

# The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1899.

Number 40.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Booth-Tucker's colonization scheme is an excellent subject for economic study. It appeals most forcibly to those self-styled "capitalists" whose capital consists of deeds to vacant land. They see money in it for themselves—unearned money—and are enthusiastic accordingly. Speaking in a newspaper interview of Booth-Tucker's scheme, the "industrial commissioner" of the Santa Fe, James R. Davis, explains that land purchased for the colony in the Arkansas Valley, "has doubled in value during the first year." There is the milk in this colonization cocoanut. As Mr. Davis puts it, "there is an enormous amount of idle fertile land awaiting colonization and development;" and "there is an enormous number of idle deserving people hoping for a future, and as many more eking out a miserable existence without a future." Booth-Tucker would bring these two economic forces together. It is the old idea to which Duganne gave voice when he sang: "Millions of hands want acres, and millions of acres want hands." But under the Booth-Tucker process, most of the profit will be garnered—as Industrial Commissioner Davis shows when he tells of the rapid increase in the value of the lands where colonization has begun—not by the hands that work the acres, but by the hands that monopolize them.

In a historical article in the Forum, intended as a special plea for American colonial governments in Spain's late possessions, Prof. McMaster, the historian, refers to the fundamental truths of the declaration of inde-

pendence as "ideals to be lived up to and gradually attained," but which were happily not applied by our predecessors and cannot wisely be applied by us. But what is the use of having ideals if it is never wise to act towards them at least if not up to them? And what kind of ideals must those be upon which we are to turn our backs whenever circumstances require us to act? If the ideals of the declaration of independence are truths, as McMaster admits them to be, then it is for us to live as close to them as we know how. If we fall short through ignorance, that is our misfortune; but if we fall short with premeditation and deliberation, it is our crime. Nor shall we find any palliation in the historical fact to which Prof. McMaster appeals, that our forefathers also fell short. We cannot attain to the ideals of the declaration of independence by ignoring them at every crisis. To attain to them even gradually, we must solve every new problem not in opposition to but in harmony with them.

In celebration of the New Year, plutocratic papers were crowded with facts and figures to show that the year 1898 had been extraordinarily prosperous. They certainly did show that trusts and monopolies had prospered amazingly. But there was not a word or a figure about workingmen's wages. To have said anything upon that phase of the subject would have completely "spoiled the preach." For in the midst of all the much vaunted prosperity of 1898, wages were nowhere raised, but in many places they were cut down; while strikes against reductions were numerous.

In the same issue of at least one daily paper which ostentatiously devoted a supplement to laudations of the prosperity of 1898, there appeared

a brief news item of a cotton mill strike in Augusta, Ga., against a reduction of wages. Wages were already so low that a man could scarcely earn a living, and children were working for 60 cents a week; yet the employers had undertaken to enforce a reduction of from 10 to 25 per cent. The consequent strike had been in progress four weeks.

In the face of their cry of prosperity the newspapers tell also of a great coal strike which they expect in the spring. This is explained by Thomas E. Young, Mark Hanna's coal manager. He says:

It is the intention of the operators to reduce the mining scale of wages. The operators cannot afford to maintain the present rate. The miners want a higher rate and the operators claim a reduction must be made. You can readily see the miners and operators are far apart, and there seems to be little chance of getting together.

Prosperity! Yes; but not for workmen. Rockefeller is said to have made profits aggregating \$30,000,000—\$82,000 a day. He is a type of the men who found 1898 a prosperous year. It was not in higher wages that prosperity made itself manifest; wages are as low, or lower, than before. It was not in legitimate competitive profits; legitimate business has been done at a lower rate of profits than before. All this is conceded. Even the wool industries, those special favorites of protection, are admitted by the Wool and Cotton Reporter to have been so bad in 1898 that "they have done well to make expenses." Trade journals have laboriously explained that a peculiarity of this era of prosperity is that business is done upon reduced profits and work at reduced wages. Where the prosperity has made itself manifest is in what in the patter of the exchange are called

values. There has been an "unprecedented increase in values." Increase in the values of what? Not of work, for wages are reduced. Not of competitive business, for profits are reduced. The increase has been in the values of monopoly "securities." The Goulds, for instance, have seen some of their railroad stock go up from \$10 a share to \$45. During the last week of the year tobacco trust stock was up to 154, as against 96 last year; Santa Fe preferred was at 52, as against 35; Chicago & Northwestern preferred at 191, as against 165; and Rock Island at 115, as against 97. But these higher values must be paid for by the masses of the people. They mean heavier burdens, not better times. "Values" have indeed risen, and men who have monopolized these values are prosperous; but that which creates and maintains all values, the work of the country, is more poorly paid. This is the kind of prosperity we have. It is the only kind that even the most enthusiastic prosperity touting newspaper shows any indication of our having. Is it the kind that Mr. McKinley promised?

It may not be easy at first for democratic democrats outside of Chicago to perceive the vital importance of ex-Gov. Altgeld's "Municipal Ownership and Chicago Platform" campaign for the mayoralty. To some, the more exceptionally ignorant or innocent, it might even appear that Altgeld is actuated by a consuming desire to be mayor. Others, who have the sense to realize that such an office could have no attractions for him, might nevertheless be irritated at what may seem to them his willingness to make trouble in the party over a question of local politics. These critics should understand at once that Altgeld is making "trouble" for the sake of holding the democratic party up to its radical standards, and that without the "trouble" he is making it will be restored to its old place as the assistant republican party.

The plain truth is that Flower,

Whitney, Gorman and their crowd, reenforced by Croker, and using Mayor Harrison as their cat's paw, are planning to undo the convention work of 1896. Their plan contemplates the making of a "broad-gauge platform," one so "broad" that, as with the democratic platforms prior to 1896, anybody can stand upon it. With nothing in it against gold, it is to furnish standing room for gold men; with nothing in it in favor of gold, it is to hold silver men in line; with soft words for "labor," it is to welcome the "sons of toil;" with a straddle on the currency, it is to make a tell-tale seat for both the Indianapolis currency reformers and greenbackers; and with a word and a wink about monopolies, it at once is to secure anti-monopoly votes and monopoly campaign funds.

Strange as it may seem, one of the very important conditions to the success of this plan is the reelection of young Harrison to the mayoralty of Chicago. That will not seem so strange, however, when the circumstances are considered. With the patronage of the Chicago city hall, and the money that Flower's crowd would freely supply, Harrison could carry the primaries of Cook county against overwhelming odds. The plotters would then control nearly one-third of the Illinois state convention; and they would have no difficulty in picking up enough additional delegates through the state to make a majority. In that way, contrary to the will of the vast majority of the democrats of the state, Illinois would be swung into line at the next democratic national convention, in opposition to the platform of 1896, and in support of the Flowers and Whitneys and Crokers. Harrison's election next spring as mayor means a democratic right-about-face in 1900. It were better for the democratic party that a republican mayor of Chicago should be elected than that Harrison should secure this advantage for Flower, Whitney and Croker.

But neither Harrison nor a repub-

lican need be elected. If the democratic democrats of Chicago do their part, and the democratic democrats of the nation, instead of worrying encourage them, Altgeld can, in spite of the machine, be elected mayor of Chicago upon the basis of municipal ownership and the Chicago platform. The principle of municipal ownership can thus be established in the metropolis of the west, with the same blow that frustrates the plottings of monopolists against the democracy of the democratic party.

One of Mr. McKinley's journalistic valets lately indulged, in the Chicago Tribune, in one of the neatest bits of snob writing that has recently fallen under our eye. It is worth preserving:

Mrs. McKinley's dressmaker came over from New York to-day and spent several hours with "the first lady of the land," trying on new gowns. While in the white house, the dressmaker's carriage, which was a hired one, drove off. She barely had time to catch her train, and as the president's carriage was waiting for him, he gracefully put it at the disposal of the New York dressmaker, who entered it and drove off with as much grace as if she were accustomed to have the president's equipage at her disposal every day.

To appreciate the delicacy of this tribute to Mr. McKinley's aristocratic condescension, we must think of some wealthy woman in the place of the dressmaker. Wouldn't Mr. McKinley under similar circumstances have put his carriage at her disposal just as gracefully? And wouldn't the lines quoted above have been devoid in that case of all newspaper interest? What is it then that gives them newspaper interest and space in the case of the dressmaker, except that she was a dressmaker—an inferior mortal?

Mr. Bryan talks like an orator, says Harper's Weekly, when he advises that the Spanish treaty of peace be ratified and that the fight against imperialism be made afterwards. Harper's thinks that after the treaty is ratified there will be only one duty for patriotic citizens, and that will be to devote all their political energy and intelligence to providing good government for what is called our

"new possessions." If Bryan talks like an orator, Harper's writes like an imperialist.

That Harper's Weekly is preparing to get over on the imperialistic side is a reasonable inference from its proposition to hinge the issue of imperialism upon the ratification of the Spanish treaty. That treaty is first of all a treaty of peace. To defeat it would be to leave us still in a state of war. For this reason alone, it is doubtful if its ratification can be prevented. Few senators will care to be in the position of appearing to vote to prolong the war. If, therefore, the question of imperialism be allowed to depend upon the ratification of the treaty, it will almost certainly be determined with a short, sharp and decisive verdict in favor of the imperialistic policy. But not so, if, for the purpose of ending the war, the treaty be formally ratified without reference to the question of imperialism. That question can then be raised—not in a form which identifies imperialism with peace, but directly and boldly; not in one house, but in both; not in secret sessions, but in open debates—upon legislation for the future disposition of the so-called "new possessions." It is not sound that after the treaty is ratified the political energy and intelligence of this country must be devoted to providing good government for these possessions. Nothing in the treaty would require us to provide any kind of government for them. It would be our duty to give them freedom to provide governments for themselves; and the treaty would in no wise interfere with our faithful performance of that duty.

Had any student of the world's affairs been asked a year ago where liberty was most in danger, he might have named Russia or Germany, but certainly not England, France or the United States. Yet in these three countries the outlook at this moment is darkest.

In England imperialism has taken

the tory party by storm, and disorganized the liberal party. Viewed at a distance, English public opinion seems almost a unit for conquest. "Little Englander" has become a term of reproach, and the blood of Runnymede appears to have nearly run out. With France, the rush toward imperialism is the same as in England, though the circumstances differ, the issue there being directly and openly between the civil power and the military. There is a disposition, also, to abolish representative government in the colonies. But staunch defenders of the civil power in France as in England are apparently very few, and the empire seems almost in sight. The United States, too, has unmistakably entered upon an imperialistic career. Here the circumstances resemble less those in France than those in England, with which they are almost identical. The party in power in the United States, the political counterpart of the English tory party, has been seized with the lust of conquest; while our parties out of power, like the English liberal party, have been demoralized by it. Opposition to imperialism is weak and timid. At a distance our people, too, must appear to be a unit for conquest, and our Bunker hill and Gettysburg blood to have run out along with that of Runnymede. All three countries—England, France and the United States—countries which more than any other have for a century stood for that fundamental principle of liberty, government by the consent of the governed, are now under the dark shadow of a more or less paternal imperialism.

The imperialistic craze with which the close of the century is marked may be fully accounted for in France by the fact that a keen appreciation of the virtues of individual liberty has never taken possession of the French people. But it cannot be so accounted for either in England or the United States. In these countries other reasons must be sought for. A long era of "protection to home industries" would account for it to a

degree in the United States. Concessedly paternal, protection is essentially imperialistic. That, however, could not account for the craze in England, for England has long enjoyed a system of modified free trade. Still, it can be accounted for even in England by the prevalence there of the commercial root of the protection idea. In spite of England's free trade policy, in spite also of the fact that she has prospered by continually importing more goods than she exports, the notion has all along prevailed there that national prosperity is to be attained by excessive exporting. Cobden gave to England a free trade statute, but England failed to get from him the free trade principle. This same notion as to the profitability of exporting prevails also in the United States. Both England and America are under its spell. It involves the queer idea that a nation in order to prosper must be forever seeking foreign outlets for what are called its "surplus products"—seeking, that is, new opportunities to export without importing. This idea is at the bottom of English and American imperialism. Let trade be free, and neither country would be concerned to extend its jurisdiction.

We have never seen the superstition as to the necessity of perpetually increasing exports more succinctly expressed than in the publisher's announcement of a forthcoming magazine article in McClure's. This article, says the announcement, will show that "the nation which gets left in the approaching redistribution of the trade of the east, will be forced to consume its surplus at home, and will be doomed to a period of partial or complete stagnation." It will be noticed that nothing is said of imports; the whole allusion is to exports. The perfectly legitimate impulse of seeking markets for exchange is ignored. It is not markets for exchange that are wanted, but markets for sales. We must get rid of our goods or stagnate. That is the impulse of this wave of imperialism which has swept over English and American politics, and

made the governments of both countries forget that the pearl of great price which has been placed in their keeping is the principle of equal rights. We in this country, at any rate, to the extent that we have become imperialists, have done so because we think that exports follow the flag, and that imperialism, therefore, will make new outlets for our surplus products. Our great papers, even the best of them, are confused if not consumed with the idea that national prosperity is measured by the excess of exports over imports; and our rule-of-thumb business men echo the absurd sentiment.

Nothing could be more absurd than the notion that it is exporting instead of importing that enriches a people. Exporting is a sign of prosperity only when it is accompanied or followed by importing. It is not exports that make a country rich, but the imports with which the exports are paid for. While a temporary excess of exports may indicate prosperity, that can be so only when it implies that an excess of imports will soon set in, or that there has recently been an excess of imports which are now being paid for with exports. A continuous excess of exports, either in the accounts of men or of nations, leads inevitably to bankruptcy. It means that the exporting country is giving away its goods. Whenever a country's exports steadily and largely exceed its imports, investigation will show that it is paying interest on bonds for which it has imported no equivalent, as in the case of Egypt; or rent to absentee landlords, as in the case of Ireland. There is no prosperity in doing either.

Nevertheless, American imperialists are hungry for a continuous excess of exports. And this in spite of the fact that we have long been exporting more than we have imported. Year by year, with only four unimportant exceptions, this country has for 24 years had an excess of exports. And for 50 years the aggregate of our excess of

exports, including gold and silver, has been \$3,381,900,000. Is this excess of exports applicable to the payment of our obligations for imports incurred during a previous period? By no means. For during the long period of 14 years preceding, our excess of imports was only \$113,200,000. That is, in the last 50 years we ran up an excess of exports sufficient to pay off all our debts for imports for the 14 years preceding, and still leave a balance of \$3,268,700,000. When and how are we to get back that balance, if not by an excess of imports in the near future? Yet we are gravely told that we are to be "doomed to a period of partial or complete stagnation" if we fail to maintain steadily an excess of exports!

In verification of our assertions that American exports have long been largely in excess, Rabbi J. L. Stern, of Cumberland, Md., favors us with the following itemized statement of exports and imports by decades from 1849 to 1897—50 years. As the figures are given in millions, they are to be read with five ciphers to the right of the figure following the decimal mark. Here is the statement:

EXPORTS.			
Merchandise:			
1849—1858	\$2146.7		
1868	2490.4		
1878	5025.2		
1888	7796.7		
1898	9226.9		\$26,685.9
Gold:			
1849—1858	350.3		
1868	585.8		
1878	398.2		
1888	175.0		
1898	633.5		2,142.8
Silver:			
1849—1858	26.5		
1868	88.2		
1878	284.2		
1888	231.1		
1898	442.5		1,072.5
			\$29,901.2
IMPORTS.			
Merchandise:			
1849—1858	\$2474.2		
1868	3149.8		
1878	5091.6		
1888	6500.6		
1898	7620.3		\$24,836.5

Gold:			
1849—1858	\$38.2		
1868	117.5		
1878	130.7		
1888	395.2		
1898	459.5		1,141.1
Silver:			
1849—1858	33.5		
1868	39.9		
1878	106.8		
1888	137.4		
1898	224.1	541.7	26,519.3
			\$3,381.9

Thus the excess of exports from the United States for 50 years has been \$3,381,900,000.

Turning to the same source from which Mr. Stern takes his figures, the Monthly Summary of the treasury department, and following the tables back from 1849, where Mr. Stern begins, to 1835, we find an excess of imports of only \$113,200,000. Deducting that amount from the excess of exports shown by Mr. Stern for the following 50 years, we have still left, after paying for the previous excessive imports, the comfortable sum of \$3,268,700,000 as representing American commodities sold to our foreign friends, for which they have not yet paid us. Where is the profit in that kind of trade?

It is sometimes argued that our excessive exports are being used to buy back our stocks and bonds from abroad. But how did our stocks and bonds get abroad? If for 64 years the commodities (including gold and silver) which we have sent abroad exceed what we have received back by \$3,268,700,000, which is the fact, what did we receive in payment for the stocks and bonds we sent abroad? Did we give them away, too?

Why not give them away? If it is profitable to give away commodities, why would it not be profitable to throw in stocks and bonds by way of inducement? Besides, by doing that we should take time by the forelock and create an opportunity for perpetuating excessive exports. When exports began to fall off we could keep them up by exporting commodities in

exchange for our stocks and bonds. And upon getting these securities back, we could provide for the future by giving them away again. Thus should we keep the export "ball a-rolling" forever and aye, growing richer and richer with every dollar's worth we lost.

The most familiar explanation of the excessive export theory is that the excess is paid for in gold and silver. We have shown the unsoundness of this explanation through Mr. Stern's figures, which include gold and silver along with merchandise, and yet exhibit an enormous export balance. The absurdity of the explanation is well illustrated by George Walker, of Harrison, N. J., who writes:

A sailor on leave of absence from his ship, anchored off some tropical island, wanders upon the seashore and meets a native who offers him a handsome shell for a plug of tobacco which has cost the sailor 10 cents. The sailor makes the exchange, and upon arriving in New York sells the shell for \$5. Now, according to the "balance of trade" theory, this transaction would make our imports exceed our exports by \$4.90, which sum we would consequently owe and should have to pay in coin!

Or, for a more commercial and complicated transaction, take the case of a New York merchant who ships \$100,000 worth of wheat to Liverpool. Selling it there for, say, \$150,000, he buys hardware to that value, which he ships to Buenos Ayres, and exchanging it there for hides he sells them in New York for \$200,000. According to the "balance of trade" theory, our imports have in this transaction exceeded our exports by \$100,000, which we owe and must pay in coin.

But common sense would say that in both transactions, the country had made large profits and owed no other country a cent on account of them.

Is it strange, however, that the ordinary man's mind is darkened by the false "balance of trade" theory, when we find a man like President McKinley making the following statement in one of his speeches?

Notwithstanding the cry that under a protective tariff we cannot sell abroad unless we buy abroad, yet during the last fiscal year we sold abroad nearly \$203,000,000 more than we bought abroad. This was the excess in our favor which the foreigner paid to us, and which we have now at home circulating among our people.

The above statement was made despite the fact that, during the fiscal

year referred to, our exports of gold had exceeded our imports of gold!

Attention has been called by the English Land Restoration league to the wrong direction in municipal reform in which some of the Progressive members of the London county council have allowed that body to drift, and the evil effects that must necessarily result. The council is devoting itself to the subject of "housing the working classes," a subject which, by its inherent incongruity, suggests some such absurdity as the making of dams for beavers, of nests for birds, of coats for tailors, or of shoes for shoemakers. As if the working classes, who do all building, couldn't house themselves if allowed to by the idle classes. In this work of providing housing for the working classes, the council has been invited to enter upon a policy of acquiring sites for working class dwellings and erecting dwellings of that character thereon at public expense. This policy, as the Land Restoration league points out, cannot solve "the slum difficulty," but "will only change the form, and may easily increase its evils." For while it might succeed in reducing the population of existing slums, the dispossessed tenants would herd in new slums. If "the council buys the land as it must, dear; and builds the houses as it should, well; and then lets them as it is asked to do, cheap," it will benefit only a few tenants at the expense of London as a whole.

That is not empty prophecy. The "memorandum" of the Land Restoration league summons in evidence an actual attempt of the London county council to deal with the housing problem on a large scale—that of the Boundary street area in Bethnal Green. The housing committee of the council in 1890 proved that the slum-owners were coining money out of what was virtually wholesale murder of their fellow citizens. The council thereupon bought up these slums at a net cost of about \$1,250,000, and,

clearing them, rebuilt at further enormous expense. Yet the slum dwellers are not benefited. The new houses are generally occupied by an entirely different class from that which was displaced. This result parallels that of every similar experiment the world over, and must in the nature of things be paralleled by every new experiment of the same kind. Municipal housing can neither remove nor materially modify the slum cause. The only class to benefit by it in the end is bound to be the class that owns land within the influence of the improvement.

The people of London have long recognized that. In the first London county council, elected in 1889, there was a large majority pledged to the taxation of land values; and each subsequent council has declared for this radical reform. Even the present council, when the resolution in favor of introducing a bill in parliament "whereby the owners of ground values in London can be called upon to contribute directly towards the local taxation of the county," came up last July, not one member voted against it. And so well understood has it been that public improvements under the existing tax systems give the chief pecuniary benefit to ground landlords, that most of the reactionary candidates for the council at the last election were pledged to the policy of making great public improvements at once, while every Progressive candidate was pledged to the taxation of ground values. The Progressive majority in the council had steadily opposed costly improvements that could be postponed, until land value taxation could be secured and the pecuniary benefit of all public improvements be thereby diverted from the landlord class to the common treasury.

But a so-called "forward movement," which in reality is a backward movement, has now got a foothold in the council; and upon the specious plea of housing the working classes a policy of buying up costly land is ad-

vocated. This policy can but put millions into the pockets of the landlords who sell, in the way of purchase money for land which God hath given to the children of men; and millions more into the pockets of neighboring landlords whose holdings would be enhanced in value by the municipal improvements. Not only would that policy, if carried out, enrich landlords at public expense, but it would intensify the deplorable conditions it is intended to ameliorate. The very poor would find it harder than ever, because dearer than ever, to secure a standing place upon the earth.

This housing scheme for the benefit of landlords receives little encouragement, however, from local radical sources. The organ of the London Workingmen's clubs, the *Club World*, has declared against it; and the council of the Metropolitan Radical federation after a full discussion of the subject has adopted resolutions which, while recognizing the urgent need of better housing for the working classes, express the very sensible opinion "that land monopoly is the principal cause of the low wages and high rents to which overcrowding is mainly due." The resolutions appeal also to the county council to consider "whether an attack upon land monopoly, by means of the taxation of land values, will not, by cheapening the cost of sites, do more to promote the provision of adequate house accommodation than a policy of land purchase, which will have the effect of increasing the value of land and consequently the cost of houses." These views are endorsed and actively supported by the *London Echo*.

Another judge has harshly exercised the autocratic power which courts long ago assumed and which they reluctantly relinquish, that of arbitrarily accusing, trying and punishing persons for contempt of court. The judge in this case is Judge Sherman, of the superior court at Dedham, Mass.; the victim is Torrey E. Wardner, editor of the *Boston Traveler*.

An engineer of the N. Y., N. H. & H. RR. Co. had been on trial before Judge Sherman for manslaughter. The charge was based upon the facts of a railroad collision. While hauling the second section of a passenger train this engineer had run into the rear of the first section, killing several people. A strong popular belief, which found frequent expression, attributed the prosecution of the engineer to the railroad company. It was believed that the company hoped thereby to avoid responsibility for its own negligence. To this popular opinion the *Boston Traveler* gave editorial expression in an article which unequivocally charged that the engineer was being made a scapegoat for the company. At the time of the publication of that article the case against the engineer was still on trial, the jury having retired for consultation; and it has since been stated that one copy of the paper found its way into the jury room. Upon these facts Judge Sherman instituted contempt proceedings; and after a hearing before himself, without a jury, he convicted the editor and sentenced him to 30 days' imprisonment in the county jail. The editor was confined accordingly and subjected to all the rigors of imprisonment and discipline which the rules of the jail impose upon common convicts. He was even forced to live upon de-appetizing jail rations, and forbidden communication with friends.

Of the propriety of summary proceedings for contempt there can be no question, when the contempt consists in lawless and disturbing behavior in the actual presence of a court of justice. It is necessary to the orderly conduct of their business that courts should have power to deal with such cases summarily. And since the objectionable conduct occurs within the sight and hearing of the judge upon the bench, no harm can come from giving him power to punish without trial. There are in those cases no disputed facts to try. But a newspaper criticism, lawless

though it may be—as when its object is to influence a verdict or decision—is not in the category of contempts in the actual presence of the court. There is in that kind of case not only no necessity nor excuse for summary proceedings, but great danger to freedom of the press in tolerating them. If any judge may, in his own discretion, hale an editor before himself, try him himself, decide the facts and the law himself, and fix the punishment himself, then editors are responsible for their publications, not to the law, but to the discretion of judges. The judge who sentenced Mr. Wardner, of the *Boston Traveler*, can cite in justification many precedents. Most of them are mouldy, however, or worse; and the whole affair lends great color of truth to the *Traveler's* claim that the engineer was a scapegoat for the railroad company. It is not an unreasonable inference that the editor was summarily, and it would seem rather viciously punished, more for the protection of the company than for the sake of the law.

To the rigid treatment of the editor of the *Boston Traveler* by the jail authorities there can be no special objection. It was perfectly right to treat him and the other prisoners alike. But there is an objection to treating any prisoners as the jail authorities have treated him; and it is to be hoped that his experience in the jail may prompt him to make a crusade in his paper against all prison abuses.

The opinion of the Minnesota supreme court in the decision to which we referred briefly in our issue of December 3, is now before us in full, and it quite sustains the view we then expressed that the decision rests upon the wholesome general principle that a legislative body cannot bind the people by creating property rights in franchises for unreasonable periods.

Judge Mitchell wrote the opinion of the Minnesota court. A private grant for a waterworks system had been made by the city of Little Falls.

It was made under the authority of the city charter, which empowered the council to erect waterworks or to grant the right to do so to third parties. In making the grant the city council required the grantees to maintain a certain number of fire hydrants, for which the city was to pay a certain sum for the life of the grant—30 years. The grant was assigned to the Little Falls Electric and Water Co., which collected annually of the city the sum so specified for water hydrants. To put a stop to this a taxpayer of the name of Flynn sued the company for an injunction, claiming that there were more fire hydrants than the city needed, and that the price was grossly excessive. In the lower court he was defeated, but the highest court of the state decided in his favor. The water company rested its case upon its 30-year contract. In rendering the judgment of the higher court Judge Mitchell recognized the power of the city authorities to contract in relation to the matter in question, but held that this power does not carry with it by implication power to make a contract "which shall cede away, control or embarrass their legislative or governmental powers, or render the municipality unable in the future to control any municipal matter over which it has legislative power." It would be a very dangerous doctrine, he said, to hold that city councils may contract for any period of time they see fit; for if that doctrine were accepted, "the city council might have made a contract running 100 or even 500 years as well as 30 years;" and by reason of the incompetency or dishonesty of its officials "the power of a municipality might thus be bartered away for so long a period of time as to practically disable it from performing its public duties." For these reasons the fire hydrant clause under consideration—the only clause the court had any jurisdiction to pass upon, in the case before it—it was decided to be "as to time, unreasonable and void, as being beyond the scope of the authority of the municipal authorities." It is evident from Judge Mitchell's opin-

ion that the whole franchise would for the same reason have been swept away had the whole of it been involved in the case. The decision is published in full in the Northwestern Reporter for December 3.

That Minnesota decision is reassuring. Its general adoption would make the danger of long-franchise grants less menacing. Yet the principles of law upon which it rests are not novel. Before corporations began to pack the judicial bench with their lawyers, the principle that Judge Mitchell invokes was familiar and supposed to be firmly established in American jurisprudence—the principle, that is to say, that municipal legislatures cannot, under the guise of contract, legally tie up or obstruct their legislative functions. With the revival of this principle, the danger of long-time franchises would be greatly minimized. There would be much less temptation to bribe city officials. A franchise that might be abrogated as an unreasonable grant would hardly be worth spending bribe money for.

#### THE SERVANT GIRL QUESTION.

Not infrequently the servant girl question is a question of incompetent mistresses rather than one of incapable servants. If the servants' side of the question were heard, this would plainly enough appear; but as servants get no hearing, while mistresses swap their grievances at social gatherings and have their complaints dished up in newspapers and magazines, the servant alone is pilloried by public opinion as the offender. It is another version of the fable of the lion and the man. When servant girls write for the papers and magazines, you will hear a different story.

Not that all mistresses are incompetent or otherwise bad. Far from it. But a perfect mistress here and there cannot undo the harm that mistresses in general, if incompetent, can cause. It is to mistresses in general, therefore, and the relationship of mistress and servant as a whole, not to individual cases, that we have reference.

As a rule, mistresses are either wholly ignorant of housekeeping or

have only a partial or a theoretical knowledge of it. They have not, so to speak, been "brought up to the business." What constitutes good service would be a mystery to them if they had sufficient sense of responsibility to inquire into it. Few could take the place of the average servant and do as well. With what intelligence can such women either direct servants or rebuke them, commend or complain?

If men who undertake to manage businesses were as poorly equipped by experience as the generality of mistresses are for housekeeping, business men would complain as much of the incompetency of workmen as their wives do of household servants. Inexperienced and incompetent business men do.

Rich women escape much of the annoyance of the servant girl problem by employing housekeepers. Nor do they thereby merely shift the annoyance to others. The important thing they do is to substitute competency for incompetency in management.

Still another advantage in this connection is enjoyed by rich mistresses. Able to pay high wages, they secure not only trained and able housekeepers, but also trained subordinates. The servant girl question is not a burning one in aristocratic households. It is peculiarly a middle class question.

We must concede, however, that neither incompetent management nor the comparatively low wages that prevail in middle class households, fully explain the servant girl question. Even competent and considerate mistresses are baffled by it.

But it must be remembered, as we have already suggested, that competency and considerateness here and there cannot atone for the incompetency and lack of consideration which characterize mistresses in general.

Then there is the further consideration of wages. Though servants' wages be high in comparison with other wages, they are not high enough as a rule, in middle class households, to attract the better grades of trained servants. The best servants are drawn to households where wages are higher and conditions better. Con-

sequently the servants usually available to middle class mistresses come from the poorer grades of the servant class.

As that class is not large, relatively to the demand for servants, it is the one employee class in the whole range of modern industry, whose members can always get a job. There is seldom any occasion for their worrying about loss of employment. They can quit one place to-day and get another to-morrow with almost absolute certainty. In productive industry this would tend continually to raise wages; but in personal employments which are virtually non-productive, wages are limited by the private purse strings of employers. In the matter of pay, therefore, the excess of the demand for servants over the supply does little more than to keep wages stiff. But in the matter of independence, it operates freely. Servants are the most independent of all the lower paid wages classes.

Now, when independence of the servant class is coupled with wages fixed in the vast majority of households at a low limit by ability to pay, and the best of the class are "gobbled up" by rich households where wages are limited only by demand and not by ability to pay, most of the difficulties regarding household servants which have not already been explained upon the basis of incompetent mistresses are accounted for.

Middle class households being restricted for their servants to the poorer grades of the servant class, poorer both as to capability and sense of responsibility, and being also without any effective coercive power, such thriftlessness, incapacity and irresponsibility as may characterize servants in those grades has full freedom to display itself.

Recognizing this condition, some people are forever asking why the underpaid shop girls of cities do not become servant girls. They are quite capable of giving satisfaction, it is said, and they would be better paid, when the homes they would get were taken into consideration.

It should require no argument to prove that if servants' wages were in fact better than shop girls wages, they would fall with a "thud" as soon as any considerable number of shop girls

offered themselves as servants. All that keeps up servants' wages is the scarcity of servants. But all things considered, servants in middle class households, or for that matter in aristocratic households either, are not better paid than shop girls.

Wages cannot be measured by dollars alone; nor by dollars and bodily comforts together. In becoming a household servant, a shop girl would give up much for which the difference in wages and bodily comforts could not compensate.

For one thing she would give up regular hours and definiteness of duties. Her day would have a fixed beginning, but not a fixed end. Not an hour in the 24 would be absolutely her own. The whim of an inconsiderate mistress might call her even from her bed, while the ignorance of an incompetent one might impose useless labor upon her. And except for an occasional abbreviated afternoon out, she would know of no let up from weeks' end to weeks' end. This is not so in the factory or the store. Her duties there are laid out by competent superiors, and her day has an ending as rigid as its beginning.

As a servant, moreover, she would live always in a state of tutelage. The mistress would be her more or less considerate guardian, and her outgoings and her incomings, her visits and her visitors, would be subject to everlasting and not seldom impertinent scrutiny. This might be as much for the good of her own soul as for the peace of mind of the household; but at the best it would be patronizing and at the worst insulting. Few American women would patiently submit to it so long as work were to be had, even at low wages, in a factory or store, where the employer never meddles except to exact the work for which he contracts to pay.

And, with public opinion what it is, a shop girl upon becoming a servant would give up something more vital still; something she has a right to retain and the loss of which no wages could indemnify. She would give up every opportunity to meet congenial men with a view to marriage. This is every woman's birthright. But in the present disordered state of society, the girl of education and refinement could have no reasonable expectation, after becoming a household servant, of

ever marrying a man of like education and refinement. Shop girls know and appreciate this disqualification. One of them in an eastern city described it when asked by a well-meaning society woman why shop girls did not accept "homes" and better wages as household servants? The girl replied: "The men we hope to marry won't visit us in your kitchens."

The same public opinion that is disturbed by the servant girl question, classifies household service as menial. So long as this is done, few girls old enough to know what it means, and not already of the servant class, will become servants if they can help it. This fact points to what, after all, is the heart of the servant girl question — menialism.

The whole relation of mistress and servant is a false relation. It is a relation not of cooperation, but of servitude on one side and mastership on the other.

In any just and normal social condition, that relation could not exist any more than slavery could. No one would want to be a master, nor would any one consent to be a servant. Household work would of course be necessary even under the best conditions. But in normal conditions, legitimate household work would be done as a matter of business, as a matter of cooperation. Not cooperation in the narrow sense of communistic housekeeping, but in a sense suggested by the laundry which does away with wash day, and by professional methods of house cleaning which do away with the old-time cleaning days. Of service in the sense of servitude, there would be none.

While industrial conditions are what they are, however, and servitude, as distinguished from cooperation, characterizes household employment, we must be prepared to endure a servant question. Menialism and the servant girl problem are inseparable.

---

## NEWS

---

Havana was evacuated by the Spanish, according to program, on the 1st. No disturbances occurred; and contrary to expectations the Cubans were encouraged to avoid making the day mournful.



The surrender took place at noon. It was made to Gens. Wade and Butler, of the American evacuation commission. Capt. Gen. Castellanos represented Spain at the ceremony in the throne room of the palace. At the appointed hour, addressing the American commissioners, he said:

Gentlemen: In accordance with the treaty of Paris, it devolves upon me to declare on behalf of my country and my king that from this moment Spanish sovereignty in Cuba is ended, and to deliver the island to the American commission of evacuation. I obey and respect the order which my country has laid it upon me to fulfill, and I declare most solemnly that I shall be the first one to render obedience to the new government. I speak as well for my soldiers. I trust our future relations will be friendly and helpful. The consideration with which we treated the American army while it was our guest will, we hope, be given to us until the evacuation of the island is completed.

The surrender was accepted laconically by Gen. Wade, who forthwith delivered the control of the island to Gen. Brooke, the American military governor. This concluded the ceremony in the palace. Gen. Castellanos, accompanied by his staff and other Spanish officers, went directly to the transport, on which they sailed for Spain the same afternoon. No representative of the American navy had been invited to be present at the ceremony, a fact which has served to strengthen the ill-feeling between army and navy.

Besides the Spanish and American officials, there were in attendance at the palace during the formal evacuation, several officers of the Cuban army. They were there upon the invitation of the American authorities. This courtesy had been extended them in adjustment of the anticipated difficulties we described last week. As we stated then, Gen. Ludlow, American governor of Havana, had consented to the entry of Cuban troops as part of the evacuation ceremonies, and given assurances that Cuban officers might be present. Upon the strength of these concessions, resident Cubans decorated their houses with American and Cuban flags. But Gen. Brooke, American governor of the island, revoked Gen. Ludlow's permission, notifying the Cubans that their army would not be recognized nor allowed to participate in the evacuation ceremonies. Gen. Brooke's action caused a revulsion of feelings, and Cuban residents

declared that unless his orders were rescinded they would strip their houses of decorations, close their doors, and remain within while the evacuation was taking place. Local excitement was intense. Prominent Cubans telegraphed President McKinley begging him to check Brooke's blundering. Cuban leaders tried to pacify the citizens, but their task was not easy. Judge Advocate Gould, of the evacuation commission, cabled the president of the uneasy situation and advised that the Cubans be permitted to participate in the ceremonies. But Gen. Brooke stood by his order, professing fears of assaults upon the Spanish if Cuban troops were admitted into the city otherwise than in their individual capacity. He also forbade the Cuban festivities which had been planned for the first week in January. The excitement had somewhat subsided on the 30th, Gen. Ludlow having promised to appoint a future day, when the situation had become more settled, on which the Cubans might celebrate the evacuation. This promise was vouched for in an address by the Junta Patriotica, which thereupon advised the postponement of the contemplated festivities. It was arranged also that Cuban officers be present at the formal surrender. Although the difficulty was thus adjusted on the surface, it was evident during the parade of the American troops after the evacuation that the Cubans had no enthusiastic welcome for American authority. They gave an ovation to Gen. Lee, who rode at the head of the troops, and when every member of an Indiana company displayed the Cuban flag, they went wild with excitement and rent the air with cheers. But in the main, the occasion evidently appeared to them less like liberation than another foreign occupation.

Gen. Gomez has issued a proclamation in which he says:

The moment has arrived to give a public explanation of my conduct and my purposes, which are always in accord with my sense of duty to the country I serve. The Americans, tacitly our allies, have terminated the war with Spain and signed a treaty of peace. I believed it was my duty not to move for any political or other object from the spot where I had drawn my sword, so long as the enemies of the army had not completely evacuated the island. My presence elsewhere would have disturbed the repose and calmness necessary to consolidate peace; nor ought I to have caused the Cubans trouble by

unnecessary manifestations during the jubilee.

The period of transition is terminated; the army of the enemy is abandoning the country; the sovereignty of the great United States is beginning, as stipulated in the protocol, over all the island. But Cuba is not yet free or independent. Self-government is not yet constituted. For that reason we must dedicate ourselves to bringing about the disappearance of the cause for American intervention.

But, above everything else, in the spirit of justice to the Cuban army, it is necessary that before the liberators of the people can dissolve, as a guarantee of order, that the debt which the country owes to its soldiers should be satisfied. Awaiting this result, I remain in my present position, always ready to help the Cubans finish the work to which I have dedicated my life.

The proclamation ordered all Cuban soldiers to rejoin their commands; and in obedience to this order large numbers have abruptly left Havana.

A conflict appears to have arisen between the American authorities in Cuba regarding the disposition of Cuban revenues. On the 2d an order was received at Santiago from Havana directing the weekly transmittal to Havana of the entire customs receipts taken in at Santiago. Compliance with this order would involve the abandonment of Santiago improvements, and would throw thousands of the inhabitants out of employment, besides giving rise to difficulties with the Cubans. The British consul at Santiago is reported as saying that it was Spain's practice of money centralization that caused most of her troubles in Cuba. And at a large mass meeting held at Santiago on the 3d to protest against the order, most of the speakers declared that the principle now proposed to be put again into effect had been fought by the Cubans for 30 years. Gen. Wood, the governor of Santiago, was urged by the meeting to use his influence at Washington against this revival of one of the worst features of the Spanish regime, and he immediately secured permission by cable to go to Washington. At Washington the objectionable order is explained as necessary to a system of general improvement throughout the island. If Santiago at one end of the island, it is urged, and Havana near the other, were allowed to keep their customs receipts, other provinces would be without funds for public improvements. Another explanation from Washington has it that the order is misunderstood by the Cubans, its purport being to require the trans-

mittal of reports of receipts and not of the receipts themselves.

From the Philippines there is no further news which is at once complete and trustworthy. At the close of last week's report, Aguinaldo's troops had captured from the Spanish the city of Iloilo, capital of the Island of Panay, nearly 300 miles from Manila; and the American troops sent from Manila to get possession of Iloilo before the insurgents could do so, had arrived too late. What course the Americans had taken or would take was then unknown, and it is still in doubt. It is reported, however, that the insurgents have established a municipal government at Iloilo, and that they are protecting life and property there. There are reports also that upon the arrival of Gen. Miller, in command of the American troops, he demanded possession of Iloilo. The insurgents asked for delay until they could communicate with Aguinaldo, and being denied it prepared for resistance. There were said to be 1,500 fully armed insurgents then in Iloilo, and 17,000 at different points within call. Another report states that the Americans have been assured by the insurgent authorities that they may land unarmed; but warned that if they land armed, the natives will be uncontrollable. All reports agree that the natives are orderly. President McKinley has cabled a proclamation to the Philippines, the text of which is not to be made public here until it shall have been proclaimed there. Further reinforcements to the number of six regiments of infantry are to be forwarded to the Philippines at once.

In the place of the Philippine cabinet, the resignation of which was reported last week, a new cabinet has been formed. It is composed as follows:

President of the cabinet and minister of foreign affairs, Senor Mabini; minister of war, Senor Lula; minister of the interior, Senor Araneta; minister of agriculture and commerce, Senor Puencamino; minister of public works, Senor Canon; state deed, Senor Rosario.

From Filipino sources by way of London, the Associated Press describes the new cabinet as more distinctly representative of the republican element than the former one. All the new ministers, it is said, "are pledged to insist upon the independence of the islands and to refuse to liberate the Spanish prisoners." Filipinos declare they will never release Spanish

prisoners "while thousands of Filipinos are dying in the Spanish convict settlements of Fernando Po, the Ladrones, and the Caroline Islands."

The Kansas legislature, in extraordinary session, has passed some of the numerous bills before it and two of them have been signed by the governor. This legislative session is peculiarly important because, as we have already explained, it was called by the governor in order to forestall the action of the new legislature, which is to convene in the present month, both the governor and the old legislature being populist and the incoming governor and the incoming lower house being republican. On the 29th a bill for the regulation of railroads was passed. This bill sets up a railroad commission with power not only to determine all controversies concerning railroad rates, but to enforce its decrees, which, however, are to be reviewable by the Supreme Court. The commission is also empowered to adjudicate railroad strikes. Railroad attorneys of Kansas denounce the bill as worthless, saying that the special session of the legislature is unconstitutional, because no "emergency" for calling it existed. Another bill to pass relates to insurance. It was adopted on the 2d, and imposes a state tax of 2 per cent. on gross premiums upon all American insurance companies doing business in Kansas, and 4 per cent. upon foreign companies. Gov. Leedy on the 3d, signed both these bills. On the 4th the legislature passed a bill reducing telegraph tolls and subjecting express companies to the jurisdiction of the railroad commission mentioned above, the legal name of which is the "court of visitation."

With the opening of the year, newly elected state governments began their careers. New Year's day having come on Sunday, the first gubernatorial inaugurations took place on the 2d. Four new governors were inaugurated on that day. These were Theodore Roosevelt, republican, of New York; F. Stenness, fusionist, of Idaho; Edward Scofield, republican, of Wisconsin, and D. F. Richards, republican, of Wyoming. On the 4th, Gage, republican, of California, and Lind, democrat, of Minnesota, were inaugurated as governors of those states respectively.

On the 2d, also, the legislatures of California, Montana and Minnesota,

met and organized. The Colorado legislature organized on the 4th, and the Delaware legislature, after 54 ballots, had failed to elect a speaker.

The legislature of Illinois organized on the 4th with the election as speaker of L. Y. Sherman, who in the last legislature supported the Allen 50-years franchise law. But the Allen law is, nevertheless, to be repealed. Five bills for that purpose have been introduced, three in the senate and two in the house. The "Campbell" bill in the senate and the "Mueller" bill in the house are identical, having been drafted by the Civic Federation of Chicago. They would establish a local commission to control street car franchises, and would require compensation for franchises rather than reduction of fares. They would also limit franchises to 25 years, and empower municipalities to purchase at fair cash value at end of franchise, and then to lease, but not to operate. The "Berry" bill originates with Gov. Tanner. It would place street railroads under the jurisdiction of the state Railway and Warehouse commission, and look to reduction of fares rather than compensation for franchises. Gov. Tanner, in his message, advocates reduced fares instead of compensation, but opposes municipal ownership. The "Busse" bill would limit franchises to 20 years, prohibit extensions until within two years of expiration, reduce fares, and authorize municipalities to acquire ownership of lines at any time upon giving six months' notice and paying compensation not to exceed cost of replacing the property.

The 2d was made notable also by the inauguration of a triumphant socialist candidate as mayor of a New England city. John C. Chase, now mayor of Haverhill, Mass., was elected as a "social democrat," which is the name of the party organized by Eugene V. Debs. In his inaugural speech, Mayor Chase proclaimed that "every atom of power" promised by the mayor would be "executed in the defense and support of the principles of socialism, in so far as they may be applicable to a municipality." Among his specific recommendations were the following:

The passage of an order establishing the minimum wage for street employes at \$2 for eight hours' work; union wages and conditions in all brick and stone masons' work performed under the direction of the street department;

and all city printing to bear the union label.

In suggesting relief for the unemployed he advised the city government to procure—

a tract of land suitable for the raising of food products; and that such of the unemployed as desire, be permitted to use said land, the city to furnish proper seeds and tools; the enlargement of the fuel yard at the city farm to such proportions as will permit all who desire, to earn by their labor such fuel as they may require; and the appropriation of such an amount of money as circumstances may warrant to be used in providing employment directly upon public works, such as improvement of the park system, or construction of a system of bicycle paths through all principal thoroughfares.

Mayor Chase advocated increased appropriations for educational purposes, and municipal ownership of the electric lighting plants and street railways.

In furtherance of the democratic national campaign of 1900, an informal conference of leading democrats was held on the 3d at Chicago. Among those in attendance were William J. Bryan, Senator Jones, and ex-Gov. Altgeld. Senator Teller and ex-Congressman Towne, also were present. The plan for raising funds by monthly \$1 subscriptions, which has been in satisfactory operation since early in the fall, was approved.

On the 4th the first indication was given of the attitude of Illinois in the next national democratic convention on Bryan and the silver question. The democratic state central committee, which organized on that day at Springfield, unanimously adopted a resolution indorsing the Chicago platform, and especially the clause declaring for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. In the same resolution the committee declared its recognition of William J. Bryan as the leading exponent of the principles it had indorsed.

European political events of a definite character are confined to the opening at Lisbon on the 2d of the Portuguese cortes geraes, as the chamber of peers and the chamber of deputies taken together are called. In his speech from the throne, King Carlos I. is reported as having disposed of all rumors touching the sale by Portugal of Delagoa bay, one of her East African possessions. His words were:

It is not sufficient to preserve our colonial domains in their complete in-

tegrity, as the sacred hostage of the nation, but they must be developed as the solid basis of our economic regeneration.

There are no other developments in European affairs to report. Riots are said to have broken out in Rome, over excessive taxation. Strike riots in Hungary are reported in which the police were temporarily overcome. Disorder characterizes the sessions of the Hungarian diet. And signs of a political crisis are noticeable in Serbia, while Montenegro is mysteriously active in a warlike way. But the reported facts are few and their significance is still speculative.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Lord Curzon, the new viceroy of India, arrived at Calcutta on the 3d.

—Extensive jury bribing in the interest of street railroads has been discovered in Chicago. The go-betweens are being prosecuted.

—The American minister to Mexico, Powell Clayton, having been raised to the rank of ambassador, was received as such on the 3d by President Diaz.

—The Mexican ambassador to the United States, and dean of the diplomatic corps at Washington, died on the 30th. His death followed an operation for appendicitis.

—A fast mail train system across the continent was inaugurated with the new year. The trains are to save 13 hours in the trip across, making it in 3 days and 22 hours.

—The first annual meeting of the Afro-American Council opened at Washington on the 29th. It was called in the interest of the amelioration of the negro race in America.

—Municipal elections were held on the 2d throughout Ontario, Canada. In Ottawa a vote was taken on the question of running street cars on Sundays and decided in the affirmative.

—A labor riot broke out on the 2d in Armour's packing establishment at Ashland, Neb. It was the culmination of an unsuccessful strike for an increase in wages of 2½ cents an hour.

—A "chamber of skilled mechanics" is to be established by government at Strasburg with branches at Muehlhausen, Colmar and Metz. It is to consist of 36 representatives of skilled trades.

—A cooperative telephone company has been organized by F. H. Howe and others in Columbus, O. In soliciting a franchise this company offers to contract with the city to turn over the entire plant for municipal control at an appraised value at any time the city may elect to take it.

—Mrs. Botkin, accused of murder by means of poisoned candy sent through the mails from San Francisco to Delaware, and who had been on trial at San Francisco for two or three weeks, was convicted on the 30th of murder in the first degree, and condemned by the jury to imprisonment for life.

#### IN CONGRESS.

Week ending Jan. 4, 1899.

##### Senate.

Congress met on the 4th for the first time after the holiday recess. The session of the senate on that day lasted but a few minutes, no business being done except to receive the treaty of Paris from the president and refer it to the committee on foreign relations. Resolutions of respect to the memory of Senator Morrill were adopted.

##### House.

The first day after the holiday recess was devoted to a consideration of a criminal code for the Territory of Alaska. An early adjournment was taken out of respect to the memory of Senator Morrill.

#### MISCELLANY

##### "THE HEIRS OF ALL THE EARTH."

From street and square, from hill and glen,  
Of this vast world beyond my door,  
I hear the tread of marching men,  
The patient armies of the poor.

The halo of the city's lamps  
Hangs a vast torchlight in the air.  
I watch it through the evening damps;  
The masters of the world are there.

Not ermine clad, nor clothed in state,  
Their title deeds not yet made plain;  
But waking early, toiling late,  
The heirs of all the earth remain.

Some day, by laws as fixed and fair  
As guide the planets in their sweep,  
The children of each outcast heir  
The harvest fruits of time shall reap.

The peasant's brain shall yet be wise,  
The untamed pulse beat calm and still;  
The blind shall see the lowly rise,  
And work in peace time's wondrous will.

Some day without a trumpet's call,  
This news shall o'er the earth be blown;  
The heritage comes back to all;  
The myriad monarchs take their own.  
—Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

##### THE FILIPINOS.

The natives are exceedingly clean, and their huts are generally marvels of neatness. They are intelligent, bright, ready to learn, quick to acquire mechanical skill, and capable of intellectual development up to a certain point. The standard of education among them is, I am assured, very high, no less than 86 per cent. of the people knowing how to read and write. This figure seems exaggerated, but in my brief but comparatively varied experi-

ence here I have not yet had dealings with any native who could not write. They are diligent, frugal and apparently contented; the women are treated with great consideration; they take great care of their children, and have a certain dignity and self-respect, particularly observable in the provinces, which are rather impressive. Exceedingly hospitable by instinct and tradition, it is a delight to travel among them.—F. D. Millet, special correspondent of Harper's Weekly.

#### THE RESULT OF BRUTAL PUNISHMENTS.

We are glad to find a judge protesting against any extension of the practice of flogging, as Mr. Justice Mathew did yesterday at the Birmingham assizes. The assaults on women and children, which are unhappily so common just now, call for heavy punishment, and several grand juries, thinking that penal servitude is too mild a sentence in such cases, have recommended the use of the "cat." But Mr. Justice Mathew declared that to resort to flogging would be neither right nor expedient. It would not be right, he said, because if any Englishman with any good in him—surely a definition that includes all, or almost all—was flogged, "he was either for the rest of his days a broken-hearted man, or he became a reckless criminal." These are precisely the two kinds of results attained by the old system of prison treatment, still in vogue in Turkey, and perhaps nearer home. A rational prison system would either crush out a man's individuality or make him ten times worse than he was before. Mr. Justice Mathew further argued that to legalize flogging as a punishment in these cases would be inexpedient, because it would make the victims less anxious to prosecute and the juries less ready to convict. We all know that crime was never so rampant in England as it was when a woman might be hung for stealing a loaf of bread. And there is reason to believe that undue severity might prove equally ineffectual, even in the case of this peculiarly repulsive class of crimes.—Manchester (Eng.) Guardian, of December 15.

#### "JUG-HANDLED SOCIALISM."

The war having presented new opportunities for commerce, of which men of business will be prompt to take advantage for their profit, Senator Hanna steps to the front with a bill to subsidize American ships at a cost to the treasury—which is to say, the people—of millions a year. Nobody is surprised. The sight of a ship owner marching

upon the capital asking to be subsidized for engaging in a money-making business, is too familiar, too harmoniously in keeping with the whole protective system to jar anybody's sensibilities. But suppose a body of sailors should march up Pennsylvania avenue, carrying the starry banner and demanding that congress should vote them full wages in addition to those paid them by their employers for pursuing their calling, on the ground that the ships on which they work are American ships—what would be thought of them? Coxey's army that the police drove off the grass had a cordial reception compared with that which would await such crazy, such socialistic sailors. And, yet why not? If the ship owner is to have the vaults of the treasury opened to him in reward for the patriotic service of building and navigating a vessel, that being his business, is the sailor who drudges on the ship's decks under the old flag to be lost sight of? He certainly needs money more than do Mr. Hanna and the other ship owners who appeal to congress to pick the people's pockets and cram the takings into theirs.

The generous Mr. Hanna recognizes the justness of the principle by providing in his bill for a bounty of one dollar a month to each sailor actually engaged in the deep sea fisheries on board subsidized ships. But what's a dollar a month? If one dollar is right ten dollars would be barely decent. Here's a chance for labor. The treasury is open and every manly spirit must feel that the downtrodden workingmen ought to have a rake at it along with the plutocracy. Hanna's bill is simply jug-handled socialism. What it logically leads to is communism, which has at least the moral merit of demanding an even division of the spoils.

Nobody owns the public money here. It belongs to anybody who can get it.—From Arthur McEwen's Washington Letter.

#### THE TRUE MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY.

Extracts from an article with the above title, by the Rev. Wm. T. Brown, published in The New Time for September.

Christianity is not to me the attitude of life that is forever looking backward. If this record of the life of Jesus is true, then we are called upon to be something better than archaeologists.

Christianity must mean for us as it meant for the first disciples, not loyalty to some one who once lived, but no longer lives among men, but rather our devotion to men in our own present. Where are we to find the counterpart of the

Christ in our time? Where are we to find that which shall take the place in our thought and affection and service of the man who focused the thought and affection and service of the first disciples? In other words, to whom is our discipleship to be expressed? Not to a memory. Not to a character of history. That would be to deny the validity of that first discipleship. The twelve were not holding themselves as servants of some man who had lived in an age that was gone. They were not antiquaries. Their service could not have meant anything, could never have survived themselves, if it had been allegiance to a man who was dead. Christianity is not hero worship. It is service of, enthusiasm for, a man, humanity. It is finding life a mission, that mission the realization of righteousness between man and man, and in the whole structure of society—the realization of the justice of love. . . .

The Christianity of the present time, let us be honest enough to say, is nothing other than the attempt to make the principles of the gospel fit into things as they are. . . .

. . . Are you looking curiously or anxiously into the skies that you may see God? Are you scanning the records of the past that you may find him, or peering into the clouded future that you may get a glimpse of his face? O my fellow men, will you not know the truth written largest on the sacred pages of all literature, that "No man hath seen God at any time"—that the only God into whose face men ever looked wore the face of a needy and suffering man? And will you not know that the only God you and I will ever see is the God that incarnates himself not alone in some unique person who is entitled to be called the Christ, but in the person and need of every human being? Will you not know that the only opportunity for the worship of God or the service of Christ that men ever had was in the service and love of a man like themselves? God is nearer to us than we have dreamed. We have stretched out vain hands into the empty air that we might touch him, when the warm touch of loving service and Christly sympathy with the man at our elbow would have brought us face to face and life to life with God. If we will but listen we shall hear the voice of Christ calling as pleadingly, constantly, commandingly here in the nineteenth century as any one heard the voice of Jesus in the first. And now, as then, it is the call of a man who "is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

It is still the call of a man to service

of men. Into that discipleship and fellowship of divinest service we are all the while entering or refusing to enter when we permit or refuse to permit the claims of selfish contentment with existing conditions to bar our entrance into the divine democracy of human brotherhood, which is only another name for the Kingdom of God.

O Saul, it shall be  
A face like my face that receives thee; a  
Man like to me  
Thou shalt love and be loved by forever; a  
Hand like this hand  
Shall open the gates of new life to thee!  
See the Christ stand.

#### SPANISH TAXATION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

An extract from a private letter dated "Manila, Philippine Islands, November 8, 1898."

The natives till the soil; they cultivate sugar, rice, hemp and tobacco, besides the small vegetables with which they supply the markets of Manila. They are a hard working, industrious class of people, and, considering their opportunities for mental development, are fairly intelligent. Contact with the Spaniard, though, has imbued them with a certain low cunning which is distinctly seen when they come to deal with Americans. This characteristic, I am confident, is the result of a long and continuous endeavor to avoid Spanish taxation. Like the great North American tax dodger, the native Filipino never fails to lie like a thief when it comes to paying taxes. But under Spanish rule it was a question of life or death with him. Who shall blame him? He steals, as it were, his own wages fairly and honestly earned, in order to support his family.

The system of taxation in force here on our arrival, was a real slave-maker, a system which looked behind every man's door, the result of church and state—a regular system by the state, and an ungoverned and indiscriminate taxation by the church.

I will cite you an instance—a fisherman. He is the owner of a small dug-out canoe, 12 or 15 feet long, with outriggers. This vessel must be numbered and registered in the office of the captain of the port, and a license paid for the privilege of using it in the pursuit of wealth. Every time the owner enters the Pasig river with fish he must pay a tax to the captain of the port. Having done this, he passes on to the market place, where a monopolist, who has purchased from the Spanish authorities the exclusive monopoly of all the markets in the city, meets him, and as he cannot sell fish on the streets, he must pay this man for the privilege of disposing of his

wealth. Add to this the annoyances and the petty exactions of the understrappers around the market places, and the picture is complete. The baleful influence is found in every man's becoming a briber. The briber is a sort of universal villain in all the Asiatic countries; foreigners are obliged to conform to the everlasting rascality, or "get left" in the struggle for existence. Can it be wondered at that the fisherman defies the law that oppresses him?

A Spaniard said to me the other day that "the natives were very treacherous." I asked him how they were made so. He simply shrugged his shoulders and walked away.

You may search Spanish history in vain for one single instance where that nation has ever raised a subject people even to her own standard of civilization; and the reason is plain to the historical student.

The ruling classes of Spain are the lineal descendants of that old corrupt senatorial party which went to its death after Caesar conquered Pompey. They have "learned nothing and forgotten nothing." They have followed the Roman rule of "taking all the traffic will bear" except a bare subsistence. This rule made it possible for Spain to keep her wealth producers constantly on the verge of starvation. A people so situated are never able to resist oppression successfully. But this is not the worst side of the Spanish system of government. A people kept constantly on the verge of starvation must, as time goes on, produce a criminal class in the state. The anarchists, the dynamiters and assassins of European countries are the legitimate products of this system—a system which takes from the producer of wealth the greatest part of that which he produces, and turns it over to special privileges, the loafer, the drone in the hive. Such a system is hard to destroy because the oppressed themselves hold on to old forms and usages.

#### TOLSTOI ON HENRY GEORGE.

Now the great merit of Henry George consists in this, that he dissolves into nothingness all these sophistries which are produced in defense of private property in land, so that the defenders of it do not dare to debate any more, but carefully evade this question, and purposely ignore it with silence. But Henry George has also driven them from this attitude of evasion. And in this, again, lies his great merit. Henry George did not content himself with making this question perfectly clear, so that only those with closed eyes can fail to see the unreasonableness and im-

morality of private property in land. Henry George was also the first who showed the possibility of solving this question. He was the first who gave a clear and straight answer to the common objections which are brought forward by the enemies of all progress, and which culminate in the assertion that the demands of progress are chimerical, impractical, and wild phantoms which one can and may answer with silence. The plan of Henry George silences these objections and puts the question in such a shape that even tomorrow committees could be appointed for the examination and trial of the plan and its crystallization into law.

#### A WARNING.

Ill-fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.  
Princes and lords may flourish, or may  
fade—

A breath can make them, as a breath has  
made,  
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.

—Goldsmith.

Dick Norris, seated in the opposite ingle-nook, had just returned from a visit to the United States, with experiences of great anticipatory interest to myself and some old friends whom I had asked to meet him. We had done ample justice to supper, which for the occasion I had had served in my sitting-room, and with pipes and tobacco and other creature-comforts we formed a semicircle before a picturesque fire of oak logs. All was conducive to yarn-spinning. At Dick's command I extinguished the lamp, and firelight and shadow danced mysteriously on walls and ceiling, as if denoting our impatience for the story of adventure we had assembled to hear and discuss.

I have endeavored to write Dick's remarkable story much as he gave it, save that the explanatory portions were mostly elicited by question and discussion.

Here is the story:

The reason of my recent visit to the United States, and incidentally imperiling my life there, was that I wished to see for myself if their socialism were as terrible and inhuman as it is described to be. You shall judge for yourselves.

On board the steamer I mingled with the passengers no more than was necessary to serve my purpose, for they were not sociable. Some seemed to regard me with curiosity, and one asked me the purpose of my trip. I traveled steerage, imagining that among the

steerage passengers I would gain more information than among those of the saloon. Among my fellow travelers were an architect, a lawyer and a clergyman, all in the employ of a very notable saloon passenger—Hon. Robber-van-Rent, in whose retinue they were traveling. The architect had been taken along to pick up ideas in Europe for the enlargement of his employer's mansion. Why he required his lawyer and chaplain I didn't ascertain.

In conversation with the architect one day he told me of his membership in the household of Hon. Mr. Van Rent. I asked him if his office were a lucrative one.

"Lucrative, in what way?" he asked, in return, visibly embarrassed.

I saw that I had touched a tender spot, so probed gently.

"Well," I said, "in England, for instance, a man invariably expects and receives some return in money or in kind—an equivalent, in fact—for the services he renders. Is not that your custom?"

"I receive no salary, if that is what you mean," he answered, curtly. "Neither for that matter does Hon. Robber-van-Rent for his services in congress. Neither do your M. P.'s, for I perceive that you are an Englishman."

"You are mistaken in your last assertion," I said; "our M. P.'s are now handsomely salaried, that the office may not be dependent upon a property qualification. In your case, doubtless," I resumed, probing, "the absence of a salary is made up to you in various ways. You are also, one can easily perceive, a person of distinction" (heaven forgive the lie), "and," looking sly, "there is doubtless patronage—ahem, contracts,—ahem!"

You see I had read about the extent to which the contract system had invaded all business in the United States toward the close of the nineteenth century, when it reached its baneful climax; how men holding high government positions would patriotically wave the flag with one hand, while dipping the other in the public treasury, in collusion with army contractors. How, by the contract system, the multi-millionaire was clothed by the starving sweatshop tailor, earning 15 cents a day. Such, I read, was the strange morality of that age, that taking contracts to sublet on margins was considered in no way dishonest; and it was perhaps with this idea uppermost in my mind that I ventured upon the subject as I did.

But I read my answer in his sullen failure to respond to my abandoned

suggestions. As a matter of fact, he and all the honorable's retinue, from chaplain to scullion, were veritable Caleb Balderstons, with this difference—they served, not from affection, but from compulsion.

This poor fellow, far from being a person of distinction, suffered even more from poverty than from pride. He received absolutely nothing but his maintenance. He dined at an upper table in the servants' hall—himself but an upper servant. He slept in a dormitory shared by many others. Though free from immediate apprehension, the yearly increasing poverty of the country ever kept before all the workers the dread of ultimate degradation to the government workshop.

Social caste had grown to extravagant excesses. The landlords recognized their social king, and invented titles for him who was the center of their innermost circle. Thence, like the annular ripple caused by the dropping of a pebble in still water, came the gradations, determined mainly in relation to territorial control, though some recognition was given to social worth, according to their peculiar standard or definition of it. There existed the strongest political unity between them all.

The workers, too, had their castes. Non-commissioned officers and privates in the army, and perhaps some minor court officers, came first; and all received a small salary. You see it was deemed, on general principles, and notwithstanding the insult of the salary, more honorable to kill than to produce. The rest of the workers had their petty castes, slightly recognized by their employers, but religiously guarded among themselves.

It seemed incredible that professors of divinity, architecture and law should be traveling as humble retainers; and I have since wondered why they had not escaped while in Europe, but perhaps they had left hostages behind. Of their professional capacity I could form no definite judgment, but they lacked something which I find it difficult to express, perhaps it was manly self-assertion, intelligence or mental backbone. There was great all-around deterioration, resulting doubtless from generations of utter dependence, poverty and lack of incentive. You are perhaps unaware—I was then—that not even the professions are carried on independently in the United States. Every industry and calling became syndicated, and then passed under government control except where individuals, such as my fellow travelers,

were specially retained, or rather owned, by the big landlords.

By being "owned," I mean that they received no return for their services, save their maintenance. Their condition is just enough of an improvement upon that of the government workers to make them fear dismissal; then outlawry, escape to a foreign country, or the government workshops, are their only alternatives.

My fellow travelers on board the steamer were very offish at first as to their own affairs, but later I wormed out of them their wretched slavery, for I can call it no less. I tell you, my heart sank as the old steamer neared New York, and I began to dread what was before me if I carried out my plans. I sickened of the atmosphere of stupid servility and flunkeyism. Even the delight of crossing the ocean, which usually exhilarates me beyond measure, did not counteract the depressing influences surrounding me, relieved solely by now and then rubbing up against one of the crew.

Well, with the exception of a gambling fracas between two saloon passengers, in which one shot the other dead, we reached New York without mishap, having taken ten days on the trip.

I think the reason we have such slow service to the United States is because the trade between the two countries amounts to very little. For their manufactures we have now no demand whatever; even their grain, no longer imported in large quantities, is used for inferior purposes only.

When the steerage passengers made their final appearance for leaving the steamer I was not much astonished to observe certain changes in their apparel, particularly remarking the frequency of neatly embroidered emblems called, I believe, coats-of-arms. These appeared on dress, denoting attachment in varying grades of service from professional man down to porter and valet.

There was, to me, considerable fun in the grave burlesque between the saloon passengers and the customhouse officers. Each saloon passenger had trunks galore, to each of which the customhouse officer affixed the cabalistic chalk mark, but not before performing obeisance to their owner. I learned later that as personal baggage relatively large quantities of European manufactures are imported; that this, moreover, is the only way by which they obtain entry, and that the customhouse officers dare not impose the tariff duty on such imports by accredited citizens.

But my mirth was soon turned to weeping, for my turn came at last. I was recognized as a foreigner unattached to any landlord, and their suave manner changed to insolence. My belongings were tumbled out and scattered around. It was the old story, only worse; and I was tempted to leave all in their possession, as I am sure that my fine amounted to nearly their full value; and had I known that my baggage would be of little use to me I assuredly would have abandoned it.

When I landed in New York I was at a loss what to do. To while away the moment I took a trolley car up town, and upon tendering my fare received my first intimation that all transportation is run by the government free of charge. My ride interested me. On one side was the river front; very picturesque, with its ruined wharves, only one here and there being maintained for use. On the other side at intervals were large government workshops, between which were deserted stores, markets and office buildings. The desolate saloons would have delighted the soul of a prohibitionist. A very tall office building stood a solitary ruin, partly covered with ivy.

The hotels and all public utilities were run by government, the latter without charge. Hotel charges were very low, and the restaurant and sleeping accommodations very inferior; it was difficult to get waited on, though there appeared to be scarcely any guests.

There was a certain melancholy charm about that quiet big desolate city, as I now recall it. The view from the window of my room embraced the harbor, and what had apparently once been the busiest section; and it seemed incredible that but few generations had elapsed since an enormous export and import trade thronged the harbors with vessels, and that the streets, now almost deserted, were once filled with busy crowds.

I had learned from one of my companions on the steamer that there were but three alternatives for me during my stay—to live, at a hotel, to be engaged by one of the landlords, or to enter one of the government workshops. The first would not afford me the actual insight and experience I had set out to obtain, so I determined to try the second, and, failing, to enter one of the workshops, trusting to luck to escape when I had had enough.

So I cut my meditations short, and, after a midday luncheon, visited L—, one of the most extensive estates in the district.

Entering the gates and walking through the park I came upon a group of workers, who had evidently been awakened by my approach. They had been engaged in mowing a field of timothy, and, in spite of their picket, I had taken them unawares. They saw at once that I was a false alarm, so to speak, threw down their scythes and renewed their noontide nap, their two sleepy pickets mounting guard as before.

At another place a stone bridge was being thrown together over a small stream in such manner and with such shallow foundations that I could with certainty predict that it would be undermined by the water within a year. The cement they were using was poor and air-slacked, and they were eking it out with mud in consequence of the supply running short. I stood and watched the men for a few minutes, unobserved by them. Their manner of working was to me a revelation. These men were not only born tired, thought I, but evidently also without brains available for use on demand.

Upon arriving at the mansion I was informed that the controlling genius of the forlorn estate was away—was, I learned, rarely in this country, but I was granted an interview with his under-secretary.

I told him that I desired employment as an engineer, and was proceeding to acquaint him with my qualifications, when he rudely cut me short by saying that there was no chance for me there, that they were already overburdened with worthless employes, and that I might as well save myself further trouble by at once entering the government employ.

"But," I persisted, "the estate seems to be suffering from inefficient supervision," and I related to him what I had witnessed during my walk through the park. "How is it," I continued, "that with any amount of labor at your command, and without cost to you save its maintenance, your park is so ill-tended and forlorn?"

"Because," he shouted, "we have a lot of low-down, lying and sneaking thieves for workers!"

"But," I returned, tacitly indorsing his condemnation and including himself therein, "the conditions I describe are general. Don't you think, now, that if workers were better fed and cared for, and, pardon me, for the suggestion must appear to you wildly revolutionary, if they were awarded a wage or a bribe, call it what you will—don't you think it would act as a stimulant, and not only result in a greater amount of

effective labor, but also improve its quality?"

The under-secretary flushed angrily during the speech.

"Wages," he shrieked, as soon as I ceased; "what these beggars need as a stimulant is a bludgeon, a flogging, or a dose of lead. Why, they once preached against the 'wage system,' as they called it; and now they've got what they wanted they're not content!"

"How strange," I mildly rejoined. "In England, now, workmen obtain wages according to their skill and productiveness; in fact, they themselves, from manager to messenger, absolutely control and run all our manufacturing enterprises. There is, moreover, such high reward for merit, that we consider the substitution of such brutalizing and stupid methods as starvation, robbery and murder as idiotic."

While concluding this little speech I bowed myself out of the room, and did not await the result of the apoplectic fit whose approach, I perceived, was fast extinguishing Mr. Secretary's small spark of intelligence.

There is, in fact, a total lack of incentive to effort on all sides; on the part of the workers because immunity from chastisement is their only reward, and on the part of the landlords because to produce any worthy results under such an inverted system would demand too stupendous an output of energetic administrative ability of a high order, and such a characteristic this class, holding control by a system of robbery, has long ceased to possess. They feel, too, securely installed in absolute control, and do not possess intelligence to perceive that the blight of deterioration is eating their crops, wasting their estates and rendering worthless their manufactures.

I called on landlords for three successive days with similar results. Their places were miserably kept up, simply for lack of brains to direct and appoint, and energy and incentive to properly carry out. I more than suspected that no capable individual stays in that country, and, in spite of there being a relatively small number of men absolutely owning everything in sight, the landlords were miserably poor in everything dependent upon faithful service and skilled labor. (And what is not so dependent?)

During these peregrinations I had, as you may imagine, obtained a pretty good insight into the domestic economy of these honorables. So according to instructions which I had received, I repaired one morning to the state industrial bureau of New York, where, as a result of an attempted examination as

to my engineering ability, I was assigned to a workshop. I was also given a letter to the superintendent, and with it my citizenship papers, conferring the right to vote.

Though workers have never been legally disfranchised they do not to-day avail themselves of the voting privilege. This fact recalls sad pages of history. In the past, when labor unions were in existence and labor retained a semblance of independence, false and alluring political issues were raised and bribery and trickery were openly and shamelessly resorted to. These influences, you can easily imagine, made ineffective the small number of honest, intelligent and courageous voters. Then upon some specious plea the secret ballot was abolished; upon another the privacy of men's political views and intentions was violated. At last military despotism and terrorism, inspired of course by landlord influence, made ineffective the casting of any ballots whatever; and now, for all practical purposes, voting might be abolished. Workers never attempt to exercise that privilege; they dare not.

"SPERO MELIORA."

To be concluded in the next Public.

Somewhere about the end of the summer of 1861 a negro woman walked on Pennsylvania avenue in Washington. She carried a negro baby in her arms, and by her side trotted two negro lads, clinging to her cheap calico dress. She was mumbling in a semi-whine:

"Nigger has always been slave, and nigger will always be slave; it's no use."

The hopeless words of that wretched woman had hardly escaped her lips when at the other end of the avenue resounded the martial music of the first regiment that came to the front; while she was bemoaning the sad fate of her race, her ears were struck by the notes that heralded its deliverance.—Truth and Freedom.

Mamma—They would take fencing lessons; but I don't approve of it! I don't think fencing is necessary for young ladies!

The Professor—Certainly not, madame! If eet were a mere necessity, madame would be right to deespise eet; but it ees an accomplishment, a luxury!—Puck.

If the street railway tracks were the undisputed property of the city, as the pavement is, and subject like the pavement to the use of anyone who would put on it trolley or storage battery cars, automobiles, compressed air vehicles, wagons or hacks, how long would there be any franchise problem?

Or, if it were deemed necessary to limit the use of such tracks and the right to use them were leased for two, three or five year periods to the bidders offering the lowest fare, what would become of those problems?—Pittsburgh Dispatch.

Those to whom we of this generation are most deeply indebted for all that is highly prized in political and religious liberty were mostly in their own time rebels against what was considered their rightful government, were in their day, and somewhat later, often stigmatized as guilty of atrocious crimes against society in general. The progress of the world—nay more, the maintenance of so much liberty as has been gained—depends to-day no less than at any earlier period upon a keen observation of the operations of authority, and firm resistance to its encroachments. We are mostly too inert; too slow to move; we are even prone to condemn rather than to support the first who refuse continued submission to what we have too long borne with pusillanimous patience. It should not for an instant be lost sight of that the prime object of the maintenance of law and order is the preservation of the liberty and security of the individual, not the upholding of authority. An appearance of tranquillity and order may consist with the prevalence of odious despotism.—Alden S. Huling, in *The Farmers' Voice*.

First Reformer—"I suppose you are in favor of the movement for a single tax?"

Second Reformer—"I have taken a position much in advance of that. I am in favor of having no tax at all."—*The Transcript*, Boston.

The man, whether street car magnate or other, who approaches an alderman or legislator with a proposal to betray the people is an anarchist and should be so considered. Our present criminal code is far too lenient toward such. The punishment should be as much

death as for any other kind of treason. Do not be startled at the suggestion that bribery of public officers should be made a capital offense. Is not murder of a community or state or nation worse than murder of an individual?—Des Moines (Ia.) Leader.

"What is the meaning of 'sic'?" It seems to be used frequently to call attention to grammatical and other errors."

"That's right. It's a Latin word meaning 'get on to the grammar—or spelling.'"—Puck.

I never loved a Bahr-Ghazel,  
To glad me with its nice White Nile,  
But when I came to know it well  
It proved a British crocodile!  
—L. F. Austin, in the *Illustrated London News*.

## FRIENDS

of this paper are requested to send us the names and addresses of persons of their acquaintance who would be interested in reading it regularly.

## The Public Leaflets.

From time to time THE PUBLIC will reproduce, in pamphlet form suitable for mailing in open envelopes at the one-cent rate of postage, the editorial articles of permanent interest that appear in its columns. These pamphlets will be supplied upon the following terms:

Single copies, delivered at office, . . . \$0.02  
Quantities delivered at office, per 100, . . . 1.00  
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, .03  
Single copies mailed to any address, postage paid, upon orders for 100 or more, per 100, 2.00  
In quantities, mailed in bulk to one address, postage paid, per 100, . . . 1.25

The following pamphlets are now ready:

1. *A Business Tendency* (from THE PUBLIC of September 10, 1898).
2. *That Favorable Balance of Trade* (from THE PUBLIC of October 22, 1898).
3. *Nero-Then*, by E. J. Salisbury (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).
4. *Department Stores* (from THE PUBLIC of November 12, 1898).

## The Public

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filling.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 622,  
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 667, Chicago, Ill.

## God Winning Us.

BY

REV. CLARENCE LATHBUR.

Price, 40 cents.

Some of its chapters are:

GOD ACCOMMODATING HIMSELF TO US . . . . . (Incarnation)  
GOD WINNING US . . . . . (Atonement)  
GOD OPENING OUR EYES . . . . . (Faith)  
GOD GROWING IN US . . . . . (Regeneration)  
GOD ACTING THROUGH US . . . . . (Religion)  
GOD CARING FOR US . . . . . (Providence)

SWEDENBORG PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,  
GERMANTOWN, PA

tf