velt has assumed to teach is the very reverse of this. He has assumed to teach that the President in his official capacity is so far inseparable from the President in his private capacity, that he may use his official authority to resent a private offense. The Emperor of Germany could hardly have gone so far to resent an insult to the royal family.

—

So seriously did the heads of departments take Mr. Roosevelt's imperatorial order against the Boston Herald, that even the routine reports of the weather bureau were withheld from that paper. This was done upon orders from Washington. The orders were afterwards changed, with an explanation that the withholding of routine information was not intended by the imperatorial order. But the flunkeyism of the department could not be erased. Moreover correspondents of the Herald are still denied "facilities for information" at the executive departments, facilities which are afforded to other reporters. If this can be done with reference to one paper to gratify a private grudge, whether just or unjust, it can be done with reference to all papers and for any reason or no reason. The President could thus become a press censor of the most objectionable and dangerous kind. Only subservient reporters and papers would have access to the sources of executive news and the public would get only the toady kinds of news. It is becoming tolerably clear that Mr. Roosevelt's soft tread and big stick are not intended for international use alone.

———

Organized workingmen are often criticised with bitterness for their low opinion of the courts. But have not the courts themselves gone a long way to earn this contempt? Recently the Court of Appeals of New York decided (p. 553) that the 8-hour labor law of that State, which makes all public-work contracts subject to a condition that the contractor must observe the 8-hour labor day, invalid, because it restricts freedom of contract. Hardly had the wires ceased ticking the news of that decision against workingmen and in favor of freedom of contract, when an appellate division of the Supreme Court of the same State decided another case against workingmen and in favor of restricting freedom of contract. It held that a contract between an employer and his men for a "closed shop" was invalid because contrary to public policy. Don't these decisions indicate anti-labor bias rather than judicial balance?

—

If it is against public policy for an employer and his men to agree that none but union men shall work in that employer's shop, why is it not against public policy, especially when the legislature so declares it, for an employer to work his men more than eight hours a day on public work? If the legislature cannot limit private contracting powers for labor on public work, how can courts limit private contracting powers on private work? If restriction of freedom of contract in the direction of protecting workmen from being ground between the under millstone of their necessities and the upper millstone of their employers' greed, is not against public policy, why is it against public policy to allow them to make contracts with employers for such protection? In a word, why did labor lose the second case, in which it stood for freedom of contract, as well as the first, in which it stood for restricting freedom of contract? Are workingmen very much to blame if they suspect that they lost at least one of these cases because the court was less solicitous for legal consistency than to rebuke "labor" and weaken its power of organization?

———

The Japanese are to be next in order for exclusion from this country. They are "taking away work" from the American, who prizes work above all things. F. P. Sargent, chief of the immigration bureau, is the principal sponsor for this new development in American demagogy. He fears the coming here of Japanese immigrants in large numbers as soon as they are released from army service. "This may complicate the labor problem of the country," he fears, "unless Congress takes some radical action in the way of an exclusion act." That workingmen should be fooled by this kind of playing upon race prejudices is one of the saddest of things. The exclusion of Japanese will surely serve as an anesthetic to quiet labor while it is robbed of its earnings more cynically than ever.

—

What enormous humbuggery all this talk about enormous immigration is. One hysterical press correspondent makes the wires hot from Washington with the announcement that 22,000,000 immigrants from foreign ports have come into the United States since 1820, and that they are coming now at the rate of about 2,500 a day. These figures have an ominous sound, simply as figures. But if it is a bad thing for a country to have new-comers in large numbers, it must be noted with fear that the gates of birth are unloading immigrants upon us in numbers vastly greater than foreign ports. The prejudice against immigration, so far as it is a labor question, is nothing but a phase of Malthusianism. It assumes that there isn't enough to go around, nor room enough to work in, and that therefore a check must be placed upon increasing population. But it is not numbers that needs checking. If, instead, we check our systems of legally plundering laborers, we shall accomplish naturally and justly what Malthusianism tries to accomplish unnaturally and unjustly. There is room enough and working opportunity enough in this country for the population of the whole world, if we only get rid of monopoly. Monopolists, not immigrants, they are the bane of our republic.

———

A brutal whipping bee took place at Wilmington, Delaware,