ideal of these miners is only $600 a year—less than $12 a week—and that in fact they get hardly half as much, there is grim humor in the plea that they are already overpaid. Think of raising a family on $7 or $8 a week, or about the price of one plate at a man-of-leisure's banquet! It can be done. Oh, yes; it can be done. It can be done with even less. So can a horse be boarded at a livery stable for less. Then consider the touching plea that higher wages for mining coal would impose higher prices upon the poor for burning it. There's delicate sympathy for you. Exorbitant railroad rates and mining royalties must be paid by the same poor when they burn coal; but as these exactions go to the support of "widows and orphans" who own watered coal stock and watered railroad stock, it is no hardship on the widows and orphans who don't. But higher wages for mining coal—ah, that would be an outrage upon the poor! As much tribute as you please, but as low wages as possible. Such is the policy of these modern scribes and pharisees and hypocrites, who devour widows' houses and for a pretense make long prayers, who contribute lavishly to churches and charities but bind heavy burdens upon their brethren, who outwardly appear righteous but like the whited sepulchers are full within of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

Prince John Van Buren, while sitting once in a court room during the trial of a case in which he had no personal or professional interest, noticed that the judge continually interrupted the proceedings with questions indicating extreme bias in favor of one of the parties. It disturbed Van Buren's sense of fair play, and, leaning toward the lawyer who was the victim of the judge's manifest partisanship, he asked in a stage whisper that reached to all parts of the court room: "I say, Mr. ——, who is retained on the other side of this case besides the judge?" The story would have no interest at this time were it not for Judge Gray's conduct as chairman of the board of arbitrators in the case of the anthracite coal strike. When the coal trust consented to an arbitration they stipulated that one of the arbitrators should be one of the Federal judges who sit in eastern Pennsylvania. It was in accordance with that stipulation that Mr. Roosevelt appointed Judge Gray, who misses few opportunities to make it evident that the trust made no mistake so far as he is concerned. His questions to Mitchell have revealed a bias against the coal strikers which must be peculiarly gratifying and reassuring to the coal trust.

It is because class-biased judges so generally occupy the judicial bench that labor unions object to being incorporated. This objection is exploited by corporation lawyers as an excuse for refusing to deal amicably with unions. They contend that while unions are unincorporated they cannot be held to contracts. For that reason it is argued that the unions should be incorporated so as to be persons in law whose contracts can be enforced by the courts. Mr. Gompers has made a reply to this argument which is unanswerable so long as the bench is filled with cronies of the rich monopolists of the country. Of requiring labor unions to incorporate Mr. Gompers says:

> **On the surface this proposition seems fair, but when we bear in mind the fact that often judges have a deep-seated prejudice against organized labor, and the far-fetched interpretation in the Taff-Vale case, where an organization of labor in Great Britain was mulcted in damages for the action of an individual member, under the law passed by the British parliament as a "concession to labor," it is not difficult to divine the purpose that the advocates of compulsory incorporation of trades unions have in view.**

One blow has now been delivered by the Supreme Court of the United States against the autocratic policy of the postal department. The question came up from Missouri. A magnetic healer at Nevada, Mo., was denounced by the department upon charges of fraud and his mail stopped. As usual in these cases, though the legitimacy of the man's business was at issue and its prosperity at stake, he was denied every right that is involved in the principle of "due process of law." He was not brought into court upon charges of fraud and subjected to a jury trial, but his property rights in his business were arbitrarily confiscated by a bureau clerk at Washington, a thousand miles away. This clerk decided that the business of magnetic healing is fraudulent, and ordered all the advertiser's mail to be withheld from him, to be stamped "fraudulent," and to be returned to the senders. In other words, the department clerk, upon his own say-so, stopped a business which, upon its face, is as legitimate as any other healing business. This advertiser promptly did what every other person who has been arbitrarily outlawed from the mails ought to do. He sued the local postmaster. The lower court decided against him, but the Supreme Court has reversed that decision. As the contest was upon a demurrer which did not raise the question of fact as to whether or not the business was carried on fraudulently, the final decision in this particular case is still in abeyance. But the Supreme Court does decide that injunctions will be granted to prevent the stoppage of mail matter until the question of fraud in each case has been duly tried. This is a long step in the direction of enabling innocent people to protect themselves against the Russianistic methods of the American post office department.

With strange simplicity the New York Times finds in Mr. Roosevelt's speech at the Chamber of Commerce banqeuet in New York evidences of his hostility to protection. Because he complimented those commercial gentlemen upon possessing "to an eminent degree the traditional American self reliance of spirit which makes them scorn to ask from the government, whether of State or Nation, anything but a fair field and no favor"—because Roosevelt said this in New York, the unsophisticated

Digitized by Google

Times imagines that he is prepared "to throw protection to the dogs." Bosh! Upon his Western tour he made as orthodox protection speeches as the most vigorous infant industry could ask for. Has he changed so soon? The true inference is not that Roosevelt has changed from protectionist to free trader, but that he has never been either the one or the other. From the time of his membership in the Free Trade club of New York, which he left to "go with his party" when that became identified with protection, he has never been anything more admirable in politics than a successful poser. Whether he makes free trade speeches before the New York Chamber of Commerce, or protection speeches in the West, or dodges as he did in New England, or admires his own portrait bravely striding the picture of a vaulting horse, his central thought is always the same. It rests admiringly upon Roosevelt in a pose.

—

Some idea of the flimsy moral fiber of the man may be had from a comparison of his former utterances about official corruption with his present close affiliations with Quay, and Platt, and now with Addicks. "There must be no compromise with official corruption;" "we cannot trust those base beings who treat politics only as a game out of which to wring a soiled livelihood;" "the real and dangerous foe is the corrupt politician;" "no man who is corrupt, no man who condones corruption in others, can possibly do his duty by the community." These nuggets of thought that Roosevelt once supposed he was thinking, we quote from the New York Evening Post. They were originally uttered by Roosevelt, and are fine expressions of civic virtue. But they do not stand in Roosevelt's way for an instant when the delectable Addicks looms up as a political factor. Roosevelt at once strikes hands with this corrupt player in the game of politics and places at his disposal the Federal patronage of Delaware in order to secure his election to the United States Senate. That sort of thing is not only bad morals, it is bad art—bad posing.

———

Canadians have no fear that the large American immigration into their country will result in annexation to the United States. The Canadian director of immigration has recently put the matter well in an interview in which he says:

> It has been my experience with Americans who come into Canada that they readily change their allegiance. They come to understand our laws, and realize that really we have a more representative government than they had in the states. For instance, we cannot change our constitution more readily than the Americans can. You change yours by stretching it. I understand that, but the American coming to Canada finds just as much freedom. He finds that England has little or nothing to do with the dominion, and that we are left strictly to our devices. I have found that these American emigrants become most steadfastly opposed to annexation.

That is a fair statement. Americans who suppose that Canadians are restless for annexation, or that there is any reason why they should be so, are greatly mistaken. With the exception of the figurehead governor general, appointed by a foreign power, the government of Canada is much more democratic than our own. It is responsible directly and immediately to the people. A discredited ministry cannot retain power, and a newly elected one comes into power almost as soon as the popular vote is counted. Objection might be made, to be sure, that all authority in Canada is centralized, coming down from the general or Dominion government to the Provinces, which correspond to our States. But there is getting to be very little practical difference between the two governments in that particular. In Canada there is a noticeable tendency toward the distribution of local authority among local officials—in other words, away from centralization; whereas in the United States there has been a pronounced tendency ever since the civil war in the direction of centralizing all local authority at Washington. As to the advantages which might accrue from political annexation to the people on either side of the Canadian boundary, there are none whatever that would not result as fully if both the Canadian and the American tariffs were repealed. Free trade would give all the benefits of political annexation with none of its burdens.

———

The first serious contest in the opening fight between the people of Chicago for municipal ownership of street railways, and the traction companies for an extension of franchises, came off in the city council on the 17th. What seems to have been a test vote was then taken; and if in fact it was a test the corporations have won. The vote was over the question of referring to committee a series of resolutions offered by Alderman Smulski providing that no franchise extensions shall be granted until the legislature has given the city authority to establsh municipal ownership. In offering these resolutions Mr. Smulski explained that the franchises could be extended from year to year, if the legislature delayed action, but that a declaration of policy ought to be made now. A hostile motion being offered to refer the matter to the committee on local transportation, Mr. Smulski intimated that this motion was in the interest of the corporations. "It would seem," he said, "from the actions of the committee on local transportation that there is a disposition in that committee and in the council to extend existing franchises without waiting for any opportunity for the exercise of the right of municipal ownership so overwhelmingly voted for by the people at the recent elections;" and to secure an expression of the sense of the council, he moved that the resolutions be referred instead to the judiciary committee, which is understood to be friendly to municipal ownership. This was the test motion, and Mr. Smulski was defeated by an overwhelming vote. What may be the possible significance of this ambiguous action of the Chicago council, only the members themselves

Digitized by Google