all natural opportunities to the end that no man shall take the proceeds of another man's labor without full compensation therefor.

The last legal obstacle to a vote on the home rule amendment to the Colorado constitution—the amendment known as the Bucklin bill (pp. 85, 116)—has now been removed. An injunction prohibiting the publication of the election notices had been asked of the supreme court of the state and that tribunal has refused to interfere. The amendment will now come before the people for their approval, and its adversaries have no recourse left but to defeat it at the polls if they can. The great monopoly interests of the state are gathering together to oppose it with all their might, and every subsidized paper is trying to chase it to death. The point of attack is that the amendment, to quote a leading daily of Colorado, “is founded upon the single-tax doctrine of Henry George and its ultimate aim is the abolition of private property in land.” The advocates of the measure are handicapped for lack of funds to make the proper campaign of education, while its adversaries are plentifully provided by the corporate interests of the state with funds for propagating ignorance of it. The amendment comes to a vote in November, and if those who believe in its principles allow it to go down to defeat for want of the necessary support to secure an intelligent vote, they will have sacrificed some of the most admirable and devoted work and one of the best opportunities for forging ahead in the whole history of tax reform in the United States.

One of the bright publications which have had difficulty with the

second-class bureau of the post office department, is called “The Straight Edge” and is published at No. 1 Seventh avenue, New York. Resuming publication after its controversy over the right to be accounted the kind of publication that is entitled to what the post office department calls “a subsidy,” namely newspaper rates of postage, it has decided, as its editor explains, “not to play horse” any more over this subsidy question, but to pay one cent a copy, full postage, on every issue. In doing this it calls attention, by certifying in black letters around the stamp, that it “pays 30 times the usual rate of postage in order to be free to advertise its views upon social and industrial problems and to print what it pleases about the products of the Straight Edge Co-operative industries. This is what every publication ought to be required to do—pay full postage; but full postage should be enormously less than now, as it could be if hundreds of thousands of tons of newspapers and magazines were not subsidized by second-class rates, said by the department to be insufficient to pay cost of delivery. Not only is it unfair to give these subsidies, but opportunities for discrimination are opened by it; and it would seem that the discriminations are favorable to publications that furnish gossip and intellectual dissipation, while some of those with new or unpopular ideas are practically barred out. The weighing scales, and not the ideas of a publication, should determine the postage. There should be no subsidy. Subsidy and censorship are never far apart.

One of the favorite arguments in behalf of trusts, that they lower prices to the consumer, an argument invented for and ridden to death by the Standard Oil trust, is rudely shaken up by Farm, Stock and Home, of Minneapolis, in an editorial comment upon an official report from an American consul in Russia. This report reads, says the F., S. and H.,—that the cost of getting crude petroleum is much greater in Russia

than in the United States. Wells cost more, methods of pumping are cruder and more expensive, and owing to the quality of the crude material or methods of refining a smaller percentage of illuminating oil results in that country than in this. Yet in spite of all these relative disadvantages the wholesale price of refined oil in tank cars at Baku, the head center of the industry in Russia, during the past eight years has averaged 1.375 cents a gallon, a little less than 1 2-5 cents. The lowest yearly average was in 1894, .72 cents, less than three-fourths cent a gallon, and the highest was in 1900, 3.09 cents, a price that the operators thought fabulous, it was such a money-maker. Increased production of crude petroleum brought the average down to 1.1 cents in 1901, which is too low for profit, but has produced no bankruptcies. It is needless to say that competition obtains in the petroleum industry in Russia, and are not the prices there indicative of what might be enjoyed by consumers in this country if competition instead of monopoly obtained here?

A wealthy woman of Boston is reported by the Woman's Journal as making a unique argument against the extension of suffrage to women. She could not see that it would improve the economic condition of workingwomen, since it had not improved that of workingmen. What she said at this point was true. But she was not content with showing that the ballot would not improve the economic condition of workingwomen; she must needs go further and argue that it would make their condition worse. This she did analogically by endeavoring to show that workingmen would be better off without the ballot. Her argument was deliciously significant. Said she:

I think many of the troubles between employer and men might be swept away if the men could not vote. If he felt that they did not stand on just the same footing as himself, that they had not quite so many privileges as he, the employer might have a chivalric feeling toward them.

Quite naively that woman put the whole anti-suffrage argument into a paragraph. Anti-suffragism, when stripped of its mask, is nothing but anti-democracy. Its ideal is not