tastrophe with its promising possibilities of good results.

—

Let it not be supposed, however, that the contest was between a "bad Lindly bill" and a "good Mueller bill." Neither of these bills was originally introduced for anything but a see-saw to prevent all legislation. The way is now cleared, probably, for the Mueller bill; but, better though it is than the Lindly bill, especially with its amendments, it is even yet hardly an ideal measure. The Mueller bill authorizes public ownership with operation or with leasing, in the discretion of the cities respectively that avail themselves of its provisions. Leases can run no longer than 20 years, nor can they be made for more than five years without an opportunity for an initiative and referendum. But they can be made for five years, by mere ordinance. Five year leases might therefore be repeated without limit and without being referred to the people; but this is an improbable outcome. The people would be safer, however, if two years were substituted for five, so that each new council and mayor could be held to public responsibility on the subject. A more objectionable feature of the Mueller bill is its lack of provision for a popular initiative on the question of municipal operation. Not until a council submits the proposition can the people vote upon it. Even then they lose unless 60 per cent. vote in the affirmative. In other words, nearly 40 per cent. of the voters would count for more in the negative than over 59 per cent. would in the affirmative. Upon no consideration whatever is there an excuse for this that does not smell of aristocracy. It is noticeable, in this view of the matter, that ordinances to lease to private corporations for more than 5 years may be carried by majority referendum—not 60 per cent., but a majority. Thus a policy of corporate operation would be easier to adopt than one for municipal operation. It would be easier for another reason. A policy of municipal operation could not be adopted by the council without permitting the people to vote upon it, nor then unless the favorable vote were 6 to 4; but a policy of corporate operation could be adopted by the council without popular consent, unless ten per cent. of the voters (some 40,000 in Chicago) should within 60 days file petitions for a referendum, each separate one being sworn to in personal verification of every signature upon it. Is there no dubious motive in these discriminations? Some parts of this bill, notably that which exempts municipal ownership in cities from the necessity of acquiring landlords' consents for establishing street railway lines along streets in which street railway tracks are already located, are good. But we have sufficiently shown that notwithstanding all its good points the Mueller bill is afflicted with bad ones which ought to be cured by further amendment.

Among the Republican occupants of the judicial bench in Chicago whom the Republican machine, under the management of "Boss" Lorimer, has renominated, is Judge Neely. This incumbent may be worthy of reelection, but certainly not if the following described incident is correctly reported. The report appeared on the 19th of April in the Chicago Evening Post, a Republican paper of unquestioned orthodoxy. We quote it in full:

> Judge Neely does not regard the occupation of driving a laundry wagon as respectable. He so said to-day in passing upon the case of George W. Dickman, who had been arrested and after much persuasion had entered a plea of guilty of having stolen a suit of clothes and placed himself at the mercy of the Court.
>
> "What is your business?" asked the judge of the prisoner.
>
> "I drive a laundry wagon, your Honor," meekly answered the defendant.
>
> "No wonder you steal," said the Court sharply. "Any man who would go around and gather up the soiled garments of other persons would be liable to steal a suit of clothing; it would come natural to him. Why don't you get a respectable position? If you will change your work I will release you."

Whether or not Judge Neely expressed that snobbish sentiment is for him and his party friends to settle with their party paper, the Evening Post; but if he did, he is unfit to sit upon the bench, and now is the time to get rid of him.

—

One of the present Republican incumbents of the bench in Chicago the Lorimer machine has got rid of without ceremony. This is Judge Waterman. The machine rubbed his name off the slate, and there was not independence enough in the convention to put it back again. Judge Waterman is one of the best lawyers and the fairest and most industrious judges in the Republican group now on the bench. That will be generally conceded. But the Republican bosses don't want that kind of judge. They refused to allow him to be renominated because he had recoiled from joining in making of the judicial offices of the county a center for the distribution of political spoils.

The Supreme Court of the United States has decided against giving relief to Negro citizens of the United States, domiciled in and citizens of Alabama, against the oppressive provisions of the new constitution of that State (vol. iii., p. 7; vol. iv., p. 821), which are transparently designed and unblushingly used to disfranchise Negroes because and only because they are Negroes. When it is considered that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Federal Constitution, which were intended to protect the Negro, have served only to protect unthought-of corporations, one cannot but feel after all that the real deficiency of the Negro is not that he isn't a man with a soul but that he isn't a corporation without a soul.

The war upon Negroes in Missouri (p. 25) has its counterpart in southern Illinois. A Negro boy charged with crime was being taken to jail when a mob of white men seized him and hanged him off hand. They re-

port that he confessed his crime. That may be true or not, but this makes no difference. Confessions under such terrifying circumstances are valueless. Even if the confession were true and the black boy a criminal, that does not exonerate the white men. Nevertheless, in imitation of their Missouri exemplars, this Illinois mob followed up their murder of one Negro victim by making a murderous attack upon all the Negroes of the region, none of whom were parties to the boy's crime, if he committed a crime. It remains now to be seen whether the Republican governor of Illinois will be any more efficient in bringing white men to justice for murdering "niggers" than the Democratic governor of Missouri is likely to be.

—

The "nigger" of Russia is the Jew. All the vicious race animosity, prejudice and injustice which in this country brutal white men feel at liberty to indulge in their relations with Negroes as a race, the Russian barbarian cultivates towards Jews. At Kishineff, the capital of Bessarabia, the Jewish inhabitants were attacked on the 20th by a Russian mob, and 25 of these harmless people were murdered while 275 were wounded. Doubtless the Russians could give reasons as absurd and cruel for their war upon the Jew as Americans give for theirs upon the Negro, and doubtless their reasons seem to them as logical and humane. What makes the whole thing topsy-turvy is that the murderous brute in each case imagines himself superior to his unresisting victim.

Whether the Supreme Court of Illinois was right in holding invalid the entire statute establishing free employment agencies because of the unconstitutional provisions of one section, it was certainly right in holding that section itself invalid. The act in question provides for State bureaus through which persons seeking employment and employers seeking help may be accommodated without expense. This in itself may be open to criticism as paternalistic, though it can be excused on poor-house principles; but for the section to which the court has objected and held to be fatal there is no excuse either in law or in the principles of democratic government. It declares that any employer whose employes are on strike or have been locked out, shall be allowed none of the facilities of the employment bureaus. The evident object of the section was to make the law palatable to labor unions. But it was clearly invalid. When the State sets up establishments of any kind for the benefit of the public, it has no right to make arbitrary discriminations. If workingmen are discriminated against in some respects that is no reason for discriminating in their favor in others. The proper remedy for existing discriminations is to abolish them, not to make more.

We were not wrong in guessing that the Republican and brevet-Republican papers would foam at the mouth indignantly at Mr. Bryan's Kansas City speech on Grover Cleveland. The echoes are numerous, but the Boston Herald and the Providence Journal are especially rabid. Their evident anxiety to have both political parties nominate Republican candidates next year, and their anger at Bryan for being "mischievously determined to destroy" that possibility, afford gratifying evidence that Mr. Bryan's speech has hit the mark in the center.

An impressive commentary upon our "abounding prosperity" was unconsciously made last week by the Board of Arbitration and Conciliation of Massachusetts. After investigating the textile strike in Lowell, the Board reported to the Governor that only one corporation could afford to pay the ten per cent. increase in wages demanded by the strikers. To soften this conclusion the Board presented figures to show that the operatives were not so badly off after all. They had already shared in "prosperity" to the extent of 16 per cent. rise in wages since 1897, and been mulcted for it to the extent of only 15.37 per cent. A weekly wage, therefore, of $10 in 1897 would now be $11.60; and if the family had then been spending nine dollars for living expenses and saving one dollar, they would now spend $10.38 and save $1.22. Who says that this is not a clear gain of 22 cents a week on a $10 operative's income? And isn't that prosperity—for those "inferior" people?

At last the city of Detroit is anxious to secure municipal ownership of the street car system. She had an excellent opportunity to do this less than five years ago, when Tom L. Johnson and Gov. Pingree worked together for it. Had their plans not been balked, partly by men who are now favoring municipal ownership, all the street car systems of Detroit would long since have been municipal property and on far better terms as to purchase price than is possible now.

EQUALITY.

I.

In "The Virginian," by Owen Wister (pp. 143-144) occurs the following passage. The cowboy from Virginia and the Vermont school mistress are taking a horseback ride.

"All men are born equal," he now remarked, slowly.

"Yes," she answered, with a combative flash. "Well?"

"Maybe that don't include women?" he suggested.

"I think it does."

"Do you tell the kids so?"

"Of course I teach them what I believe."

He pondered. "I used to have to learn about the Declaration of Independence. I hated books and struck when I was a kid."

"But you don't any more?"

"No. I certainly don't. But I used to get kep' in at recess for bein' so dumb. I was most always at the tail end of the class. My brother, he'd be head sometimes."

"Little George Taylor is my prize scholar," said Molly.

"Knows his task, does he?"

"Always. And Henry Dow comes next."