

upon the legislature to frame and submit a statute for final adoption. Judge Dunne asks why this simple amendment does not cover completely all the needs of a city like Chicago. It does. And it is in harmony with the line along which public opinion is forcing legislation. It would tend to establish home rule.

Mark Twain is severely criticized by friends of Dr. Ament, the Chinese missionary, for his condemnation of that gentleman's exploit in levying contributions upon Chinese villages with a "mailed hand." The missionary's friends protest that Dr. Ament "appealed" to the head men and the people of these villages for redress for the destruction by Boxers of the homes of Chinese Christians, and, to quote one of them, that "the villagers responded nobly to this appeal." That response must have been a sight for the gods. A whole people aroused to madness by foreign intrusion, and native Christians despised and hated and assailed as perverts to foreign superstitions; yet a foreign missionary collects from Chinese villages a large fund to reimburse these Chinese perverts for their losses, and does it by moral suasion alone! If that story were true, it would go far to prove that Chinese villagers are morally head and shoulders above other races of men. But it is much to be feared that Mark Twain's estimate of Dr. Ament's exploit is correct. All the probabilities point to the good doctor's use, in addition to moral suasion, of something like immoral threats.

That eminent professional regulator of poor people's lives, Jacob Riis, has been studying the inhabitants of Chicago's First ward, with a view to the possibilities of putting them under plutocratic tutelage. Having made observations at a ball of the First Ward Democratic association, he sagaciously concludes that these people are not fit to govern the most valuable two square miles west of the Alleghanies, and suggests that the owners of First ward property

should, regardless of where they live, be allowed to vote for First ward aldermen. This is the old British landlord idea of a vote to every landlord wherever he owns land. It is the manifest political evil which Anglo-Saxon common sense has resisted under the cry of "one man, one vote." Government is for men, not for valuable lots. When consulted about Mr. Riis's plutocratic proposition, several Chicago property owners thought it excellent. But one sensible downtown merchant, Otto Young, of the Fair, gave it a quietus. "According to law," said Mr. Young, "every man who lives in the ward has a vote, and that is all there is to it; you can't take his vote away from him, and you can't give a vote to a man who lives outside the ward." Mr. Young's remark is true, whether stated as matter of law or of good American horse sense. If the First ward property owners wish to vote in the First ward, they have only to move into it. As yet, men and not property are the voters in this country. That is a condition, however, which plutocrats, rich plutocrats and poor ones, are extremely anxious to reverse.

The disposition of the senate to retain the check stamp tax is another indication of the indifference of law makers to the rights of that part of the community which cannot or does not make its demands known forcibly. This stamp tax is a burden upon the ordinary man. To rich men it makes no difference. Their checks are so large that a two-cent tax on each is less than a bagatelle. And it is no inconvenience to them to invest ten dollars or more in books of ready-stamped checks. Even if it were, they have clerks to draw their checks; and the clerks would suffer all the bother of affixing and cancelling. Not so with the man of small means, who nevertheless uses checks for his payments, as all business men should. Unless he spends ten dollars in a lump sum for a stamped check book, he must "lick" and stick and cancel stamps every time he draws a check; and as

his checks are small, the tax of two cents on each is out of all proportion to the tax upon rich men's checks.

Addressing "the man with the hoe," by way of inculcating a general lesson on capital, that unique and bright little publication of New York, "The Straight Edge," says:

Do not imagine that your debt to all those fellow men and to those other thousands who have lived and died and left the products of their brain and skill to swell the common capital of the race, is paid when you hand 50 cents over the counter for a hoe!

The debt referred to is described as running against "the man with the hoe"—

to the brain and skill of thousands upon thousands of his fellow men, from the prehistoric inventor down to the miner who digs the iron out of the earth, the machinist who forges and tempers it, the woodsman who fells the tree from which the handle is made, the workman who turns the handle, the railroad that transports the products, with all the innumerable gangs of workmen who have a part in making the miner's pick and shovel, the machinist's forge and tools, the woodsman's ax and wagon, the turner's lathe and chisels, the railroad's engines and cars and signals and warehouses, etc.

But why is not that debt all paid when "the man with the hoe" hands 50 cents over the counter for that implement?

It is a very common thing for men of socialistic trend of mind to say that the debt is not paid, and to think so. The idea is common, too, with the university cult of economists and sociologists, whose chief aim in life it seems to be to blur the primary distinctions and obscure the elementary differences between mine and thine and ours. But we have yet to be shown in any rational way why "the man with the hoe" does not discharge all economic obligations when he hands his 50 cents over the counter for it. Being "the man with the hoe," he earns that 50 cents. It represents less than the value of his labor rather than more. Consequently, he starts fair. And as the merchant who sells him the hoe charges him 50 cents, that sum must fully represent all that has been paid for the labor of making