

McKinley, when the old slaveholders' ethnical philosophy of races with "superior" and races with "inferior" natural rights was adopted by McKinley's party, when the Jeffersonian principle which Lincoln proclaimed anew as "government of the people, for the people, and by the people" was abandoned by that party—from that moment the manhood rights of American Negroes were no longer secure either in South or in North.

It is no longer necessary to turn to the South for evidence of Negro subjugation. We may, indeed, see numbers of this race at the South recklessly convicted by petty magistrates of petty crimes, so that they may be forced to work in chain gangs. We may see them lynched there and burned at the stake. We may hear President Roosevelt bitterly condemned there for no other reason than because he was once the host of a Negro gentleman of high character and accomplishments. But these things can be matched at the North now. Why does ex-President Cleveland deny with so much spirit the story that he also has eaten with a Negro, if he does not feel the force of the hostility of his own race to the Negro race? If it was not a fact that he had eaten with a Negro, his denial would of course have no such significance. But the spirit of his denial, the vigor with which he makes it, the indignation at what he evidently regards as an injurious slander, these are extremely significant. How very significant, also, is the combination in Chicago, of a lot of Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Catholics and Lutherans to prevent the buying of a church building in their neighborhood by a respectable congregation of Negro Baptists. Nor does the growing anti-Negro sentiment of the North manifest itself alone in such comparatively trivial ways. In Northern Kansas and Colorado, as well as in Southern Texas and Georgia, popularly approved mobs have burned Negroes at the stake; less horrible forms of locally

approved lynchings of Negroes have been reported from more settled Northern States. And from the overwhelmingly Republican county of Clark, in the overwhelmingly Republican State of Ohio, there now comes news of an atrocious attack upon Negroes, simply as Negroes, to which the old secession South furnishes no parallel. When in a Republican stronghold, in the heart of a State as distinctly Northern as Ohio, a mob rises up not merely to lynch a Negro prisoner, but to drive every Negro out of the place, to raze their houses to the ground, and to shoot to kill, regardless of age or sex, but with reference only to color and race—when such a demonstration is possible in such a place, it is not unreasonable to infer that the spirit of race hatred by whites against Negroes all over the country, has become as vigorous as it is satanic.

There was a world of significance in President Roosevelt's exclamation when Congressman Baker explained his interest in the bill for the sale of Indian lands in South Dakota. Mr. Baker had called upon the President to urge executive influence in favor of leasing instead of selling these lands. "What is your interest in the matter?" the President asked. Mr. Baker explained that as a single taxpayer he was interested in saving these lands from falling into the hands of land grabbers. It was then that Mr. Roosevelt exclaimed. "I am glad," said he, "to meet a man who doesn't want to see me about a post office."

It is a sad commentary on public life at Washington, when the President is surprised into an expression of gratified amazement at meeting a Congressman who comes to talk with him about public matters in a public spirit instead of private graft in a grafter's spirit. It would seem from Mr. Baker's experience in Congress that the conception that most Congressmen have of their duty is to worry the President about post offices, fill their wal-

lets with railroad passes, and laugh and sneer at the "fresh" Congressman who rejects passes and brings more important questions than post office patronage to the President's attention upon making official calls at the White House. A wager would be safe, however, even with heavy odds, that the Congressmen who do bother President Roosevelt with patronage applications, come away with more of what they go for, than Mr. Baker is likely to secure from the President for the public interest in connection with the leasing instead of the selling of Indian lands.

We have little hope that a recently started movement in Chicago will be allowed to develop far. Yet it is of great importance with reference to good citizenship and good public service. The movement in question contemplates an inquiry into the use of railroad passes and other passes, by State and Federal officials, including judges. This movement is said to have been inspired by a legal author, Seymour B. Thompson, and the editor of a law periodical, Adolph Moses, and to have the support of several law journals. Good luck to it. May it succeed in putting an end to this specious method of corruption. But we have doubts, for there are eminent judges who carry railroad passes; and where is the man who cares to incur the odium of exposing these honored functionaries when it comes to the sticking point?

Congressman Baker's experience with railroad passes (p. 690) has not been encouraging. When he refused a pass, he might have said nothing about it; but that would have served the purpose of the bribers almost as well as if he had accepted. Quiet refusal is as useful as secret acceptance, so long as only a few refuse. So Mr. Baker told about it—"gave away" the bribe-offering railroad and his bribe-taking colleagues. Thereupon every pass-seeking Congressman sneered at

him, and every pass-soliciting editor jeered at him. Then he brought the pass question before the Democratic caucus in Congress, but by a considerable majority that virtuous body buried it in a committee. Still Baker persisted. His next move was to present resolutions to the House asking an inquiry. The resolutions went to the judiciary committee, and there they have fallen asleep. Perhaps Baker is tired out by this time. If he is, his fatigue is no greater than that of the Chicago gentlemen is likely to be, who are attacking the corrupting pass-privileges of eminent judges.

In this connection we commend the following well considered opinion of pass bribery, which is valuable on its merits, regardless of the identity of the author, who prefers, doubtless for good reasons, as a practicing lawyer, to withhold his name. We quote it from the Chicago Chronicle of the 6th:

It is common knowledge among Chicago lawyers that as soon as a judge is elected to the bench his mail is full of passes from all directions sent him by both State and inter-State companies. It is difficult to see why the railroads should do this except that they expect some advantage from these free gifts. I believe that if the commissions make a full investigation on this subject and an exposure is publicly made of it, the facts will show that every county judge in the 102 counties and every Supreme Court judge, including the Federal judges, is tendered yearly passes. The extent to which they are accepted can only be surmised. This point should be established and made a matter of record. Some judges spurn the passes, others use them. The people should know who they are. It is not the claim of any lawyer who is in favor of breaking up this practice that a railroad pass will affect the decision of a judge in an important case, yet the question remains whether anyone for a moment supposes that railroad companies grant these favors without an expectation of getting something in return.

In some respects these pass favors are worse than naked bribes. It is not easy to offer a naked bribe; it is easy to offer a pass. It is not easy to take a naked bribe; it is easy to take a pass. The judge who takes a naked bribe knows it as a bribe, and if he allows it to influence him he does so as a con-

scious criminal. But the judge who takes railroad passes cannot tell whether they influence him or not. In almost every case he is bribed without knowing he is bribed. There is a subtlety about pass bribery which makes it more dangerous than the highly profitable bribe of official commerce.

We have sometimes had occasion to call attention to the fact that when good roads (p.658) are made at public expense, the process is essentially one of taxing some persons in order to enrich others. This is not to say that good roads ought not to be made. They ought to be made, and plenty of them. But the persons whose property they increase in value ought to be taxed pro rata to pay for them. It is not fair to compel a man whose property is not increased in value by good roads, to pay for those roads, when the notorious effect is to increase the value of the property of another man, who pays no more toward the improvement. That is tantamount to giving back to the latter all he pays, and maybe with a profit added, while giving to the former only a better road to use, which the latter also gets. It isn't fair.

Everybody ought to realize that it isn't fair; but one may realize this without being sure that the fact is as we have stated it. For that reason we quote from the New York Tri-Weekly Tribune of March 2, an unmistakable acknowledgment that farm owners expect to get a financial return from good roads which farm hands, farm tenants, mechanics and others who do not own landed property do not get. Says the Tribune in its "Good Roads" department:

It is rather an important matter that money be spent intelligently on the improvement of highways in order to bring farm produce more cheaply to market and increase the farm values by giving a better highway to carry farm produce on. This is shown very clearly from the official figures of the last Federal census report, in which are tabulated in comparative columns "the increase (or decrease) in the value of

farms, including land with improvements, from 1890 to 1900." The total increase in all the States and Territories in the United States in farm values in the ten years was 27.6 per cent.

	Per Cent.
The increase in farm values in Maine was	1.0
The increase in farm values in New Jersey was	3.9
The increase in farm values in Connecticut was	4.9
The increase in farm values in Vermont was	6.5
The increase in farm values in New Hampshire was	7.0
The increase in farm values in Rhode Island was	7.0
The increase in farm values in Massachusetts was	23.7

In New York State there was a decrease of 6.1 per cent. in the ten years, equaling \$70,000,000. New Jersey, in the last ten years, has built 1,000 miles of highway at a cost of \$4,544,000. Massachusetts has built 430 miles of highway at a cost in round numbers of \$5,000,000, and under its county system has built as much more. Connecticut has built 454 miles of highway at a cost of \$2,500,000. New York, after six years of work, has built 300 miles of highway, at a cost of about \$3,500,000, all in small sections, commencing nowhere and ending nowhere. And now it is a pity that the road advocates who desire to improve the farm values of the State by improving one mile in every ten of all the highways in all of the counties, so that when the system is completed there will be a continuous stretch of main highways leading from one county to another throughout the entire State of 8,000 miles, are told that they can only have \$1,000,000 to build roads with this year, and this \$1,000,000 will build 28 miles of highway in Orange county, and the other counties that want it can go begging. It seems that the political interests which neglect the expenditure of money for the improvement of farm values ought to become more conscious of the requirements of the agricultural communities, or there will be a great awakening among the voters and taxpayers.

Why should any State spend money to improve farm values? Some of this money comes from farm tenants. Yet not only will no financial benefit go back to them as a result of the good-roads expenditure, but the consequent "improvement of farm values" will involve their paying higher rents. The real meaning of higher farm values is that farm rents are higher.

Little Brother—I'd just like to know how to read.

Little Sister—Oh, I wouldn't. When you know how to read they give you a lot of books without any pictures.—Puck.