robbery of the people for the benefit of privileged cliques and classes the whole protective system is.

As an international question, this tariff war with Russia is one in which our country is in the right, if there can be any right to what is fundamentally wrong. What we mean is that countervailing duties must be imposed by us upon bounty stimulated exports of sugar from Russia if our wretched tariff system is to be kept up at all. The American sugar trust might be completely circumvented, be wholly deprived of its tariff profits, if bounty-fed foreign sugar were admitted into this country without an extra import duty large enough to offset the advantage of the foreign bounty. And if we impose such duties upon sugar from one bounty paying country, we must impose them on sugar from all. Otherwise delicate international difficulties, promoted by "business" interests in the countries discriminated against, would assuredly arise. That is what makes it necessary to discourage the bounty-fed sugar exports of Russia with a countervailing duty. We impose countervailing duties upon the bounty-fed sugar exports of Germany, of Austria, of France, of Belgium; and consequently must be ready to do the same regarding Russia. So we must either continue to provoke Russia's retaliatory duties upon our steel trust interests, or consign our sugar trust interests to the free list. If we could turn the whole collection of tariff schedules into a free list, it would be a blessed thing for everybody—our trusts alone excepted. It is only justice to Russia, however, to acknowledge that her indirect method of giving a bounty on sugar exports—by merely remitting from the exports the internal taxes she imposes upon sugar consumed at home—is a concession to sugar exports of what ought to be conceded to all products. She allows her sugar manufactures to go into the markets of the world free from tax burdens. Would that our protected masters would allow us to do the same, only more of it.

Apropos of the rumored consolidation of the steel trusts, the core of the trust question is touched by an editorial in a conservative newspaper, which declares that for the present—

it may be said that as long as the raw materials of industry are not monopolized, there can be no monopoly of long duration in the finished products.

That is perfectly true, provided highways are regarded — as economically they must be—as raw materials of industry. What the paper in question overlooks, and in common with most other superficial students of the subject of trusts, is the fact that in the steel industry the raw materials are now monopolized. Not that all ore mines are in the trust. They are not. But all the rich mines are; and as these are amply sufficient to satisfy demand, competition by means of other mines is impossible. Besides that, the monopoly of highways has to be reckoned with.

When treasury looters fall out, the public may get some of its dues. And treasury looters in congress have fallen out over the river and harbor plunder and the ship subsidy plunder. Mr. Hanna himself became so angered at the difficulties he had encountered in his efforts to pay campaign debts with ship subsidies and thus make himself solid, "an honest man who stays bought," with the "business interests" for the next campaign, that in his speech in the senate on the 15th he suddenly exclaimed, in a loud voice:

How about the river and harbor bill? What does that contain? I make no charges against anybody, but there are things in that bill which make the ship subsidy bill pale by comparison. I say this most emphatically.

For once Mr. Hanna is right. The river and harbor steal does make the ship subsidy steal pale by comparison. But once the river and harbor steal also was a smaller steal. With time, patience, cheek and McKinleyism, it has expanded to such magnificent proportions that Mr. Hanna notices its predatory qualities. Give the ship subsidy steal but half a chance and it will soon play a good second to the river and harbor bill in every congress.

Large employers of dependent labor are often guilty of impertinences which not unnaturally irritate and anger their tongue-tied objects. An instance was offered recently by Marshall Field & Co., of Chicago. Into the pay envelope of their employes this firm thrust a printed slip containing advice "on saving" from the pen of Russell Sage. That Russell Sage is competent to give advice on saving methods, no one doubts who knows of his mania for accumulation. But he is the last person to whom young men should be referred for advice as to the morality of saving or of anything else. And even if his example as man and citizen were worthy of emulation, it would still be an impertinence on the part of employers to thrust his advice unasked upon their adult employes. To appreciate acts like these it must be observed that they are not acts of friendship between equals. They are condescending efforts to regulate the lives of underlings, who tolerate it only because they dare not risk losing their jobs. The circumstances are such that Marshall Field & Co. virtually command their employes to read the sordid preachments of the most notorious miser of the modern kind. It is this assumption of a right to intrude upon the privacy of their employes, and not so much Sage's platitudinous, and in one respect abhorrent, advice for success in life, that offends. Mr. Field might proffer the Sage tract to a friend without offense. The friend, if sensible, would laugh at the tract, and might joke Mr. Field about his augmenting years. An employe has no such liberty. He is as helpless as when the firm orders him out on parade for political effect.

The possibilities of slavery in the guise of freedom have lately been ex-

emplified in South Carolina. By accident it has been discovered that labor contracts are made in that state which return negro workmen to a condition which, if it differs from chattel slavery, differs only for the worse. Under these contracts the laborer agrees to work under supervision upon certain terms, and "at all times to be subject to the orders and commands" of the employer, who is authorized by the contract "to use such force as he or his agents may deem necessary" to compel the laborer "to remain on the farm," including the right to lock him up "for safekeeping," and if he should run away, "the right to offer a reward" for his capture, such reward to be deducted from his wages. The employer is empowered also "to transfer his interest in this contract to any other party." This system of serfdom is in general use in at least one South Carolina county. The facts came out in a murder trial at Columbia, in which one Newell, a convict farmer, was charged with the murder of a negro named Hull. Newell had complained to a magistrate that Hull refused to carry out one of these labor contracts which Newell held. The magistrate thereupon issued a warrant for Hull, and placed it in Newell's hands for execution. Newell arrested Hull and took him to his convict "stockade," where he held and worked 18 convicts. Here Hull was treated like the convicts, and upon attempting to leave, was shot dead in his tracks. Upon these facts Newell was tried for murder. The result of his trial has not come to our attention; but the circumstances led the trial judge to charge the grand jury most earnestly to make a full investigation. The resemblance of this labor contract practice to the worst features of slavery is very marked, and the practice has a significance that extends beyond the confines of South Carolina and reaches to others than individuals of the negro race. There is a growing army of men everywhere, white and black, whose opportunities for making a livelihood are so meager that they would gladly sign labor contracts like those quoted from above. Let this army but grow a little larger, and its members become a little more desperate and obtrusive, and public opinion would readily countenance the summary enforcement of such labor contracts. Through that door lies the reestablishment of a system of slavery in support of which there already exists the makings of a strong sentiment among the comfortable classes.

With some flourish of journalistic trumpets it is announced through the press that one of John D. Rockefeller's daughters is studying industrial problems in a fashionable young woman's school of New York. That news would be encouraging if there were any reason to suppose that the instruction were serious and the instructors courageous. The indications are, however, that this is only another fad, like the heartless and brainless slumming fad of a few years ago. Its keynote question appears to be, How shall employers improve the condition of their employes? Miss Rockefeller, however genuine and earnest, may study that question until she dies of old age and a plethora of wealth without making any further real progress than the daughter of Robert Toombs would have made half a century ago had she joined a class of Georgia aristocrats to study how masters might improve the condition of their slaves.

A fine modern type of the old-fashioned inquisitor who accelerated the administration of justice with thumb screws and the like, is Mr. Senior, the recorder of Paterson, N. J. His torture machine was up to date, for he operated it with electricity. But the squeamishness of some of his townsmen has compelled him to remove it from the court. Mr. Senior's torture appliance came to public knowledge through its use in the case of an Italian charged with forgery. The Italian asserted his innocence. The evidence was hazy and weak. But the prosecutor was certain, as usual, of his guilt. So the recorder, personating Justice, pulled the bandage from his eyes, laid his sword upon the bench, and dropping his scales, ran a strong electric current into the brass rail upon which the prisoner was resting his hands. As the current caught and held him while it vibrated through his body, the prisoner yelled, as many an innocent but cowardly victim of torture in the middle ages had done before him: "I did it! I did it!" Whether he really did it or not, no one but himself knows. But he was promptly convicted, and Recorder Senior has his own opinion of the weakness of a people who object to so simple and effective a method of securing criminal convictions.

Judge Dunne, of Chicago, has made a suggestion regarding the constitutional obstacles to local self-government in this western metropolis, which would, if adopted, settle all the difficulties with which the city contends, and without involving the expense and uncertainties of a constitutional convention. He proposes a constitutional amendment to which no fair objection can be interposed. It consists merely in supplementing the clause in the present constitution which forbids special legislation, with these words:

> Save and except that in all cases where any common council of any city or any board of county commissioners of any county or 25 per cent. of the voters of any city or county shall request the passage of any law applicable only to such city or municipality, the legislature shall have the power to enact the law so requested, said law not to take effect, however, until submitted to popular vote in said city or municipality and a majority of voters thereof shall approve the passage of the same.

The only improvement that might be desired in Judge Dunne's proposed constitutional amendment is a requirement that questions shall be submitted to the people upon the demand by petition of a much smaller proportion of voters than 25 per cent., and that when 25 per cent. vote for it in principle, it shall be mandatory