

ring as true and seem as courageous to the democratic-Democrats as did his gold standard telegram to the plutocratic Democrats—there would be something for the leaders of democratic-Democracy to work for with hope for the future, and with enthusiasm and effectiveness in the present.

Eastern Democrats are at present threatened with future mental suffering, by John P. Hopkins and Roger C. Sullivan, of Chicago. These delectable Democrats assure their Eastern coadjutors not only that Illinois will give its electoral vote to Parker (which politically is proper, since they are responsible for Illinois), but that Indiana is a "sure thing" and that prospects are bright for Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Nevada and Utah. When Hopkins and Sullivan return to Illinois, which they themselves have made hopeless, they will doubtless report bright prospects in another quarter. They can't fool Western Democrats with glittering predictions about such States as Illinois, Montana and Colorado; but they might arouse enthusiasm over prophetic victories in Maine, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

Municipal-ownership advocates who object to municipal operation, might profit by an object lesson in Union county, New Jersey. There is a trolley line in that county, in the region of Roselle, which is owned by the county but operated by a private corporation. Behold the result. The private corporation has a lease which is virtually perpetual; the fares cannot be regulated; the private company is as masterful and arrogant as if it owned the property of which it is only a tenant; and the county not only furnishes the trackage and other line equipment, but keeps them in repair. The net benefit, therefore, to the county is nothing, minus cost of erecting and maintaining the line; to the operating company it is the same as private ownership, plus the advantage of having a line furnished and maintained for it free by the county.

Traction is not the only subject regarding which Union county, New Jersey, affords valuable object lessons. This is one of the localities in which even the water supply is furnished by a private corporation. Water, gas, electric lighting, street car service, steam car service, trolley service—all but the one county-owned trolley line—are under private ownership, and all are under private operation. Union county, therefore, is a place where the beauties, comforts and general perfection of private enterprise in the management of public utilities may be expected to shine forth. But it doesn't shine. The character of the water service in comparison with cities that own and operate their water supply may be inferred from the fact that in this region of abundant water conveniently located, the charge for serving a cottage is over \$30 a year. And as to "graft," what is the graft of the graftiest political grafter in comparison with the enormous graft of the owners of this Union county water privilege? Nor is it a matter alone of graft and dear service. The owners of this water supply privilege dominate both political parties with a degree of arbitrary power which might make any mere political boss envious to distraction. Look to it, you who are doubtful of the wisdom of municipal ownership and operation of municipal utilities! Investigate the wretched experiments in private ownership and operation of Union county, New Jersey, before you close your minds to the successful experiments in public ownership and operation elsewhere.

Two or three weeks ago it was announced that Eugene V. Debs had been requested by McClure's Magazine to reply to ex-President Cleveland's defense in the same periodical of his action in the Chicago strike (p. 195), and that the magazine had been obliged to reject Mr. Debs's article because it was abusive. What purports to be the same article has

now appeared in the Socialist papers,—among others, in the Chicago Socialist of August 27. As it is there printed, we fail to find anything in the Debs article that can fairly be characterized as abusive. It is certainly not as abusive as Cleveland's. Controversial it is, and overwhelmingly destructive of Cleveland's defense of his action. But if this constitutes abuse, Mr. Cleveland should be wrapped in paraffine paper and put in a glass case where he may be admired but not "abused." McClure's was under no obligation to print any reply to Cleveland. There are good reasons why it should have refused, for it is doing vigorous and valuable work against plutocracy at great risk and may be pardoned for avoiding further risk. Besides, the publication of Cleveland's article may be justified on the business ground that it would largely enhance the demand for the magazine, whereas, on the other hand, Debs's would have little or no effect of that kind, if, indeed, it might not be prejudicial. But nothing can excuse the rejection of Debs's reply as abusive, if it was not more abusive than its present publication shows it to have been.

It is a great mistake, we beg to remind both the confident conservative and the impatient progressive—a very great mistake, to suppose that the Henry George movement, because it makes little or no organized display, is making no progress. In one way and another, here in advancing legislation and there in developing public sentiment, in one place crudely, in another timidly, in a third boldly, but everywhere persistently, this movement is advancing with leaps and bounds, though many there be who having ears hear not and eyes see not. Its advances in Australasia, in Great Britain, in Canada, and even in the United States are notable; but in Germany it is supposed to have made none whatever. Yet now come reports from Germany which show that even there, crudely and without