

**Economical Living.**

The household economics committee of the Federation of Women's Clubs is reported to have mapped out a plan for economical living. By elaborate estimates they show how a young man and his wife can live comfortably on \$100 a month. This plan would be ever so much more useful if it were supplemented with one for getting the \$100 a month. When it is considered that only exceptional employes command more than \$20 a week, plans for living on \$100 a month are of limited value.

\* \*

**The Negro Vote.**

Most bitterly does the New York Age, Mr. Fortune's paper, complain of what it regards as the apostasy of Senator Foraker. Among all its surprises of a quarter of a century it heads the list with this Ohio senator's attitude toward the question of forbidding railroad discriminations against Negro passengers. He practically admitted, says the Age, the right of a State to authorize this discrimination and disclaimed any design to interfere. Not only did Senator Foraker apostasize, but not a single friend of the American Negro appeared in the Senate. After this not very original discovery The Age exclaims that the race it represents, although numbering 10,000,000 American citizens—about an eighth of the total population of the Republic—is without one representative in Congress. All this is regarded by the Age as "one of the most remarkable and significant facts in the history of the Federal Republic." Significant it is, indeed; but not remarkable. The reverse of this situation would be remarkable under the circumstances. Why should either party send Negroes to Congress. The Democratic party doesn't want to, and the Republican party doesn't have to so long as it can get the Negro vote on the strength of mere party traditions. When Negro leaders learn how to utilize the fact that the Democratic party (at the North at any rate) would be glad to get the Negro vote, and that the Republican party would be aghast at losing it, they will no longer have reason to complain of political neglect.

\* \* \*

**MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN GREAT BRITAIN.**

From time to time the beneficiaries of private monopoly favor the American public with reports by "experts" regarding municipal ownership and operation in Europe. Great Britain has usually

been the place for their researches, and, of course, the reports are always discouraging. The latest of these experts is Mr. Everett W. Burdett, a Boston lawyer, who in "The Journal of Political Economy" for May, published by the faculty of political economy at the University of Chicago, tells us a great many things indicating that municipal ownership has in general proven a failure in Great Britain, from which he infers that it would be certain to prove a failure in this country.

It is to the credit of Mr. Burdett that he frankly states in whose interest he went to England last summer to study the question. In doing so he discloses his reason for saying so little about successes and so much about failures. At the beginning of his article he insists upon the inviolability of private property, telling us all that "we must in our own interest, as well as that of the body politic, try to enlighten and educate the honest and intelligent portion of our citizens." "*In our own interest*" implies a great deal; and when reading his report it is well to always keep those words in mind. Mr. Burdett evidently did when writing it.

\* \*

The immediate cause of Mr. Burdett's going to England to find out for himself if there were no drawbacks in municipal ownership which could conveniently be used to head off superficial readers of his report from continuing to listen to the advocates of municipal ownership, seems to have been "the great socialistic agitation that is upon us," and the fact, perceived by him, that there is "largely a spirit of destructiveness abroad in the land." He is evidently frightened by the enormous increase of the Socialist vote in the latest Presidential elections; although, it may be safe to assume that Mr. Burdett and the interests he represents are not so much afraid of party socialism as of a true civic awakening, and a true education of the masses of the voters.

The inquiry begins with the specific question of whether or no municipal ownership in Great Britain has been successful. In only one particular does Mr. Burdett admit success, and even here only partly. He admits that the municipalities have furnished equally good service with private corporations for the same or a trifle lower price. But in all other respects there have not been the expected results, and the measure of success, he says, is due only to such conditions as could not be duplicated in the United States. Thus we are asked to assume that municipal ownership in this country would inevitably prove a complete fail-