in favor of privilege, as it does against reforms that strike at privilege, it had better be voted down.

There is all the more reason for this when certain speeches in support of the proposed amendment are considered. We allude to the speeches of which John S. Miller's, before the Bankers' Club on the 15th, was typical. Mr. Miller recognized, what is the fact, that this amendment is proposed in order to avoid the necessity for calling a constitutional convention; and his objection to a constitutional convention was that it would open the way "for the cranks, and lunatics and agitators." These handy terms are bankerese for all active objectors to high-grade graft. In view of speeches of the Miller type, it will be safest for citizens who have no axe of their own to grind, no special interest to serve, but who believe with some fervor in equitable public policies and are therefore "cranks" and "lunatics" in the estimation of the grafting interests miscalled "conservative," to vote against the charter amendment. Instead of constitutional patchwork, contrived in the interest of arrogant classes, let us have a constitutional convention, through which the people can be heard on the whole question of constitutional readjustment.

There is reason in the idea that the preferences of the legal profession in a community are a good guide in the selection of judges. But there is none in the notion that this preference is expressed by the vote of a lawyers' club. Yet a lawyers' club in Cook, the Chicago county of Illinois, with a membership of only 900, habitually assumes to speak for a bar of 5,000 members, on the question of judicial preferences. It has done this with reference to the choice of judges at the approaching election. The highest vote it casts for any candidate is 520—about 10 per cent. of the total membership of the county bar. This vote is entitled to its full value, as indicating the preference of a respectable club of respectable lawyers, including all of the more dangerous corporation-owned practitioners; but its exploitation as an indication of the preferences of the bar of the county is not quite ethical.

Some implications are made by the Record and Guide, the real estate review of New York, that the local tax department there is remiss in not assessing all property, unimproved as well as improved, at full value, as the law requires. If deserved, this is a good criticism. There is no fair reason for assessing unimproved lots lower in proportion to market value than those that are improved. It is often urged that the owners of unimproved lots get no income from them, and therefore should be treated more gently than improvers. But if these owners get no income from their vacant lots it is their own fault. The fact that a vacant lot has market value proves that it is in demand for improvement. If, then, it is not improved, the reason must be that the owner is holding out for higher prices. In other words, he is preventing the lots' yielding an income now, in order that he may some time in the future possibly reap a larger reward. This disposition should not be encouraged by tax discriminations. If either kind of owner is to be encouraged by tax officials, it should be the improver and not the forestaller. But after all this has been said, the embarrassments of the New York tax officials must be considered. For many years it has been the custom there to assess improved property at 50 to 60 or 70 per cent. of market value, and unimproved at from only 15 to 30. This custom is being reformed. Efforts apparently in good faith are being made to bring all assessments up to the level prescribed by the law—full market value. But it is evident that this cannot be done as quickly with property heretofore assessed exceedingly low as with that which has by custom been assessed relatively higher, without making trouble for the assessors; and their admirable report (p. 402) indicates a disposition to advance to the legal requirement as diligently as possible. No harm will be done by stimulating this disposition on the part of the taxing officials; but they have fairly earned exemption from severe criticism. It is gratifying to observe in the criticisms of the Record and Guide a judicious balance in this respect.

While the utmost sympathy is due to men who are denied employment for having passed the age limit, or, indeed, for any other cause, how is it possible to sympathize with the criticisms on employers for refusing to hire these men. This is a false scent. Employers don't refuse to hire men for the joy of making them miserable. They do it because other men can serve them better. The true reason for sympathizing with the unemployed is not that this employer and that, or all employers together, refuse to hire workers; but that the unemployed workers have no where else to go to earn a living. And why have they no where else to go? Is it in the nature of things that men should be workless when the demand for workers is as limitless as human wants. We have all gone far astray in assuming that so-called employers are the real employers of labor. They are only middlemen—workers themselves in some degree, and in some degree monopolists, it may be. The real employers of labor are the consumers of labor products. And in the nature of things who are these? They can be no other, in the nature of things, than some kind of plunderers who give no work for the work done for them, or else workers themselves. If consumers, the real employers of labor, are workers themselves to the same degree that they are consumers, then it is impossible to conceive how there should exist at one and the same time an unsatisfied demand for products and an over-supply of productive labor. In that case we must "give up" the riddle. But if the consumers are in any degree plun-