

books occasional reactionary precedents which in years to come may prove dangerous." He writes with especial reference to the arbitrary action of a New York judge, Marean of the Supreme Court. Judge Marean, as reported by the New York Herald of the 18th, had turned his court into a secret tribunal. He excluded all reporters during a habeas corpus hearing and announced that he would punish for contempt any person present who should divulge the proceedings. This instance only indicates the distance we have drifted from our moorings as a republic in these days of imperialism, frenzied finance, and government by injunction. That any judge should presume to create a star chamber court is evidence of the demoralization of the bench; that he should actually do it without exciting more than passing notice suggests demoralization of the bar and even of the people themselves.

Congressman Hearst's motion for an inquiry into the dismissal from the postal service of carriers for defeating the reelection of Congressmen who had been hostile to the efforts of the carriers' organization to secure better pay, is a meritorious proceeding. It simply asks for the facts. If the dismissed men have been guilty of neglect of their official duties or of misuse of their official powers, their dismissal is just. But if they are dismissed, not for official delinquencies, but for a proper exercise of their rights as citizens, their dismissal is an abuse of power. This raises a question into the facts of which Congress should inquire.

But Congress, as at present constituted, is not swift to inquire into abuses of power. When Congressman Baker offered a resolution relative to the tender regard which the Administration exhibits toward the steel rail trust, which is charging the American people double prices for rails, the majority whispered "Hush!" And "hush" it was; for the committee

reported the Baker resolution back with a recommendation that it lie upon the table, and then put upon it a parliamentary paper weight so heavy that it can't be taken off the table. No one was allowed to say a word during this hushing process.

Another resolution offered by Congressman Baker, calling for action in the limitation of production by the steel trust, must have got lost somewhere in the pigeon holes of the committee on ways and means. It, too, has been "hushed." But Baker himself cannot be hushed. No sooner do the trust protectors in Congress "hush" one disturbing exclamation of his than he produces something still more intolerable. His latest is a demand to know why the criminal products of violators of the anti-trust law are not subjected to confiscation? This punishment is applied, he observes, to smugglers and illicit distillers and derelict cigar makers; then why not also to trusts? Sure enough. Why not? Is there any other reason than that the Republican outcry on the stump against trusts was pure demagoguery?

The anti-trust campaign cry of the Republicans is like their platform demand for the proportionate limitation of Congressional representation from States that place limitations upon male suffrage. This demand was just. But it had no other purpose than to hold the Negro vote in line until after election. Now that the election is over, this reform in Congressional representation is to be dropped—so say the Washington dispatches.

When Tom L. Johnson was defeated for governor of Ohio by a large majority, plutocratic Democrats thought him politically buried and congratulated one another upon having furnished the corpse. But one year later their own candidate, Judge Parker, was beaten in Ohio by double the majority against Johnson. So Johnson hadn't been very successfully

buried. But better results have come out of Johnson's work in Ohio politics than the mere demonstration that he was supported by a vastly larger number of Democrats than were willing to support the plutocrats who had opposed him. Johnson has made his fight in Ohio for equitable taxation, and the Republicans have opposed him; but in West Virginia this Fall the Republicans adopted Johnson's taxation programme and won upon it after a fight. If Johnson had succeeded in doing no more than set an example to West Virginia, his Ohio work would have been well worth while. But his success was greater than that. He struggled in Ohio for home rule in taxation, and the Republicans fought him—fought him successfully because they secured the aid of every plutocrat of every party, church, and labor organization in the State. Yet the Republican attorney general of Ohio, Wade H. Ellis, is now demanding Johnson's home rule programme. Said Mr. Ellis, in a speech on taxation, at a Bar Association gathering in Columbus on the 14th, as reported by the Columbus Citizen of the 15th: "Establish absolute home rule, not only in the system of taxation but in the things taxed." That is exactly what Johnson has urged. The good seed that Johnson and Bigelow sowed in the campaigns of 1902 and 1903 is incalculable in amount, and it is beginning to bear fruit. Wherever Johnson was able to get a fair hearing in 1903, even in the farming communities, where he might have been handicapped by his outspoken advocacy of Henry George's ideas, he increased the Democratic vote. That in itself was significant. But much more significant and encouraging is the tendency of Republican leaders in Ohio and the neighboring State of West Virginia to adopt his fiscal programme.

In a sermon to Harvard students at Cambridge on the 18th, Lyman Abbott declared that his "God is a great and ever-present force, which is manifest in all the