

tants would have to "move on" to a new Negro State in the interest of "advancing civilization."

Congressman Baker, who refused the Baltimore & Ohio railway-pass bribe, has put a riddle to the Democratic party in Congress. He has asked them in caucus to refuse these petty bribes. That a majority of the Democratic side of the House indicate a disposition to travel on railroad bribes and pocket as a perquisite the liberal traveling expenses which the government allows them, is not reassuring as to the sincerity of the party in power when it criticizes the President for accepting railroad favors. Some officials look upon passes as too trifling to be regarded as bribes. But consider the enormous number of passes the railroads give out. Is it supposable that these free rides are given with no expectation of return—that they are mere courtesies? If they are, then why not give them to ex-Congressmen, ex-legislators, and ex-judges? Why confine the courtesy to men who control legislative or judicial favors? No lawyer trying a case against a railroad would accept a juror who had that railroad's pass in his pocket. Are legislators and judges who have passes any more to be trusted than jurors? It is to be hoped that Mr. Baker will drive his party on to refusing passes. Republican officials cannot be expected to refuse them. What are Republican officials there for? But Democrats, as members of a party in opposition to corporate aggression, if for no better reason, are bound to decline these and all other corporate favors. It may encourage Congressman Baker to know that the Democratic judges of Chicago are now refusing railroad passes, although the custom of giving them has long been common and more or less reputable.

It was a wise warning that Samuel Gompers gave the Federation of Labor at Boston, when he told the delegates to beware of anti-

trust legislation, because much of it is aimed at the labor movement. All anti-trust legislation, however sincere, is heavily charged with elements of such danger. The only safe method of attacking the trusts is to undermine their monopoly privileges by repealing the laws that make them. That kind of anti-trust legislation cannot be used against the labor movement. All other kinds can be.

Complaints of the fruit trust are coming in on the score of its increasing the price of bananas. "By this increase in price," says a fruit merchant who is quoted by the daily papers, "the trust has practically stifled the demand for bananas among the poorer classes of people." The same merchant explains the power of the fruit trust in this respect by saying that it "owns all the banana land, all the ships—in fact everything but the water between America and the tropics." If it did own the water it might sell its ships and have even greater power than now. There are people, it is true, who think that monopoly of the land is less important than monopoly of machines, and to them it may appear that monopoly of the ocean would be less important than monopoly of the ships. But they would be in error. Monopoly of the ocean would really be the more important, whether we were in the canoe age or the age of ocean greyhounds.

A promising movement is under way in Cuba to tax unused lands enough to force them into the market. Similar steps are being taken with reference to the building sites of Cuban cities. Crude as the method is, the principle involved and the purpose sought are those of the single tax policy. By still another crude method, but sound as far as it goes, the city authorities of Paris are reported to be encouraging the erection of cottages for the poorer classes by exempting them from taxation. Crude as all these innovations are, they afford

good object lessons of both the efficacy of the single tax principle and the advances it is making in actual legislation.

Carroll D. Wright regards the single tax question as "too vast for discussion." He is prepared to say, however, that "when the single tax advocate can demonstrate to us"—not merely demonstrate, mind you, but demonstrate "to us"—"that one-half or even one-tenth of the benefits they claim for their system are possible, we will all become single taxers." The condition is practically impossible. Carroll D. Wright couldn't be convinced of one-tenth of anything that might jar him loose from his job.

Republicans must feel like blushing for their pride in Hanna's Ohio victory, when they read such comment upon it as the following from the Boston Herald, a paper of their own party:

Hanna and Foraker, Nash and Cox, stand for all manner of political corruption, and all manner of abuse of power. So far as political morality is concerned, they are as unworthy and shameful as any Democrats in the land. Johnson, with his adopted Bryanism and his own peculiar Populism, was defeated; but the defeat was not a victory of right and justice, only the victory of a machine organized to promote criminal politics.

That criticism is almost as withering a comment upon Republican morality in Ohio as are the increasing signs of commercial disaster a reflection upon the good sense of the majority of Ohio voters. They voted for Hanna because he promised to preserve good times; yet in less than two weeks after the election he has allowed stocks to fall, grain to decline, banks to fail, wages to be cut, strikes to be provoked, and workingmen to be turned out of employment with empty dinner pails. Hanna's word may be as good as his bond, but if it is his bond must be somewhat indifferent as a commercial asset.

How nearly the United States have retrograded to the period in their history which is distinguished by the enforcement of the