

lowing letter from the Illinois Manufacturers' Association points?

We do not think it fair for the President of the United States, after he received the support of the corporations, to enact a law that was discriminatory and unjust. We do not believe that there is any law of God or man that justifies one in asking for help and giving a body blow in return. There is no intention of being disrespectful and unfair in any of the literature that goes out from this office, but I assure you that we will insist on our rights, and will present the truth as we find it.

\* \*

### Roosevelt.

It is appalling, what good Roosevelt may do when he gets home—and what harm. He may be democratic, but only as a red blooded aristocrat is. He may mean well, but he doesn't think well when he thinks at all. Should his right meaning draw him to the Insurgents, his personality might be as steam to a boat with her nose pointed right; should his wrong thinking make him a Stand-patter, he might become our Man on Horseback.

\* \*

### The Police "Sweatbox."

Justice Wright of Washington, whose conduct in the Gompers injunction case (vol. xii, p. 1188), was justly criticized, has made a decision on the police "sweatbox" (pp. 337, 350) which entitles him to the credit that belongs to a judge who holds fast to the land marks of civil liberty. He decides that the arrest of persons on suspicion of crime without a magistrate's warrant is unlawful unless a warrant is immediately procured. Under that view of the law—and it is a view that no well-read lawyer will dispute—the "sweatbox" would be as impossible as it ought to be. Police detectives could no longer hold prisoners in secret custody to torture out or worm out from them confessions that are more likely to be false than true.

\* \*

### Menacing Municipal Home Rule.

A vicious bill before the Ohio legislature, has but barely escaped passage. It was a bill to empower the Governor to remove the mayor of any city in the State upon finding him guilty of "gross misconduct," "gross neglect of duty," or, among other things, "refusal to enforce the law." Such a bill would have taken the government of every city away from its inhabitants. What partisan Governor would have had any difficulty in finding a mayor guilty of gross misconduct or neglect of duty if a partisan advantage were to be gained by it? Incidentally this bill afforded an

interesting contrast of the attitude of politicians toward the recall. In Illinois they required a petition of 75 per cent of the voters to enable the people of a city to vote for the removal of an official; but in the Ohio bill, a 2 per cent petition was considered enough to authorize the Governor of the State to remove the mayor of any city.

\* \*

### The Gold Dollar as a Dishonest Dollar.

Financial experts, both the theoretical of the universities and the practical of the market place, seem to be fairly well agreed upon Byron W. Holt's theory that gold has fallen in value. What, then, is to be done in order to have an "honest dollar"? Silver was demonetized. But as gold is now the single monetary standard, gold cannot be demonetized. Consequently the creditor class must suffer loss just as they would if depreciated silver had been restored as a money metal—unless some way can be found to raise the value of gold dollars. But that might not be so difficult. Gold dollars are standard now at 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine. Why not standardize them at some higher point—say 38.7 grains, or more or less according to the depreciation of gold? Listen to the little birds, and maybe they will tell you pretty soon that something like this is to be attempted by and by.

\* \* \*

### THE EXPLOITATION OF LABOR.

What does that mean—"exploitation of labor"?

It means that workers are "fleeced" through unfair wages, which they accept because they have to or starve. They have to accept or starve because the supply of workers is greater than the demand for workers. This is a fact which everybody knows.

Everybody ought also to know the reason why it is a fact.

There may indeed be many reasons, but there is one which must be reckoned with before the others can be effectually disposed of. This is monopoly of natural resources. The earth is forestalled by labor exploiters. Workers are disinherited. Labor is locked out from its own.

\* \*

Think of it a moment, calmly and fairly.

If mines were monopolized, couldn't exploiters of labor slow down mining operations? And wouldn't this make an over-supply of labor—unless disemployed miners could find profitable opportunities to work at something else?

And then if lumber forests also were monop-