

classes, which included the coal baron class but excluding the miner class. There has been no time during the strike when such a settlement would not have been acceptable to the barons. A more impudent proposal was probably never made before in the pacific name of "arbitration." The only concession that has been made since is in respect of a representative of the miners. They have allowed the President to appoint one man who may be presumed to have some sympathies with the under dog. As for the strikers, by acquiescing they have won the laurel wreath of public approbation which is doubtless worth something while it lasts.

The Supreme Court of Indiana handed down a wholesome and much needed decision on the 10th. It decided that the police "sweat box" is utterly illegal, and sustained a judgment for damages against a sheriff who had subjected a prisoner to some of its processes. No bodily injuries had been inflicted. The sheriff had merely arrested a suspect without a warrant and probed him with questions to make a case. But the highest court of the State decides that "an officer cannot legally hold the person arrested in custody for a longer period of time than is reasonably necessary, under all the circumstances of the case to obtain a proper warrant or order for his further detention from some tribunal or officer authorized under the law to issue such a warrant or order." If law suits like that of Indiana were instituted against the lawless "sweat" box policemen of Chicago, an excellent effect might be produced. The Indiana court has declared no local policy nor new law. It has simply applied to a modern instance legal principles as old and universal as the political principles of English liberty.

A comparison of notes last week between banking institutions of New York with foreign connections showed that American bankers are indebted to foreign bankers in an

amount somewhere between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000—probably not less than \$135,000,000. What becomes then of our "favorable" balance of trade, about which Republican orators and newspapers have been boasting so glibly?

Consider the figures of the "favorable" balance as furnished by the treasury department. At the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1902, our excess of merchandise and silver exports amounted to \$500,622,235. This "favorable" balance had been increased at the time of the latest monthly report, Sept. 30, 1902, by excessive exports of merchandise and silver amounting to \$59,743,088. At the end of the fiscal year there had been an excessive import of gold to the amount of \$807,938; but as the excessive exports of gold during the first three months of the new fiscal year were \$4,614,023, the difference makes a net excess of gold exports for the 14 months, of \$3,806,085. So far, then, as merchandise, gold, and silver go, we have done a rushing export business in all. Yet now we are told that instead of foreigners owing us anything for this exported wealth, we owe foreigners \$135,000,000 on bankers' balances alone. For convenience of examination let us tabulate this extraordinary commercial situation:

|  |               |
|--|---------------|
| Export balance of merchandise and silver for year ending June 30, 1902 | \$500,622,235 |
| Export balance of same from June 30 to Sept. 30, 1902                  | 59,743,088    |
| Export balance of gold for the same 14 months                          | 3,806,085     |
| Due nevertheless on bankers' balances                                  | 135,000,000   |
| "Favorable" aggregate  | \$699,171,408 |

It is now in order for some one to explain why all that outgo, with no offsetting income, is so favorable that voters ought to "stand pat" for a continuance of the political policy that makes it.

According to the report of the bureau on insular affairs, and upon the Republican theory of exports, the American occupation of the Philippines must have been disastrous to Philippine prosperity. The islands

are being overwhelmed in increasing degree with imports. Their "unfavorable" balance is mounting. Here is the table:

|      | Exports      | Imports      | "Unfavorable" Balance |
|------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| 1899 | \$12,386,902 | \$13,113,010 | \$726,108             |
| 1900 | 19,751,068   | 20,601,438   | 850,370               |
| 1901 | 23,214,948   | 30,278,406   | 7,063,458             |
| 1902 | 23,732,079   | 32,141,842   | 8,409,763             |

When statistics are used for enlightenment and not for worship, they are valuable aids to study. But juggled statistics are to the student what perjury is to juries. They not merely fail to enlighten; they positively mislead. It is such misleading statistics that the statistical bureaus at Washington have been frequently charged with manufacturing for partisan effect. The census statistics, for instance, which make it appear that wages have advanced, are challenged as deceptive. But these criticisms of the good faith of bureau statistics have been superciliously ignored by the census officials. Now, however, the criticism comes in a form which cannot be ignored. Silence will be equivalent to confession. It is made circumstantially by Henry L. Bliss, one of the best analytical statisticians in the country, in a pamphlet on "Our Juggled Statistics," which should be very generally read.

It seems that one form of the juggle with reference to census statistics is to change methods of computing averages with each census, so that the censuses will not be comparable, and then comparing them. By this juggle average wages in the manufacturing industries of Michigan, for example, appear to have increased by \$39.57 per year since 1890, whereas an examination into the figures juggled shows that instead of increasing they have decreased by \$11.40.

Especial value is given to Mr. Bliss's able pamphlet by the incorporation of a letter from the chief statistician for manufactures—S. N. D. North. Mr. North says in this letter that "any comparison of the statistics between the two censuses"—that of 1890 and that of 1900—would be

"practically worthless." He also says that it is impossible to ascertain "by ordinary census methods, whether or not the average earnings in any industry or in the country as a whole have increased or decreased." Also in the census report itself it is admitted that the change in method "undoubtedly invalidates in a marked degree any comparisons that may be attempted between the returns of the two censuses." Yet in that report, as finally published, comparative tables of average wages are given! Why? Of what use are comparative tables of incomparable statistics? Of none whatever, that appears upon the surface, except to enable partisan speakers and editors to quote them as evidence of "prosperity among the working classes," without quoting the few words that are buried in the text and which invalidate them. If the census officials can make any answer to Mr. Bliss's damaging arraignment it will be wise for them to do so. As the matter now stands the census computations appear to be not merely valueless but fraudulent.

Single tax men over the country cannot complain of being overlooked this year by the Democratic party in the distribution of nominations for offices in which they might promote their cause. There are a large number of Democratic candidates who qualifiedly indorse single tax principles and methods, and no inconsiderable number are pronounced advocates of this reform. One of these is Franklin K. Lane, the Democratic candidate for governor of California. Another is L. F. C. Garvin, the Democratic candidate for governor of Rhode Island. Herbert S. Bigelow, the Democratic candidate for secretary of state of Ohio, has been heard upon the single tax platform from coast to coast. William Radcliffe, of Youngstown, one of the oldest single tax men, is the Democratic candidate for sheriff of Mahoning county, Ohio; and Prof. Lybarger, a single tax orator, has the legislative nomination in a Pennsylvania dis-

trict. For Congress, Edmund G. Vail, of Cleveland, is the nominee in Tom L. Johnson's old district. Robert Baker has been nominated in the Sixth district of New York. George A. Miller, a prominent New York lawyer, is the nominee in the Seventh New Jersey district. Vernon J. Rose is running in Jerry Simpson's old district, the Kansas Seventh. And James O. Monroe is contesting the Eleventh of Illinois. All these are not only democratic Democrats, and able men, but single tax advocates of long standing.

Mr. Monroe's Congressional district is distinctive in that it lies in an agricultural region. Yet he does not shrink from the principles he has espoused. He has issued a platform of his own, in which he urges "the abolition of all special privilege," declaring that—

it is by special privilege, national, State and municipal, that the great monopolies of our land have been incubated, encouraged and protected. This has destroyed labor's opportunity, has forced organization in self-preservation, which, to be effectual, must result in the strike, and thus the masses must suffer as the result of the folly of their own creation.

In harmony with this general doctrine he demands—

the greatest freedom of trade permitted by the constitution of the United States, and calls the attention of the people to the fact that the commercial greatness of this country is due to the absolute free trade existing between the States.

Even a few men like that in Congress, clear in perception and courageous in expression, would soon create a political sentiment in which monopoly could not breathe and trusts would be asphyxiated.

In answer to the tales of Republicans about trusts in free trade countries, ex-Gov. Boies, of Iowa, makes an offer to which only three kinds of reply are possible. These Munchausenites must either prove up, back down, or, after the manner of Mr. Hanna, "stand pat." Gov. Boies makes them this offer:

If they can establish by competent testimony before an impartial tri-

bunal that there is one trust or combination of any kind in any free trade country on this earth that manufactures articles of necessity of any kind and makes a business of exporting them to other countries and selling them in markets foreign to their own at regular market prices substantially below those for which they sell the same articles in their own markets at regular market prices there, as our trusts are doing every day in the year, I will pay every dollar of the expense of obtaining such evidence and withdraw from this campaign and permit the election of the Republican candidate for Congress in this district without the expenditure of another hour of time or another dollar of money.

Out in Colorado, seated in the chair of economics of the University of Denver, they have a professor of the name of Le Rossignol, whose pen is now being utilized by the land grabbers and land speculators of Colorado to discredit the Bucklin amendment, which is to be voted on by the people of Colorado this Fall. Prof. Le Rossignol's profound respect for the right to life and liberty may be fairly inferred from his declaration that "if it could be shown that private ownership would best tend to the improvement of land, air or sunlight, then it would be right and beneficial for society to permit of such private ownership under proper restrictions." Voters of Colorado, how would you like to have your right to the light and warmth of the sun, and your right to breathe the air, left to the will of private owners, subject to "proper restrictions," if somebody, perhaps before you were born, had thought private ownership of privileges in sunlight and air a good thing? Prof. Le Rossignol might like it, but how about the rest of you? The spirit of this Denver professor is really borrowed from the Nehemiah Adamses of our old slavery days, who thought chattel slavery right because they thought it improving to the slave and beneficial to society. It is much the same thing whether you make men subject to ownership by others, "for their own good and that of society," or make their sources and conditions of life—land, air and sunlight—subject to ownership by oth-