

as its editorials. There is virtue in uniformity.

The unsophisticated news reader who last week found proof of the impartiality of the law in the fact that a collection of rich men were on trial for manslaughter in New Jersey, because their negligent management of a street car system had caused the death of several school children, was too previous in his expressions of satisfaction. He should have considered that the corporations which own the legislature of New Jersey might possibly own her judges also. Had the case gone to the jury, and an uncorrupted verdict been rendered in favor of the defendants, that would have been as satisfactory, on the score of the impartial administration of justice, as a verdict the other way. It is not convictions, but trials that are needed as an earnest of the impartiality of the courts. But there was no trial in this case. The three judges ordered the jurors to acquit—ordered them, mind you! This is something which judges often assume to do. It is a common practice. But the very form of it testifies to its being a judicial invasion. If judges had the right to render verdicts, they would need to resort to no such fiction as directing juries to do the rendering. But as they have not that right, they have calmly arrogated it to themselves in this indirect manner, and so built up a practice in contravention of the constitutional theory that in criminal trials the jury shall judge both the law and the fact. Taking advantage of that practice, these judges of the corporation-ridden State of New Jersey took the prosecution of the multimillionaire street car managers away from the jury and turned the millionaires loose. To do so they were obliged to declare that neglect to take precautions against the possibility of accidents at notoriously dangerous railroad crossings, is not negligence on the part of the street car managers. The outcome of

this farcical trial is what might have been expected. One of the distinguished defendants—John D. Crimmins, of New York,—frankly said he expected it. "Why," said he, "the case of the prosecution was hopeless from the outset. I knew all along what the outcome would be. There never was the least doubt in my mind of the final decision." Mr. Crimmins's foreknowledge must appear to the unsophisticated to have been quite phenomenal. But really it would have been much more remarkable if the president of the Pennsylvania railroad had gone to prison in New Jersey so long as there was a Jersey judge to stand between him and a jury.

If one case of horrible lynching has occurred in Delaware, the same State has at least given the world, as an echo, the benefit of wise words from the lips of the chief justice of her Supreme Court. In an address before the Universal Peace union last month, Chief Justice Lore condemned not only the lynchers who burn men accused of crime, but also the lynching spirit which, as expressed by Judge Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, would deny to accused men the commonest safeguards which the law throws about property. "I cannot agree with Judge Brewer's suggestion," said Judge Lore, "that there should be no appeal or writ of error in criminal cases; it would seem monstrous that an appeal should be denied where a man's liberty and life are at stake." To such as Judge Brewer, Judge Lore administered in this connection this well-merited rebuke: "The only difference between those who claim that the court should act quickly before the mob can act, and the man who claims that lynching is the only proper remedy for crime, is that the first would convert the court into a mob and the second would convert the mob into a court." Judge Lore's words on the true function of the court are golden words: "Courts of justice," he said, "are not established

to administer swift vengeance, but to administer justice after a fair and full opportunity of defense and just conviction."

Judge Lore gave expression to other sentiments regarding the spirit of lynching which are of highest moment at this critical period in the history of our democratic republic. There is warning as well as truth in his words:

Lawlessness pervades the land, unrest and discontent brood over apparent prosperity. We have become the money center of the world, but this has bred a feverish appetite for gold with all its vulgar accompaniments. Coronets and coats of arms are eagerly sought by the sons and daughters of late hucksters, and butchers, and blacksmiths. Law has degenerated into lawlessness. We would call a halt upon our captains of industry who have brought our country to its present height of frenzied speculation. Plants worth only thousands of dollars are by the magic wand of watered stock and glittering advertisements swollen into millions. Gigantic frauds are palmed upon the people as successful business enterprises. Our greatest financiers are racking their brains to circumvent the law and the people, and by lawlessness achieve wealth, being careful only to keep outside of actual violence and the common jail. When their cunning evasions of the law are crowned with success all men are tempted to lawlessness. Captains of industry, how much of the unrest, the mob violence, and the labor troubles of the time have been bred and fostered by your methods?

It is well when a man in Judge Lore's position can see with vision so clear the homogeneity of crime. Lynching is not isolated lawlessness; it is a brutal manifestation of a universal spirit of the time. When rights and duties are ignored in the teachings of college and pulpit and newspaper, and expelled from the ethics of business, regard for them loses its hold also upon the common mind.

David B. Hill, the New York statesman who declared himself "a Democrat still—very still,"—has broken his reticence with a declaration of the soundest kind of democracy. "What the government of a free country like ours owes its citizens," said Mr.