

to set a needed example to the nation. She may do more now for the cause of civilization than the mob has done for the cause of savagery. Let her punish those blasphemers of justice and publish to the world that Springfield is not the city and Ohio is not the State to tolerate this thing.

Those murderers in the streets of Springfield are worse than their fellows in the penitentiary, for they boast of their crime and call it justice. Let the judge and the preacher declare and let the public also say:

That the sin they do by two and two,
They must pay for one by one.

SALVATION BY THE TRUTH.

Extract from a sermon delivered by Rev. Quincy Ewing, in the Church of the Advent (Episcopal), Birmingham, Ala., March 6, 1904, from the text: "If I say the Truth, why do ye not believe me?"

The indictment that stands against scribe and Pharisee stands, and has always stood, against the world's majorities. They are not unreservedly interested in truth; they are not uncompromisingly seeking it; nor yet fearlessly ready to be sought by it, and put under obligation of its new commandments, and made witnesses of its new fulfillments. The uncompromising truth lovers, and seekers, and servers, and welcomers, are the peculiar people of our time, as they have been the peculiar people of every time.

And here we have the reason why, despite all the intellectual achievements and marvels of the race, our world to-day is not more civilized than it is in the only true sense of the word, the moral sense—the fact that so rare is the moral heroism waiting to welcome any great truth, on its own conditions, and in all its greatness; that so few are the souls willing to see, save through the mist of prejudice, or to serve, save hobbling on the crutch of custom. Do we need to ask how to get rid of incalculable misery in this world that ought not to be—how to throttle and crush out of human life barbarous sentiments and cruel practices, which are responsible for the larger part of mankind's wretchedness? There is not a social problem unsolved, to-day, which might not be solved and settled by human faculties in their present stage of development, let them but be employed in an uncompromising search and service of truth.

"If I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" What would have happened on this earth before any of us were born; what light and glory and joy would we all be witnesses and recipients of to-day, if 100 years ago no great-souled Leader of men had need-

ed to ask that question in the face of humanity, as Jesus Christ asked it, 1,900 years ago, in the temple at Jerusalem? Who will feel disposed to return a meager answer!

Aye, the problem of 'problems, lengthened out through time, compared with which all others pale into insignificance, is how to get the majorities of men and women to love truth and welcome it, with a love and welcome that give themselves to service: is how to get them to quit being scribes and Pharisees, on a big scale or little, in or out of the church—scribes and Pharisees social, commercial, political, as well as ecclesiastical: is how to get them to clear their ears of the wax of bigotry; to strike from their eyes the scales of prejudice; to shift off their souls the stupefying incubus of selfishness; and be free, untrammelled, fit, to hear and see and walk after an uncompromising Christ!

This problem solved, others that are pressing heaviest on the heart of humanity would not wait long for solution and settlement. Their difficulties would vanish in the light of truth, let it but shine steady and strong enough. And until men are willing to will that it shall shine with all possible strength and steadiness in all the world's walks and ways, the problems unsolved of society must remain unsolved, and the old tragedies and the old wretchedness, which darkened the yesterdays will live on through the to-days, and darken the to-morrows of human existence.

Blind partisanship will never free or save. It has been everywhere tried, and has everywhere failed! Deaf bigotry will never free or save; it, too, has been tried, and has done nothing better than to weight freedom with shackles, and transfer souls from one dungeon of death to another! Narrow visioned selfishness will not free or save; as often as it has been tried, hell hath enlarged itself in the rightful territory of the Kingdom of Heaven!

Nothing can free but truth; nothing can save but truth; and truth, only on condition that it be truly loved—fearlessly, humbly, reverently, heroically welcomed and sought and served.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

For The Public.

CUMULATIVE VOTING IN TORONTO.

Up to January, 1904, the city of Toronto, Canada, was governed by a mayor and 24 aldermen; the mayor being elected annually by a general vote of the city, and four aldermen annually in each of six wards. The chief executive power was vested in a

board of control of five members, consisting of the mayor and four "controllers," the latter being elected annually by the aldermen from among themselves. It required a two-thirds vote of the city council to reverse a decision of the board of control on finance, contracts and other important matters.

Educationally, the city had a public school board of 24 members, elected by wards; a high school board, nominated; and a technical school board, also nominated.

In the spring of 1903, changes were made as follows, to take effect at the next election: The four controllers hitherto elected by the aldermen were to be elected by the city at large; and the number of aldermen was reduced to three from each of the six wards, thus making a city council of 23, namely, mayor, four controllers and 18 aldermen. All three school boards were to be amalgamated into one board of education, consisting of only 12 members, elected by the city at large, for a two years' term, six retiring annually, so that 12 were to be elected in 1904, and six in each year thereafter. Polling to be on New Year's day.

The new plan gave us four different municipal elections, namely: 1, mayor; 2, controllers; 3, aldermen; 4, educationists. But this year Mayor Urquhart got a second term by acclamation, and there was no mayoralty election.

The cumulative system of voting was used this year in the election of the board of control, and partly in electing the educationists; whilst the old "block vote" was retained for aldermen.

For the board of control, each elector had four votes, which he could cumulate if he chose. He could give them all to one candidate, or divide them among four candidates, or between two or three; in fact could distribute them as he liked. In doing so he marked one cross for each of his four votes.

Then for the board of education the power of cumulation was partial. Although each elector had 12 votes, he was not allowed to cumulate more than three of them on any one candidate; so that the greatest concentration he could make was three votes on each of four candidates. Subject to this limitation, he could scatter his 12 votes just as he liked.

For aldermen, the block vote was retained, and no cumulation was allowed.

These three varying modes of elec-

tion bothered the average elector, and were a serious handicap to the cumulative plan. Another complication arose from the fact that 46 candidates competed for the 12 seats on the board of education. The disbanding of the three old and larger boards was responsible for this, because many of their members were candidates. But it made a huge ballot, and added to the voters' perplexities. There was a good deal of grumbling, but not nearly as many spoiled ballots as one would expect.

Of the six daily papers published in Toronto, two vigorously attacked the cumulative plan, and another was also hostile, two were neutral and one—the Globe—editorially favored it. Attacking an innovation is always popular.

I attended at one of the polling subdivisions as scrutineer, and while the votes were being counted I took a special tally in order to ascertain how far the power of cumulation had been used by the electors. I found that for the board of control three out of every four votes had been cumulated—I am using round figures—and there was a still larger proportion of cumulation in the voting for educationists. Subsequent reports from other subdivisions showed that an overwhelming majority of the voters had used the power of cumulation.

This is a popular declaration in favor of the system. The voters could use it or let it alone. They chose to use it, and thereby set the stamp of their approval upon cumulation as compared with the "block vote." They wanted to concentrate their voting power instead of "spreading it out thin;" and that is a healthy electoral instinct. I found a striking confirmation of this desire in the voting for aldermen at my subdivision. As already stated, cumulation for aldermanic candidates was not allowed. I found that only about half the electors used their three aldermanic votes, while about a fourth of them used two votes, and the remainder "plumped" for one candidate. They wasted part of their votes rather than help candidates they were indifferent to.

Most of the spoiled ballots were in the aldermanic vote, caused by voters acting on the natural assumption that they could cumulate for aldermen as well as for controllers and educationists. Another fruitful cause of spoiled ballots was that four votes could be cumulated for controllers, and only three for educationists. The simple remedy would be to allow cumulating

for aldermen, and to allow a voter to cumulate all his votes in every case. As only six educationists are in future to be elected, the use of crosses would present no difficulty.

I regret to say that a large amount of personation and ballot stuffing has been practised at this election. Several returning officers and poll clerks have been arrested or summoned, and a thorough investigation is being made by the authorities. Public opinion is thoroughly aroused. There is no doubt that these practices have been going on for some years. The fact that the exposure has taken place in the same year as the adoption of the new system is due to the fact that certain results arising from the election of controllers at large and the use of the cumulative plan led to an official scrutiny and recount being demanded. Then frauds were discovered, and a rigorous investigation was set on foot. Our vicious system of allowing an elector to vote for aldermen in as many wards as the elector owns property makes electoral frauds more easy. It is an illogical system of plural voting that ought to be abolished.

THE SINGLE VOTE AND THE CUMULATIVE VOTE.

Suppose that 24,000 voters go to the polls to elect the four Toronto Controllers, what is the true principle by which those 24,000 should be represented? Simply that any one-fourth of them should be allowed to unite freely and elect one Controller, without interference from the other three-fourths. In other words, that the 24,000 should by the act of voting divide themselves into four groups of about 6,000, each group being represented by one Controller, and the units composing each group being drawn from the whole city. Similarly, in electing the 12 members of the Toronto Board of Education, any 2,000 electors ought to be able to elect one member, no matter what the other 22,000 voters chose to do. Then, if the voters divided on strict party lines, and there were 14,000 Conservatives and 10,000 Liberals, there should be elected:

Seven Conservatives,
Five Liberals;

so that each party would be represented in exact proportion to its voting electoral strength. This is the origin of the name "proportional representation." It is evident that in such a case there would be no political advantage to be gained from introducing party politics into school matters, and it would not be done.

Now, take the single vote—or, to give the full definition, "the single vote in

a large district"—and suppose you are electing our four Controllers, and that there are eight candidates, whom we will call A, B, C, D, E, F, G and H. Each voter has only one vote that counts; that is, he has a Single Vote. Now take round figures, and suppose that the 24,000 votes were distributed as follows:

A, 6,000.	E, 2,500.
B, 4,500.	F, 2,000.
C, 3,500.	G, 1,500.
D, 3,000.	H, 1,000.

Then A, B, C and D are elected, because they are at the top of the poll. Notice particularly that none of A's supporters gave a vote for any other candidate. They concentrated themselves on the one man that they wanted, because they had only one vote each. The same thing is true of all the other candidates. Now A has one-fourth of all the votes cast, and no possible combination could beat him.

I spoke of a true proportional representation giving four approximately equal groups of 6,000 each—one-fourth of the total vote. Yet here we have eight unequal groups, varying from 1,000 to 6,000; and E, F, G and H, the defeated candidates, have received 7,000 votes between them, which at first glance seem to be wasted votes, electing nobody; whereas one principle of proportional representation is that practically every vote should be effective, and none should be wasted.

Now, if, while confining each elector to a single ultimate vote, we had allowed him to mark a first choice and a second choice, and third and fourth choices; and if we had begun by counting the first choices only, so as to give effect to them, if possible; then the foregoing figures would represent the first choices, and we would have to begin with the lowest man, and transfer "H's" 1,000 votes to whoever were second choice on his ballot. The ballots cast for "H" would then not be wasted on the defeated "H," but would go to help some one with a better chance. This process would be repeated until all the votes had been concentrated on the four elected candidates, whoever they were. I am not attempting to give details, but merely indicating how a system of transfer could concentrate all the votes on the four successful candidates. So that you can either have the system of:

A Single Transferable Vote,
or,
A Single Untransferable Vote;

and the latter is much the simpler.

Now, here is a good point to be specially emphasized. When votes are transferred they usually go to the candidates at the top of the poll, and the

transfers make no difference in the result. In the example given, a system of transfers might possibly put "E" above "D," and elect "E" instead of "D," but in most cases A, B, C and D would be elected, notwithstanding the transfers.

This was the experience in Tasmania, where six different Parliamentary elections were held under a transferable single-vote plan known as the Hare system; and in each case the candidates heading the poll on first choices were those ultimately elected. The transfers made no difference.

Therefore, the single vote without transfers, is a good practical system, and gives true proportional results in most cases. But if you want to make perfectly sure of these results always, you must add some plan of transfer, direct or indirect.

If my reader has followed me thus far, he has got an insight into the principles of proportional representation which will give him the key to any voting system he may read about hereafter.

Now for cumulative voting. It is simply a compromise between the single vote and the old block vote, enabling a voter to use either. In the election for the four Toronto Controllers, each voter was given four votes, with liberty to distribute them or concentrate them as he pleased. He could give all his four votes to one candidate, if he liked; or two votes each to two candidates; or one vote to each of four candidates; in fact, distribute them as he pleased. This is really giving each voter a single vote, with liberty to split it as he pleases; because, if every voter cumulated all his four votes on some one candidate, it would be just the same thing as if each voter had only one vote. Therefore, one-fourth of the voters, all cumulating fully, could elect one of the four Controllers, no matter what the other voters might do; and that is Proportional Representation, so far as it goes.

ROBERT TYSON.

A QUESTION.

For The Public, by Rev. Cassius Roberts.

Is it right to be sad—
To find men are bad?
Or shall we be glad
That the world is but mad?

When gold buys but lust
In a world where true trust
Finds naught but a crust,

And when 'twill not do
To tell what is true,
(Except *entre nous*)—

Dear God that's above,
Whose true name is Love,
Come down in thy might
And scatter this night.

Amen!

For each of these Imperialism brought a gift: New markets for the Merchant, thrills for the Patriot, capital for the Politician.

The Ordinary Taxpayer burst into tears.

"Is there nothing for me?" he sobbed. Imperialism hastily felt in all her pockets.

"Hush! Here is some nice, new horizon for you!" she said, soothingly.—Life.

"He is worth a hundred millions, the most of which he stole."

"Gracious! And he belongs to the church?"

"Oh, no, the church belongs to him."—Puck.

BOOKS

REALITIES.

Some of the best editorials on general subjects that have appeared in any newspaper for many years were those which James Arthur Edgerton (the author of "The God who reigned over Babylon is the God who is reigning yet"), contributed to the Sunday issues three or four years ago of the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver. Many of these editorials have now been republished in a small volume, "Glimpses of the Real" (Denver: The Reed Publishing Co.), wherein they appear in logical series, the connecting thought being that sentiment which Mr. Edgerton himself once phrased in the fewest possible words: "The laws of right are eternal laws; the judgments of truth are true."

A few extracts will serve at once to suggest Mr. Edgerton's line of thought and indicate the vigorous English in which it is expressed:

The real progress of the race has been away from selfishness.

Injustice breeds injustice. Optimism does not consist in shutting your eyes to conditions as they are. It is shown rather in facing the worst, while working and hoping for the best.

While we are sending missionaries to all lands and races, we are just beginning to be converted ourselves. . . . Our work will never be done until we have a civilization that is the perfect expression of God's kingdom on earth.

We should both dream and do. He who sees how to make inventions and never makes them is of as little use as he who does things in the hardest ways with no thought as to the improvement of methods. The materialist is only half a man. He leaves out one whole side of his being. But the monk who shuts himself in a cell to see visions and never gives the world the benefit of anything he sees is little better. We need the balance between the two. We want the faith and we demand the work.

Religion is not a theory; not a form; not a creed; not a book. . . . All these are but . . . the paraphernalia. Religion, as some one has said, is the life of God in the soul of man. . . . The mere intellectual apprehension of things is not enough. It is the living thing that counts.

Progress? Yes, there is progress, but we have only been in the basement of it. . . . We have been gazing at the reflection of the sun in a mud puddle instead of casting our eyes upward at the glory of the heavens.

The final statement of religion, then, is in Character. It is for that we build; and we cannot build it in the sands of immorality, but on the rock of virtue and truth.

This is a universe of law. On the physical plane is law. He who transgresses that law destroys his own body. On the civic or social plane is law. He who transgresses that law destroys his harmonious relations with his fellows, his liberty. On the moral and spiritual plane is law. He who transgresses that law destroys his own soul. The great lesson we have to learn is that of . . . obedience to the laws of our own being. The physical self must obey the spirit.

All truth is axiomatic and is capable of simple statement. It is so clear that most look through it and see nothing. It is so apparent that all accept it on the mere statement. Yet it is infinite, and only as much comes to you as you are capable of taking. If you would know the truth you must be in the humble, the teachable, the receptive attitude of mind. "Except ye become as little children." Lay down your prejudices and preconceived opinions. Put aside the self and be in the frame of mind to say: "Thy will, not mine, be done." Then open the windows of your soul and let the light flow in. It will come to you as fast as you demand it and are ready to receive it.

Men talk about finding God in nature, in books, in what other men have said, in systems, or institutions or creeds. They cannot so find him. The place to look for God is in the temple of your own soul. If you find him there, then you will find him everywhere. . . . We make the mistake of regarding manifestations as real entities. They are not. They are but the expressions of entities. A particular combination is to-day and to-morrow is not; but nothing has passed out of being; the combination merely has changed. We are in the habit of looking at things inverted. We are not bodies possessing souls, but souls possessing bodies.

This outline of Mr. Edgerton's thought is filled in with as strong and wholesome a discussion of living questions, social and religious, as any person of vigorous thought and human sympathies could wish to read. There are 31 essays in all this book of only 202 pages, among the titles of which are "Living the Truth," "The Brotherhood of Man," "The Social Trend," "The Thought of the Soul," and "The Triumph Over Death." The book is free from all that wearisome paganistic cant of which churchly publications are apt to be full. It is vital with the genuine religious spirit.

For including a familiar poetic quotation, one that contrasts intellectual with moral or spiritual vision, the author is to be especially thanked:

The night hath a thousand eyes,
The day but one;
Yet the light of a whole world dies
At set of sun.

The mind hath a thousand eyes,
The heart but one;
Yet the light of a whole life dies
When Love is done.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—The Twentieth Century Money Law. By Timothy Wright. New York: Peter Eckler, 35 Fulton street. To be reviewed.

PERIODICALS.

The many admirers of B. O. Flower all over the country will be glad to know that he is once more to take supreme command of the editorial pages of the Arena. This magazine, after many vicissitudes since its establishment by Mr. Flower in 1889, now passes into the hands of Albert Brandt, whose publishing house at Trenton, N. J., has become famous for its handsome "Brandt books." The publisher announces that while the Arena "will give special attention to progressive and constructive thought, which is in alignment with the