

by declaiming against municipal ownership of public utilities as enlarging "the field and opportunities of the political boss." So gravely and with such oiliness was this said, that one might suppose Senator Foraker had never heard of "the field and opportunities of the political boss," in connection with public utilities, which his good friend and copartisan, the delectable Senator Quay, has in Pennsylvania utilized beyond the dreams of avaricious power—without municipal ownership. Yet some of Mr. Foraker's hearers must have known, as Mr. Foraker doubtless did himself, that with municipal ownership, nothing like so great an abuse of power over public utilities would be possible.

Senator Foraker ruled himself out of Mrs. Irving's \$1,000 contest at another point in his convention speech. He appealed to what he assumed to be the moral obliquity and mental density of Ohio farmers, in a denunciation of "the single tax," which he associated with the work of the new mayor of Cleveland. It is proposed, he said, that "in the name of the single tax, the farmers and other real estate owners and holders shall be compelled to bear all the burdens of taxation, while those who hold mortgages and stocks and bonds shall be made a privileged class and be exempted from all the expenses of government." It would be an insult to Senator Foraker's intelligence to suppose him sincere in that utterance. He must know that the owners of bonds and mortgages cannot be regularly taxed. A tax on bonds and mortgages increases interest. He must know that a tax commission of his own state, appointed by Gov. McKinley, has reported the impracticability of regularly taxing this kind of property, and has shown that the inequitable burdens of the attempt to do it in Ohio have been evaded by Ohio cities and fallen upon Ohio farming communities. He must have known, moreover, that stocks represent land values more than any other kind of

property, and that those who hold them would therefore not only not be exempt under the single tax, but would have their taxes on valuable stocks very decidedly increased. He must have known, finally, that the single tax, so far from falling upon farmers, would fall upon land monopolists, to the relief of farmers. Taxes on working farmers would be considerably reduced if the single tax which the mayor of Cleveland advocates were in operation.

In an article by Dr. Azel Ames on labor conditions in Puerto Rico, published in the United States Labor Bulletin for May, a multifarious explanation of the extreme poverty of the working classes of Puerto Rico is advanced, though a simple explanation suffices. "The mass have been content to live and die as their fathers did," is one of the explanations. This is blended with another, "the comparative ease with which the actual necessities of life can be obtained, and the consequent absence of either means or ambition for better things." That blend is heightened by an observation that the average peon has no visions of a decent cottage and garden of his own, because it involves "too much of imagination, of initiative, of energy, and too slow an acquisition, little by little, to bring it within the bounds of his hope or even his yearning." Then comes the simple but comprehensive explanation. It accounts for all the squalid "contentment" of the peon, all his absence of "means" and "ambition," all his deficient "imagination" and "initiative" and "energy," all his lack of "hope" and "yearning," all his poverty. It is the explanation of explanations. "If ever his mind awoke to thoughts and plans of better possibilities," continues Dr. Ames, "reflection reminded him that property was only for the masters; that taxes were adjusted by omnipotent alcaldes to take from one of his class about all he had; that to labor, to acquire and to serve was to do so only for some one more powerful and acquisitive, to

whom he must sooner or later surrender." That is the true and all-sufficient explanation of peon poverty in Puerto Rico. And with only slight variations of phrase, without any variation in substance, that explanation accounts for the social institution of poverty wherever it exists.

In his baccalaureate sermon at Dartmouth college on the 23d President William J. Tucker probed to the core, with a trenchant sentence or two, the social question of wealth and poverty. Said he—

I doubt if men care to be equally rich. It is evident that they do not care to be equally intelligent. What human nature cannot endure is that one man should be rich at the price of another man's poverty, or intelligent at the price of another man's ignorance. The man whom everybody hates is, first, the unjust man and the man who, without being actually unjust, is willing to thrive upon organized injustice.

To the thoughtful consideration of all persons who attribute motives of covetousness or envy to men that cry out against the organized injustices of our time, which make a few luxuriously rich at the expense of millions of working poor, those truthful words of President Tucker are respectfully commended.

Why is it that republican papers confidently take Mr. McKinley at his word when he denies ambition for a third term, while they brutally discredit the sincerity of Bryan's declaration that he will not be a candidate again? Is it because their partisanship requires them always to fondle political friends and growl at political adversaries? If either of these men is to be regarded upon the evidence of his record as insincere, it certainly is not Mr. Bryan. On several occasions Mr. McKinley has made important declarations, not merely of purpose but of principle, which he has afterwards repudiated. He has changed from a silver coinage advocate to a gold standard man; from promising free trade for Puerto Rico as "a plain duty," to applying a Puerto Rican tariff; from denouncing for-