

not given great attention to national questions; he will not become the greatest orator in the United States Senate; but for sound judgment, wholesome common sense, and rectitude of purpose, he will be acknowledged before his term expires, as a leader in that august body. New York, in my judgment, has never sent to the United States Senate a man more independent, or better endowed with sound judgment and magnanimity than James A. O'Gorman." It is due to Senator O'Gorman, and also to Mr. Pierce, that we add that all the information and opinion coming to us about this new Senator, and much of both has come from sources commanding our confidence, is completely in harmony with Mr. Pierce's estimate. Nor does the fundamental democracy of Senator O'Gorman's party Democracy seem to be of recent growth. His record as far back as the New York Anti-Monopoly movement of the late seventies and early eighties, and the Henry George movement of the middle eighties, seems to testify throughout in his favor.

+ +

University Economics.

One of the British victims, intellectually, of that labyrinthine political economy of the universities, which is cribbed, cabined and confined by those powers of institutional privilege that make university professors mind their p's and their q's, prints a fruitful remark on the economic writings of Henry George. In a testy letter to the April "Land Values," the single tax organ of Great Britain, he says of Henry George that "the University of Cambridge, in common with all other places where economics are seriously studied, has no use for his writings—except perhaps as a critical exercise." How old John Milton would have enjoyed pen-handling that scholar chap! If George's writings are only good for "critical exercise" among the class of fellows at Cambridge whose bad manners drove George himself into exclaiming, "What's the use of arguing with you well-fed men?" why do they not at least give us a "critical exercise" or two? For instance: George made the analysis that "land" and "labor" (with "capital" as a sub-class of labor) are the two factors in production, and that "rent" and "wages" (with "interest" as a sub-class of wages) are the two categories in distribution. What is the matter with that analysis? Isn't it sound, even by the test of a "critical exercise"? If not, why not? And if it is sound, how do the "well-fed men" escape the inevitable conclusions which, without arguing, they call "the fallacious arguments of Henry George"? Awaiting the "critical exerciser" who

may "make good" even on that point alone, there is a rich reward of merit lying around loose somewhere.

+ +

The "Street Car Hog."

Every now and again the department of "Letters to the Editor" in some one or another of our newspapers blooms out with verbal assaults upon the "street car hog"; and occasionally the weary editorial writer, for want of a better subject, takes up the refrain. Who is it that they call "street car hog"? Not the man that sprawls over seats. Not the man who obstructs passageways. Not the man who elbows himself into a car already overcrowded. Not the man who pushes into cars ahead of women or weaker or older men than himself in order to grab a seat. The "street car hog" seems to be the man who, having paid for a seat (after waiting for it, possibly, while one crowded car after another went by), is discourteous enough to retain it, though women or his elders of his own sex who have come aboard after the seats are all taken, have to stand.

+

He is discourteous, of course. No one would do in a drawing room what he does in a street car. But then drawing room seats are not bought and sold. Where seats are bought and sold, the rule is a rule of property rather than one of courtesy. Is a man a "theatre hog" if he keeps the seat he has paid for while later comers stand? Is a man an "automobile hog" if he doesn't get out and walk in order to let some one without an automobile get in and ride? Is a man a "holiday hog" if he keeps the seat on the reviewing stand which he has paid for while older men and women of all ages stand on the curb? Certainly not. Then why is any man—or boy, for that matter—a "street car hog" because he doesn't politely give up the car seat he has paid for? It is his property for that ride as truly as if it were worth five dollars instead of five cents. If he gives up his property to another, just as matter of good feeling, we may applaud his generosity; but if he prefers to keep his property, who has any right to complain? Surely not the person who wants it.

+

True enough there is somewhere in this matter a responsibility to women and old men. But a little reflection will place the responsibility not upon owners of seats who refuse to give them away, but upon street car officials who do business on the Yerkes theory that "the money is in the straps." When the street car business is so conducted as to call upon seat owners to give up their property