

tion. What is the object of the Bucklin amendment which menaces the welfare of Colorado? It simply provides that any county in the state may be permitted to raise its revenues as a majority of the voters may determine. It means majority rule in local affairs. This the Republican fears and takes the position that majorities are not competent to manage local affairs.

But even if under home rule in taxation, which the Bucklin amendment would allow, the people of any or all the counties of Colorado should adopt the Australasian tax in place of the present property tax, how would all real estate investments be injured? As taxes on improvements would be abolished, investments in real estate improvements certainly would not suffer. On the contrary, such investments would be benefited. The only kind of real estate investments to be injured would be investments in vacant land for the purpose of monopolizing it. But that would not be prejudicial to the true interests of Colorado. It is not investments in land, which is already there, that Colorado needs; but investments in improvements, which would utilize the land and are not already there. The latter kind of investments would be encouraged by the Bucklin amendment; for whenever its permission was availed of by the people, improvements would be exempt from all local taxation.

An agitation appears to be in progress among orthodox Jews, who observe Saturday as Sabbath, to secure the legal right to pursue their regular vocations on Sundays. Regarding this right, Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists are in the same category as the Jews. The restrictive legislation upon these religious sects has been sustained by the courts by the most absurd reasoning imaginable. Conceding that the legislatures cannot make laws in the interest of any religious worship whatever, and therefore cannot legalize any sect's holy day for religious reasons, they have decided that laws forbidding labor on Sundays are police regulations for the preservation of

the public health, and not religious enactments. It would be as reasonable to enforce generally by law the Dunkard rite of feet washing as a police regulation in the interest of the public health. These Sunday laws clearly violate the rights of religious worshippers whose holy day is not Sunday. Bound by their own religious convictions to abstain from labor on one day in the week, and by other people's religious convictions to abstain on another, they are put at a peculiar disadvantage by unwarranted legislation. It may be said that the Sunday laws violate the rights also of persons who recognize no holy day; and that, too, is true. While a regular weekly rest day is doubtless a valuable social inheritance, and everyone who desires should be protected in its enjoyment, it is a very different matter to enforce by law its observance upon those who object, no matter whether they observe another rest day or not.

When Senator Beveridge, of imperialistic ambition and fame, spoke before the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, in session last week in New York, he gave voice to the following extraordinary composite of pagan piety and pinchbeck patriotism:

The flag and the cross are alike in one respect. They never retreat. You may temporarily close a church here and a flag may be withdrawn there, but only in order to advance more permanently their interest. They have one common purpose—the cross to advance Christianity, the flag to make this Christian country the greatest power on earth.

The religion which breathes through that sentiment is akin to the piety of the profane Rhode Island colonel in the civil war, of whom it was told in Harper's Magazine that upon being informed by his adjutant that the chaplain of a neighboring Massachusetts regiment had baptized 25 converts the previous Sunday, exclaimed: "Order out a detail of 50 men for baptism next Sunday. No blankety-blank Massachusetts regiment shall get ahead of ours, even in religion!"

EDWIN L. GODKIN.

No one who believes in maintaining moral standards in public life could wish to have the death of Edwin L. Godkin pass unnoticed. For Mr. Godkin was one of the few champions of civic righteousness who have become distinguished in this generation of materialistic utilitarianism.

In many respects we disagreed with him. In some respects the disagreements were fundamental and irreconcilable. His perceptions of moral principle often differed from ours. But that he had moral perceptions, discerned with intelligence and adopted with sincerity, by which he was guided and for which he fought, was evident to all who read his trenchant reviews of current events. For this we should honor his memory though we had differed from him at every point.

Mr. Godkin had the courage and the vigor of his convictions. He has left behind him no evidence of any disposition to minimize anything in which he believed, from fear of consequences either personal or logical; and he was capable of indulging that righteous wrath at essential wrong and deliberate wrongdoers which is as necessary to a sound character as the spirit of toleration toward accidental wrong and unwitting offenders. Good people forget too easily that the considerate: "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do!" was no more characteristic of the life of the Galilean than the wrathful flagellation in the temple.

Nordid Mr. Godkin flabbily reserve his wrath for the sin and let the sinner escape. He realized that evil is done by individuals, and that if you would bring it to the bar of human justice you must bring it there in the person of an individual. It is as necessary to make criminals unpopular as it is to make crime abhorrent. And this is as true of crime against public rights as it is of crime against private rights. Accordingly he was always ready with his potent and dreaded, "Thou art the man!" He did not content himself with denouncing public theft; he also denounced public thieves. He was not satisfied to denounce vicious public policies; he denounced just