

"farms" which could be sold by the front foot. If these were scheduled as agricultural lands they would carry up the value of sites as compared with improvements very rapidly. And that this has been done would appear from the fact that Cook county, in which Chicago is located, is credited with \$68,265,260 for farm lands, or about 4 per cent. of all the farm land value of the state, while the value of farm buildings is only \$8,839,960. It is not hard to guess what kind of farm land it is that has brought up the farm land value of Cook county so disproportionately to the farm buildings value. Doubtless the owner could raise corn on this farming land, but he can raise the price more easily and to better advantage. Its value is affected by the proximity to Chicago.

The policy of pardoning workhouse convicts detained for non-payment of fines or other pecuniary penalties, which was adopted over a year ago in Cleveland by Mayor Johnson and his chief of the charities and correction department, Harris R. Cooley, has had the effect of reforming the police justice system theretofore in vogue in Cleveland, as it is elsewhere, which discriminates between convicts with money and those without. Police Justice Thomas A. Kennedy, of Cleveland, is credited with having recently made the following sensible declaration:

Although the police fund is bankrupt and I might replenish it by fines from the unfortunates who come before me, I will not levy fines as long as I am police judge. I will not use this bench to incite vice and crime, to force men and women to the depths to get money with which to oil the police machinery. If they deserve punishment they go to the workhouse. If they can reform on the outside, suspended sentences will give them the chance.

Should Judge Kennedy impartially apply this policy to all convicts, letting off no one who happens to have the money to buy immunity, except those that "can reform outside," and then not by fining them but by suspending sentence, he will have set

an example of much needed reform in criminal administration.

It is to the honor of Clarence S. Darrow, Joseph S. Martin, William A. Bowles and others that they have undertaken to raise a fund to secure an appeal for Lewis S. Thombs, now confined in the Chicago jail under conviction of murder and sentenced to be hanged. Thombs may be guilty, and if he is his crime was brutal in the extreme. But he did not have a fair trial (p. 101). One jury disagreed, two of its members, reputable men, being for acquittal because they did not believe the story of the prosecuting witness. The prosecuting attorney thereupon outrageously denounced these jurors in the newspapers as unfit to be in a jury box, and at once brought the case to trial before another jury. This placed the prisoner at a disadvantage to which no one accused of crime should be subjected. Not a man on that jury would have been for acquittal, though he had a reasonable doubt, unless he had been made of the stuff of which heroes are made, and that is not common. This method of forcing convictions should be denounced by the whole bar. It is something to have it repudiated by one or two members who are serious enough in the matter to raise a defense fund.

When the tariff issue was paramount, one of the protection absurdities in the way of argument was peculiarly confusing. We were told that to the extent that the United States imports goods the United States has the goods and Europe has the money, but to the extent that the United States buys home-made goods, the United States has both goods and money and is therefore better off. It was as puzzling a riddle as that about putting ten men in nine beds with a bed for each. But we have come to see through its intricacies now, and to realize that money isn't worth any more than money's worth. But the same trick of argument has come forward in

another and perhaps more confusing form. Suppose, says the riddle-me-ree protectionist, that—

the exports of a country are \$20,000,000 and the imports are \$10,000,000. The balance of \$10,000,000 is favorable, because of the exports probably only about \$5,000,000 of actual value was sent away, being the raw material in the goods exported, the \$15,000,000 being represented by wages paid and profits to the manufacturer. The \$10,000,000 of imports thus represents an actual profit of \$5,000,000 to the importing country.

Could absurdity go much further? Suppose the exporter were a farmer's family instead of a national family. Suppose that this farmer's family exported from the farm to the dealer in the market town \$20 worth of corn, and imported back to their farm in exchange \$10 worth of groceries. Where would the profit to the farmer's family come in? Wouldn't it look to the man up a tree as if that family were out of pocket \$10? "Oh, no," exclaims the riddle-me-ree protectionist, "they have made a profit of \$10. Although they billed the corn at \$20, there was only about \$5 of artificial value in it, being the raw material. The additional \$15 was represented by the wages and profits of the farmer's family. So the \$10 worth of groceries imported would really represent \$5 of actual profit to the farmer's family. See?" Of course we see. Since the farmer's family gets \$5 worth of groceries for \$15 worth of work, they have a clear profit of \$5! And this is the kind of profit the national family reaps when it exports more than it imports.

GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION.

In the case of the strike agitation among West Virginia coal miners, Judge Jackson, a Federal judge of West Virginia, has put the finishing touches upon the scheme for governing workmen by injunction. He has resorted to it to restrain freedom of speech, and to hold that aforesaid American birthright within the limits of his own notions of its proper exercise.

"The rightful exercise of freedom of speech," says this most excellent