ideal of these miners is only $600 a year—less than $12 a week—and that in fact they get hardly half as much, there is grim humor in the plea that they are already overpaid. Think of raising a family on $7 or $8 a week, or about the price of one plate at a man-of-leisure's banquet! It can be done. Oh, yes; it can be done. It can be done with even less. So can a horse be boarded at a livery stable for less. Then consider the touching plea that higher wages for mining coal would impose higher prices upon the poor for burning it. There's delicate sympathy for you. Exorbitant railroad rates and mining royalties must be paid by the same poor when they burn coal; but as these exactions go to the support of "widows and orphans" who own watered coal stock and watered railroad stock, it is no hardship on the widows and orphans who don't. But higher wages for mining coal—ah, that would be an outrage upon the poor! As much tribute as you please, but as low wages as possible. Such is the policy of these modern scribes and pharisees and hypocrites, who devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayers, who contribute lavishly to churches and charities but bind heavy burdens upon their brethren, who outwardly appear righteous but like the whited sepulchers are full within of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

---

Prince John Van Buren, while sitting once in a court room during the trial of a case in which he had no personal or professional interest, noticed that the judge continually interrupted the proceedings with questions indicating extreme bias in favor of one of the parties. It disturbed Van Buren's sense of fair play, and, leaning toward the lawyer who was the victim of the judge's manifest partisanship, he asked in a stage whisper that reached to all parts of the court room: "I say, Mr. ——, who is retained on the other side of this case besides the judge?" The story would have no interest at this time were it not for Judge Gray's conduct as chairman of the board of arbitrators in the case of the anthracite coal strike. When the coal trust consented to an arbitration they stipulated that one of the arbitrators should be one of the Federal judges who sit in eastern Pennsylvania. It was in accordance with that stipulation that Mr. Roosevelt appointed Judge Gray, who misses few opportunities to make it evident that the trust made no mistake so far as he is concerned. His questions to Mitchell have revealed a bias against the coal strikers which must be peculiarly gratifying and reassuring to the coal trust.

It is because class-biased judges so generally occupy the judicial bench that labor unions object to being incorporated. This objection is exploited by corporation lawyers as an excuse for refusing to deal amicably with unions. They contend that while unions are unincorporated they cannot be held to contracts. For that reason it is argued that the unions should be incorporated so as to be persons in law whose contracts can be enforced by the courts. Mr. Gompers has made a reply to this argument which is unanswerable so long as the bench is filled with cronies of the rich monopolists of the country. Of requiring labor unions to incorporate Mr. Gompers says:

> **On the surface this proposition seems fair, but when we bear in mind the fact that often judges have a deep-seated prejudice against organized labor, and the far-fetched interpretation in the Taff-Vale case, where an organization of labor in Great Britain was mulcted in damages for the action of an individual member, under the law passed by the British parliament as a "concession to labor," it is not difficult to divine the purpose that the advocates of compulsory incorporation of trades unions have in view.**

---

One blow has now been delivered by the Supreme Court of the United States against the autocratic policy of the postal department. The question came up from Missouri. A magnetic healer at Nevada, Mo., was denounced by the department upon charges of fraud and his mail stopped. As usual in these cases, though the legitimacy of the man's business was at issue and its prosperity at stake, he was denied every right that is involved in the principle of "due process of law." He was not brought into court upon charges of fraud and subjected to a jury trial, but his property rights in his business were arbitrarily confiscated by a bureau clerk at Washington, a thousand miles away. This clerk decided that the business of magnetic healing is fraudulent, and ordered all the advertiser's mail to be withheld from him, to be stamped "fraudulent," and to be returned to the senders. In other words, the department clerk, upon his own say-so, stopped a business which, upon its face, is as legitimate as any other healing business. This advertiser promptly did what every other person who has been arbitrarily outlawed from the mails ought to do. He sued the local postmaster. The lower court decided against him, but the Supreme Court has reversed that decision. As the contest was upon a demurrer which did not raise the question of fact as to whether or not the business was carried on fraudulently, the final decision in this particular case is still in abeyance. But the Supreme Court does decide that injunctions will be granted to prevent the stoppage of mail matter until the question of fraud in each case has been duly tried. This is a long step in the direction of enabling innocent people to protect themselves against the Russianistic methods of the American post office department.

---

With strange simplicity the New York Times finds in Mr. Roosevelt's speech at the Chamber of Commerce banqeuet in New York evidences of his hostility to protection. Because he complimented those commercial gentlemen upon possessing "to an eminent degree the traditional American self reliance of spirit which makes them scorn to ask from the government, whether of State or Nation, anything but a fair field and no favor"—because Roosevelt said this in New York, the unsophisticated