

its veto, and by empowering the board to interfere with both legislation and execution whenever moved thereto. On the point of responsibility, also, the bill is open to grave objection. It divides responsibility with so much complexity of powers and checks upon powers that no one could be held to account for bad management. The mayor could not be so held; for when he once appoints the board members he loses effective control over them. The board could not be; for they are nine in number, each of whom can accuse his colleagues; and while they could check the superintendent, they could not command him. The superintendent could not be held to any degree of responsibility to the people, for while he might initiate, the board could check and worry him. And so it would go. The mayor could throw the responsibility upon the board; the board members upon each other and the superintendent; and the superintendent back again upon the board; while the teaching force would be a body of obedient nonentities more anxious to know what would please the superintendent or the board and secure permanency of tenure or promotion in place, than to promote the usefulness of the schools. Taken all in all, the Civic Federation school bill is about as vicious a piece of school legislation as could well be devised at this stage of municipal progress. With a good superintendent and a docile board, the system it would establish might work fairly well, until the teaching force had withered with dry rot. But if the board were to select a bad but politic man (and there is nothing in the bill to interfere with its selecting the worst political heeler in Chicago), the Chicago school system could be made a prey to "politics" of the basest sort.

The insincerity of the Republican leaders in Congress, regarding the trust question, was cleverly exposed recently by Congressman Sulzer, of New York. It was in connection with the new cabinet department of

commerce and labor. Labor organizations have long been trying to secure a labor secretary in the President's cabinet. This the Republicans are unwilling to concede. But as the matter is pressed and bids fair to divert the labor vote, they have cooked up a bill providing for a cabinet secretary of "commerce and labor." Obviously this secretary is to be a "business" man. The commercial interests would not tolerate a "labor" man for such a post. Consequently the "labor" interests will be looked after under the "commerce and labor" bill by "business" leaders. Over this happy adjustment of conflicting industrial interests, the Republicans are boasting about their practical demonstrations of love for the dear "laboring man." But in framing their "commerce and labor" bill they have conveniently omitted to provide for any check upon trusts, a subject over which the contemplated cabinet officer might reasonably be expected to have jurisdiction. Not a line gives any indication of a disposition to "shackle cunning," though the bill is a highly appropriate one for that purpose. Even the favorite administration idea of "publicity" is ignored. Therefore Mr. Sulzer moved as an amendment that there be in the proposed department a bureau of corporations to which every corporation doing an interstate business should be required to make reports of its condition. Though there was no objection from the Republican side of the House, either to the character or the form of the amendment, every Republican voted against it. Their reasons were not stated, but the inference is strong that while they do much talking about "publicity" and "shackling," they are under such peculiar obligations to the powerful trusts that they dare not take hostile action of any kind, not even of the kind they profess to advocate. Mr. Sulzer has now put the matter in such shape upon the record that no other inference is possible.

When the bill to establish a depart-

ment of labor and commerce was before the lower House, as noted above, a remarkable recommendation from labor sources was announced. Congressman Mann, of Illinois, who supported the bill, explained that he had "sent to the Chicago Federation of Labor, which" he believed to be "the largest organization of labor in the country affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, a copy of the bill as reported to the House and a copy of the report of the committee giving the reasons why the department of labor should be included in the department of commerce and labor, and had that morning received "a reply in the shape of a letter from the Chicago Federation of Labor, stating that they have received the bill and report, that they appreciate the favor of sending them to them, and hope that the efforts to pass the bill will prove successful." Mr. Mann added: "I know of no better instance that can be given of the actual feeling of labor than a letter of this sort from probably the greatest body of organized labor in the country." The remarkable thing about this recommendation is the fact that the labor leaders who gave it, were at about that time being voted out of office as officials of the Chicago Federation by an overwhelming majority, because their fidelity to their organization was distrusted. These men were Mayor Harrison's "labor" contingent. Some of them held office at the Chicago city hall, some were employed by the street car companies, some were on the pay rolls both at the city hall and at the street car offices, and altogether they were a nest of labor "fakers," counting themselves into office as labor leaders at every Federation election and serving the Harrison political machine and the street car monopoly between times.

A "labor leader" outfit has come to be regarded as part of the recognized equipment of political and monopoly rings; and the surface signs indicate that Tom L. Johnson has run up against an equipment of this kind with which Senator Hanna has