

Tolstoy were to accept the invitation, not only could Tolstoy be stopped in New York harbor, under the darkened torch of the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World," and be shipped back as a "disbeliever in all organized government," but Mr. Bryan could be sentenced to a long term of degrading imprisonment for having invited this peace-loving anarchist to our shores.

To bring about the repeal of this utterly un-American law was one of the objects of a delegate meeting called by the Chicago Federation of Labor on the 14th. At that meeting steps were taken to raise a fund to carry Turner's case through the Supreme Court, and a petition for the repeal of the law was adopted, and ordered to be circulated for signatures. The petition is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States: It having come to our knowledge:

1. That John Turner, a British subject, is imprisoned in a Federal prison at Ellis Island, N. Y.;
2. That he was arrested while in this country upon a warrant issued by the United States Secretary of Commerce and Labor, a member of the President's Cabinet, and not a judicial officer;
3. That he is held under said warrant for deportation from the United States upon conviction of "disbelieving in organized government;"
4. That upon habeas corpus proceedings a Federal judge has sustained the constitutionality of the act of Congress authorizing arrest and deportation for such cause, and has remanded the prisoner.

And inasmuch as, in our opinion, any law which interferes with mere opinion, or authorizes restraints upon personal liberty for opinion's sake, is at variance with the principles upon which this government is founded, while any law that authorizes administrative process or executive warrants in time of peace for the arrest of persons is hostile to American polity and condemned by our political history;

Therefore we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to repeal so much of the immigration law:

1. As vests in any administrative officer the power to issue warrants of arrest for the apprehension of any person within the United States in time of peace.
2. As authorizes any interference with the personal liberty of any person, citi-

zen or alien, on account of mere opinions on any subject whatever.

This petition has been already signed by several leading Chicago men. Their names are Edgar B. Tolman, the corporation counsel of Chicago; Thomas M. Hoyne, a prominent lawyer of Chicago recently elected to a judicial position; Thomas S. Windes, one of the judges of the Appellate Court at Chicago; and Edward F. Dunne, Edward Osgood Brown, and Murray F. Tuley, all judges of the Circuit Court of Illinois for Cook county. Judge Tuley is also justly the most distinguished jurist of the West.

When these signatures to this petition were made public, an attempt was begun through the local Republican press to discredit the non-partisanship of the petition, by calling attention to the fact that all the signers are Democrats. It may be proper, therefore, to explain that a prominent Republican judge was asked to sign the petition before any of the signatures were made public, and he declined. His reason was that he did not know the facts of the case. This naturally discouraged any further efforts to get the signatures of Republican judges. Since the one approached pleaded ignorance of the merits of the Turner case as an excuse for refusing to petition for the repeal of a law of which—as a citizen if not as lawyer and judge—he is presumed not to be ignorant, the possibility of getting other Republican judges to sign seemed unpromising. It was altogether too suggestive of the widening suspicion that Republican office holders are not at present strenuously interested in preserving the old American doctrine of liberty of opinion. However, if this suspicion be ill-founded, the petition in question is open to all. No Republican who wishes to sign it, be he judge or lawyer, will be debarred.

When Congressman Baker, of New York, recently introduced a bill for the regulation by governmental bureaus of pretty much

everything under the sun, doing so expressly at the request of a constituent, the press of the country threw at him shafts of sarcasm heavy-weighted and sharp-barbed. They were probably trying to earn the railroad favors which they secretly accept and Baker openly refuses. But Mr. Baker comes out of the affair not only unscathed but justified.

It is a common custom in Congress for members to introduce bills "by request." This they do though they wholly disbelieve in the bills, as was the case with Mr. Baker in this instance. And Mr. Baker makes a defense of that custom and his compliance with it which it is not so easy to answer. Writing to one of his journalistic critics, the Brooklyn Eagle, he said:

I recognize that in introducing this bill I have laid myself open to such editorials as that of the Eagle of yesterday, but holding as I do the theory that every citizen has a right to present his views on governmental affairs, even when presented in the form contained in this bill, I did not feel justified in refusing to introduce it, especially as its author, a Mr. Cowdon, of Washington, consented that I should mark it as being introduced "by request." To my mind, Mr. Cowdon is as much entitled to a hearing in Congress as the American Protective Tariff League; the only difference being that Mr. Cowdon voices the opinions of many honest, well-meaning, if, from my standpoint, misguided people, as to what constitutes the proper functions of government, but who do not expect that their ideas will be adopted until a majority of the American people formally indorse them; while with such people as the American Protective Tariff League, the ship subsidy "beggars" and others who are trying to raid the Treasury, they care nothing about a formal indorsement by the people.

Inasmuch as a great deal of the criticism of Mr. Baker in the matter has assumed that he was a socialist, Mr. Baker retorts in a way which ought to make his critics think and do them some good. He writes:

Permit me to say I am, if anything, less of a socialist than the editor of the Eagle, as I would draw the line very sharp and very distinct between those things which are essentially governmental functions and those which indi-

viduals should be permitted to do without interference from government, those things which individuals have an inherent right to do and government has no right to prevent their doing. For instance, I regard tariffs as essentially socialistic. If there is any distinction, then ship subsidies and other forms of bounty are doubly and trebly socialistic. This is true also of all forms of excise taxes, of licenses, whether issued for peddlers or for dogs as well as of poll taxes. Each and every one of these being either the conferring of a favor, a special privilege, at the expense of the many, or, as with dog licenses, the conferring upon those who can afford it the privilege of maintaining a nuisance, or, as in the case of excise taxes and peddlers' licenses, a restricting of the individual from doing those things which he has an inherent right to do and which the community has no moral right to interfere with.

Returning to the principal subject of his letter, Mr. Baker makes this stinging comparison, which it is safe to say his critics with railroad passes in their pockets will be glad to ignore:

As I have said, while I am opposed to paternalistic legislation and would if I could repeal all such now upon the statute books, yet the author of this bill, Mr. Cowdon, has a right to be heard just as much as these powerful influences, the trusts, et al., which are constantly knocking at the doors of Congress asking for legislation in their interests. I regard many of the provisions of his bill as fantastic in the extreme, but can not understand how any one who favors, for instance, the continuation of the present power of private individuals—i. e., railroad corporations—to "hold up" the traffic of a nation and exact such tribute as they care to levy; who build up one community at the expense of another through lower freight rates; who build up foreign trade at the expense of domestic trade as in the case of the 33 1-3 per cent. reduction granted to the steel trust on its exports, how, I say, can those who favor this system consistently oppose the provision of Cowdon's bill, which proposes to establish a government system wherein all would secure an equal service.

Official errors were made, as now appears, in the New York tax report (pp. 690-91) under the new system of assessment. These have now been corrected as accurately as the data permit. It seems that the total valuation of land includ-

ed such as is exempt from taxation. To correct this error, the value of all exempt real estate—land value and improvement value included, has now been deducted from the total value of land, with the following result:

Assessed value of taxable real estate (land and improvements).....	\$4,798,344,789
Assessed value of all land.....	\$3,697,686,935
Assessed value of all land, less value of exempt real estate (land and improvements).....	\$2,871,408,726
Assessed value of taxable improvements.....	\$1,926,936,063
Percentage of value of taxable land to taxable real estate.....	59.8
Area in acres.....	269,218
Population.....	3,784,853
Population per acre.....	18
Average value of taxable land per acre.....	\$13,725
Average value of improvements per acre.....	\$9,267
Average value of taxable land per capita.....	\$759
Average value of improvements per capita.....	\$509

It is to be noted that inasmuch as exempt real estate has been deducted from total land values, the taxable land values appear to be somewhat less than they really are; while the taxable value of improvements, nothing being deducted from the total, appears to be higher than it really is. But it is explained that "the error cannot be great, as the value of improvements is a small proportion of the value of exempt property, of which public parks alone constitute more than one-third."

Judging from the reports of the grand jury investigation into the Iroquois theater disaster at Chicago (p. 713), that body is very likely to do its work better than the coroner did his. At any rate there appears to be a disposition on the part of the grand jury to bring out instead of concealing the facts regarding an explosion. From this feature of the disaster the coroner's jury seemed to turn persistently away. But several witnesses before the grand jury have given testimony which tends to confirm the theory of those who from the outside saw the exploding gases burst through the stage roof in a high column of fire,—their theory that the whole force of the explosion did not go through the roof, but that it shot out a similar column of fire at an angle through the

auditorium. This witness, George C. Berry, is reported to have said:

My wife and brother and sister and I attended the performance. They were killed before my eyes and I was burned the way you see me here in trying to get away from the awful gases and flames. We had seats in the balcony on the north side nearest the alley exit. We were crowded almost out of our seats by the people who were standing. The space back of the seats and in the aisles was packed with people standing. The crowd was so great that the aisle arm of my chair was used as a seat. We all noticed the sparks falling on the stage, and I feared a panic worse than I did the fire. I had all I could do to make my wife and brother and sister sit still. We obeyed "Eddie" Foy's command and sat quiet until something awful shot into our faces. It was like an explosion of gas to me and it came with such force that all four of us were knocked from our seats. I was the first up from the floor and I reached down to pick up my wife. She was lying still and white. I was crowded away from her side to where my sister lay. I attempted to raise her up and she was crowded from my arms. I tried to get back to where I could see my wife lying, but I could not get to her side. I tried to, but, my God, it was awful the way the fire and heat beat me back. Fortunately, I had taken fresh air into my lungs when that awful explosion occurred and I escaped its suffocating blast. When it got so hot and the flames so thick about me, I started for the exit, which was open. When I got to within a few feet of it, I saw men and women and children piled up in a twisted mass of arms, legs and heads in the doorway. They were burning then. None of them seemed to be struggling. I did not wait any longer then to get my wife and relatives, but climbed up on top of the people jammed in the doorway and pulled myself out over them to the fire-escape. It was the inhalation of the gas in the explosion that killed my people.

Another witness, John Haney, is reported to have told the grand jury of an odor of chemicals and gases, which he asserted almost completely overcame him. He said the sensation was not an unpleasant one and that he did not fully realize the horror of it all until he reached the fresh air and recovered his senses. This corresponds with the statements of others who assert that the sensation was like that of anaesthesia. Altogether the probability is strong that the explosion was caused by chemicals, and that many in the theater were instantly killed by the