

tion. If ignorance is found to flourish in so high places, among our so-called statesmen, then it is not surprising that the average citizen lacks information on this important question.

Therefore it is deemed that a comprehensive treatment of public ownership of railroads, giving facts substantiated by statistics from the best sources, is appropriate for publication at the present moment. The author has tried to avoid general platitudes. He has aimed at substantiating every opinion or conclusion by the records of actual results. And he finally permits himself to claim to have a right to assume to be more intimately acquainted with the actual opinions of the people in countries where government ownership of railroads is an accomplished fact, than could be an occasional traveler, more or less unfamiliar with the language, the habits and the general attitude of the people in the country where he may try to study this subject.

+

We are to-day facing an interesting and significant condition in American politics. The dividing line between the conservative, or, rather, reactionary, and the liberal and progressive force in our politics, is one less coincident with party lines than ever. While the American people have hitherto, in a general way, been divided by a line drawn vertically from the top down, the changed conditions have greatly eliminated the old partisan divisions, and the dividing line is now a horizontal one, above which are the beneficiaries of special privileges in whatever form these may take; and below which are those who contribute to privilege without sharing in the benefits derived—those who pay tribute. These two divisions or classes are in the deepest sense of the word, our political parties of to-day.

On no question could these two parties be more clearly divided than on the railroad question. Here stands privilege clearly on one side, claiming its vested rights, and the tribute-paying public stands on the other. And while the question of government ownership of railroads is not an active campaign issue as yet, it is nevertheless one of the fundamental issues in present-day American politics. The question of railroad control must inevitably be followed by that of government ownership, even in active politics. We shall soon see the futility of our attempts at control. Then we will be forced to grapple with the greater and fundamental question, that of actual government ownership. It is impossible to deny that this question is a political issue. And being an issue, it is our duty to seek information, form an opinion, and to place ourselves on one side or the other in regard to it.

It is, then, in the first place of importance that we should find out what has been done elsewhere in regard to public ownership of railroads. Has

this policy been extensively tried anywhere? Has it been tried for a sufficiently long time to permit of definite conclusions? Have rates been lowered by the application of public ownership? Are present existing publicly owned railroads self supporting? Do they give satisfactory service? Is life more safe on publicly owned railroads than on private roads? And, in particular, how do publicly owned railroads in foreign countries compare with private roads in the United States? These are all questions which we must answer in order to be able to form an intelligent opinion. And these questions the author has tried to answer as well as is possible with the information at his disposal. The conclusion arrived at can be disputed only by pure prejudice, for the facts we are about to quote will plainly indicate that public ownership of railroads is guilty of very little of that which its opponents have charged against it.

It would be possible, and perhaps profitable, to dwell at length on some of the preliminary considerations connected with this question, but as these have been previously dealt with in *The Public* (vol. ix, p. 723; vol. x, p. 326), we may, after this explanatory introduction, consider ourselves ready to enter directly on the investigation necessary to reply to the questions which should be answered relative to the development and results of publicly owned railroads in foreign countries, in order that an intelligent opinion may be formed.

ERIK OBERG.

* * *

CHILD LABOR: ITS CAUSES AND AMELIORATION.

For The Public.

"A Penny for Your Thoughts!" As a matter of fact, it cost more than a penny; but after several Child Labor committee meetings, in which everybody had an exclusive idea as to what the public thought on the Child Labor question, it was decided to find out definitely. Eight thousand question blanks were printed and distributed as widely as possible. The questions asked were as follows:

1. State in the order of their importance what you consider the three principal causes of Child Labor.
2. Should the minimum age for child employment in occupations other than domestic and farm labor be 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, or 18 years?
3. What distinction, if any, would you make between mines, factories, and stores in this age limit?
4. Would it be desirable to allow children to engage in light work outside of school hours?
5. Would you favor allowing work in vacation? For what occupations? At what ages?
6. Would it be desirable to introduce some kind of manual or trade education in all grades between the kindergarten and the high school?
7. Do you care to specify any particular kind of training?

workers and school teachers, the majority is voting for a 16-year minimum age limit. Even with the vote of the teachers against it, 16 receives nearly 100 more votes than 14.

The strong consensus of opinion places the minimum for mines at 18, for factories at 16 and for stores at 14, although there is a heavy vote for an 18-year age in factories.

The vote on light work outside of school hours is 2 to 1; but for vacation the vote is overwhelming, nearly 20 to 1.

Some feeling exists against manual training in all of the grades between the kindergarten and the high school, and the school teachers voice this feeling far more strongly than any other group. In contrast to their vote of only 2 to 1 in favor of manual training, it is interesting to note the 9 to 1 vote of the school officials in favor of it.

The answers to Question 7 were disappointing, as the average answer had no definite suggestions to make.

The vote against increasing the number of school hours, nearly 3 to 1, is due to school teachers and officials and unionists. All other groups voted in favor of the increase.

The vote for vacation schools, 2 to 1, shows the growing sentiment in favor of this kind of education.

Approximately, the same vote is given in the last question, but every group votes in favor of State aid, though in every group there is considerable opposition.

SCOTT NEARING,

Formerly Secretary Penna. Child Labor Committee.

BOOKS

JERRY SIMPSON.

The Story of Jerry Simpson. By Annie L. Diggs. Published by Jane Simpson, Wichita, Kansas. Price, \$1.25.

This eloquent tribute to the memory of one of the simple great men of American public life, is dedicated by his widow "to his friends in all walks of life, the rich and the poor, the learned and the unlettered, the widely known and the great unknown, whom he held in close affection and to whom he was always loyal." Would that all these to whose welfare Jerry Simpson was true, might remember his loyalty by adding Mrs. Diggs's charming story of his life to their household treasures.

It is truly a charming story, alive with human interest. From its opening chapter, in which the young sailor of the Great Lakes and the English girl who became his wife are introduced at a Michigan spelling bee, to the farewell words of his biographer and friend, the real Jerry Simpson walks through the book. The humor of his life,

its patches of sorrow, its unvarying earnestness, are reproduced with faithful touches.

With her material Mrs. Diggs might have made a large volume of biographical detail. She has chosen to make a graphic portrait. And this she has done with so much appreciation of the man she tells about as to make her work the worthy monument to Jerry Simpson that his wife intended it to be and his friends hope it may become.

Accompanying the story are portraits of the man and those he loved, and supplementing it are personal tributes from Tom L. Johnson, Chester I. Long, Tom McNeal, William Jennings Bryan, William Garrison, David Leahy, Champ Clark, Harry Landis, Louis F. Post, W. D. Vincent, Hamlin Garland, Jennie L. Monroe, W. W. Gatewood, C. W. De Freest, Henry W. Young, Cora G. Lewis, Frank Doster, Mrs. Lester Simpson, and Mrs. Jerry Simpson. "My husband did not leave me wealth," Mrs. Simpson writes, "but he left a far more priceless legacy in the record of his public career and his untarnished name."

This career is too well known to need recalling here. It began in the early days of the Farmers' Alliance in Kansas, and included two terms in Congress from the 7th District of Kansas. While in Congress Simpson was one of the men who joined Tom L. Johnson in putting Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade" into the Congressional Record and thereby making it a public document; and with Johnson, Warner, Maguire, Harter and Tracy he was one of the six who voted for the single tax method of raising Federal revenues as a substitute for the income tax.

* * *

THE PRESIDENCY IN 1876.

The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Election of 1876. By Paul Leland Haworth, Lecturer in History, Columbia University. Published by The Burrows Brothers Company, Cleveland. Price \$1.50 net; postage 12 cents.

This is the story of the Centennial campaign and its critical climax in the seating of a Presidential candidate who was probably not elected.

In behalf of the author it is stated that he had the personal assistance in his work, of participants in those events who have since passed away. Among these were Carl Schurz, a leader with Charles Sumner in the Liberal revolt from the regular Republicans which had nominated Horace Greeley four years earlier. Grant easily defeated Greeley, but Hayes was burdened with the discovered sins of his party, and Tilden represented a Democracy which, while somewhat reactionary with reference to questions of Reconstruction, was progressive with reference to other issues that were re-crystallizing in our politics.

The author follows the subject from the Democratic tidal wave of 1874 to the final adjustment