

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1904.

Number 306.

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 page.

The beginning of a bloody war and the reports of a destructive fire, fill men's minds with conflicting emotions. They are stunned by the vast destruction of property in Baltimore, as but recently they were appalled at the awful loss of life in Chicago—accidental occurrences, both—while they face a savage prize-fight in the Orient, in which, not by accident but by design, there is to be an incomparably vaster destruction of property than at Baltimore and an enormously greater sacrifice of human life than at Chicago. To describe the emotions which these events engender would necessitate a descriptive catalogue of almost every human passion. We can only classify them as coldly selfish, thoughtlessly sentimental, or rationally just, and pass on.

From the overshadowing bigness of these events to the littleness of a municipal election in a Western city seems a very far cry; yet there is that in the approaching municipal election at Chicago which is prophetic of greater things in human history than the accidental destruction of Baltimore property (which, vast as it is, human labor will quickly reproduce), or the deliberate destructiveness of the Russian war in Asia. Once more (vol. v, p. 11) in Chicago the people themselves, upon their own initiative, are to be consulted, not merely upon their preference among candidates for office, but directly upon questions of public policy. This is the highest and most effective form of democracy.

As it gains ground, wars will have to be abandoned and even holocausts will be prevented. That sounds like a large claim for democracy. But when it is considered that holocausts are due to public policies which cause the congestive building that a democracy trained in voting on principles and policies would insist upon relieving, and that wars are but deadly games in which the common people are thought of only as pawns to be sacrificed for kings and queens and bishops and jackass knights,—when these considerations are taken into account, the approaching referendum in Chicago can nowhere be fairly regarded as a little thing. If little its littleness is only as that of the grain of wheat, in which are all the potentialities of pampas of waving grain.

It was no light work to set in motion the present cumbrous machinery for securing the Chicago referendum. When the Illinois legislature passed the referendum law it did so grudgingly and with a proviso which was intended and supposed to be a sufficient handicap to make the law a dead letter. This proviso required the signatures of 25 per cent. of the voters of any city as a condition of allowing the people of that city to vote directly on a question of public policy. In consequence, the leaders in the present movement were compelled to secure the enormous number of 93,310 signatures. Nor that alone. They were absolutely without newspaper aid, excepting only Hearst's two papers, the Examiner and the American. Every other local paper was gagged by the influence of the local traction interests, against the unrighteous demands of which this referendum is leveled. For their successful work against these odds, those leaders

are entitled to the most cordial commendation; and in the distribution of special praise it would be churlish not to include the Hearst papers. Not only has the full quota of 93,310 signatures been secured, but there is a surplus of 37,937—the total number filed being 131,247.

The questions thereby required to be submitted to popular vote at the municipal election in April are as follows:

1. Shall the city council, upon the adoption of the Mueller law, proceed without delay to acquire ownership of the street railways under the powers conferred by the Mueller law?

2. Shall the city council, instead of granting any franchises, proceed at once, under the city's police powers and other existing laws, to license the street railway companies until municipal ownership can be secured, and compel them to give satisfactory service?

3. Should the Chicago board of education be elected by the people?

There will, therefore, come directly before the people of Chicago at the Spring election three questions relative to municipal ownership of the local street car system. Two are quoted above; the third will be on the adoption of the Mueller law (p. 458), the enabling act on the subject of municipal ownership. The vote on the former will be advisory only, but the latter will be mandatory. That is to say, if the latter question receives a majority vote in the affirmative, the Mueller law will thereupon go into operation in Chicago; but a majority vote either way on the other two questions will not bind the city council.

There are good reasons for believing, however, that an advisory vote in the affirmative will operate with the city councilmen as in the nature of imperative instructions. Not the least among these reasons is the fact that the mere

filing of the petition, with its 137,000 signatures, resulted in the disruption of the traction committee of the council, which, until then, the local traction interests had held well in hand. Under the influence of those interests, the Mueller bill had been colored to suit, in its passage through the legislature. Under their influence the city council had held back from presenting the Mueller law to the people for acceptance until whipped into doing it by popular demonstrations of unmistakable significance. Under their influence a "tentative ordinance," giving those interests another 20-years' franchise, with a vice-like grip on 20 years more, or 40 altogether, had been concocted in secret. Under their influence the committee had actually agreed to this whole ordinance in secret sessions, and then invited the public to discuss in open session the solitary question of the amount of compensation. Under their influence this "tentative ordinance" was about to be rushed through the committee and the council, when the filing of the huge petition startled the acquiescent committeemen out of their comatose condition and inspired them to break away from the two or three "business men" members who were dominating the committee. It is now evident that the "tentative ordinance" is tentatively dead. Let it be hoped that its demise may prove to be absolute.

That will depend upon the vote next Spring. If a pronounced majority for immediate public ownership is cast, the city officials and their professional counsel may be depended upon to make the same vigorous fight against the local street car capitalists that they are making against the Philadelphia outfit. If, however, the vote on these questions goes the other way, then the city's representatives will be justified in reviving their interrupted arrangements with the local company. This fight is between the people on one side and the street car monopolists on the other. If the people vote with

the monopolists, now that the issue is squarely presented to them, their instructions should be obeyed.

A bombshell has fallen into the camp of the alert tax-dodger who would still further lighten his own burdens by taxing street car riders by the poll through a system of "compensation" from street car companies for the use of the streets. This bombshell is in the form of a judicial opinion in an Elevated railroad case, rendered on the 8th by Murray F. Tuley, one of the oldest of Illinois judges, and among the most respected as man, lawyer and judge. As Judge Tuley's judicial fame is national and the point he so ably argues affects most if not all American cities, we quote from his opinion:

I am strongly inclined to the opinion that the city is without power, even by the joint action of the mayor and aldermen, to sell or barter away any franchise in the public streets for a compensation to be paid into the city treasury. While the city has the fee, it does not own the street as an individual owns his own property. It holds the fee and the control of the streets as a trustee for the public, and in its control of the streets its ownership is subordinate to its duties as a trustee. It is not a trustee for the inhabitants of the city, but it is a trustee for the public use. By the public use is meant the people of the whole State. The city as a public trustee is subject to the rule applied to all trustees, whether individuals or corporations, and that is, that a trustee cannot control trust property for his or its own benefit. The city has power to exact a reasonable license fee for compensation for the extra cost it may be put to, and the supervision and the use of the street, but it cannot speculate or make money for its treasury or its taxpayers out of its exercise of the power to control the public streets as a trustee for the public.

If the committee of the Chicago Citizens' Association for the suppression of crime intended to reflect upon the Chicago Federation of Labor by somewhat ostentatiously inviting its cooperation at a time when gentlemen of the same class are trying to indict its officers regardless of evidence—and that is what the Federation members have suspected—the Federation certainly handed back a Roland for the Oliver it re-

ceived. Among other things in its reply the Federation said:

The one thing that strikes us as peculiar in your movement is that your organization has existed for the past 36 years and that within the past ten years to our newspaper knowledge thousands of persons have been held up and scores of them wounded and killed, yet your organization betrayed no signs of life until a "millionaire lawyer and business man" fell victim.

Then, after expressing its willingness to cooperate in any movement aimed at suppressing the crimes of the rich as well as those of the poor, the Federation pointedly suggested—

as a necessary move in view of our city's present financial condition, that you go after the tax-dodging individual millionaires and corporations who are continually demanding police protection while shifting the burden of taxation on their poorer fellow citizens. The first important step in this direction is to insist upon compliance with the law requiring the publication of the complete list of real estate tax assessments, including descriptions of property taxed, valuation and name of owner. If this law were complied with every real estate tax dodger would be detected easily, and the city would be sure of enough revenue to increase the police force, perfect the fire department and pay our school-teachers.

In that declaration the Federation struck home. If the city were properly policed, vulgar crime could be suppressed. It cannot be properly policed because it lacks funds. It lacks funds because the class of which the anti-crime committee is largely composed devote their abilities and influence to the work of relieving their monopoly investments from taxation. The natural communal income of Chicago increases every year in consequence of the city's growth, but most of this income is appropriated to private use by the very classes who organize anti-crime committees for the pursuit of lesser though more violent offenders against public order and common rights.

The criticism of the Federation of Labor is reported to have had a salutary effect upon the Citizens' Association. "Instead of tending to strain the relations between the anti-crime committee

and the Federation," says a newspaper report, "it was declared that the censure and criticism of the members of the latter organization would have the effect of clarifying the atmosphere and bringing the two closer together in the movement for universal law and order." There is truly a hopeful ring about that. But the resulting letter of the Association to the county commissioners is not reassuring. It is reported as follows:

On behalf of the Citizens' Association of Chicago, I wish to urge upon your honorable body the publication of the real estate assessment list, including valuations, description of property and names of owners. It is the view of the Citizens' Association that inasmuch as the law provides for such publication its requirements should be fully complied with.

Considering that the county commissioners are required by the law to do what this Association demurely requests, the Association "sings small" indeed.

At the recent meeting of the Illinois committee of the Democratic party, Mr. James H. Eckels appeared with a proxy, and made a speech. One of the papers reported him as saying in this speech that—

the Democrats who voted for Weaver and others are dead and in hell.

A denial of the use of this language was hardly necessary. Mr. Eckels has not the personal manners of a blackguard. It has been denied, however, by Mr. Eckels himself, who makes an explanation which goes to show that he may possibly have been guilty of a worse offense than blackguardly manners. He says:

That which I did say was, "I have no quarrel with Mr. Bryan, but why have his friends the right to dictate the Democratic nomination when their candidate voted for J. B. Weaver and did not vote the Democratic ticket?" At this point I was interrupted, and somebody in the rear of the hall called out about the issues of 1896 and 1900, and I replied: "Those are past issues, dead, damned in hell. Let us turn to the living for what the Democracy may be in this year of our Lord.

Mr. Eckels's opinion of political is-

suess, past or present, is of little importance except as it reflects the views of the bi-partisan group of financiers to which he belongs. But his assertion that Mr. Bryan "bolted" the Democratic ticket when he voted for Weaver instead of Cleveland in 1892 is made either in ignorance of the truth or in defiance of it.

Mr. Bryan's explanation of the circumstances to which Mr. Eckels either ignorantly or mendaciously alludes, has been recently published, accompanied by proof. Mr. Bryan writes:

In 1892, many Democrats in Nebraska voted for the Weaver electors at the request of the Democratic national committee. That request was delivered in a confidential letter sent out by James E. Boyd, then governor of the State of Nebraska, and since then one of the prominent members of the gold contingent. Gov. Boyd's letter follows:

"Lincoln, Neb., Oct. 17, 1892.—(Personal and confidential.)—Dear Sir: I have just returned from the East where I was honored by a consultation with the national committee and leading men of our party, with regard to the best policy to be pursued in Nebraska this fall in dealing with the electoral ticket; and they agreed with me that the wisest course would be for Democrats to support the Weaver electors; the object being to take Nebraska out of her accustomed place in the Republican column. Information has reached me that a number of Independents who were formerly Republicans contemplate voting for the Harrison electors. With the Republican strength thus augmented it would be impossible for the Democrats to carry their own electors' ticket to victory. It is therefore the part of good judgment and wise action for Democrats to support the Weaver electors in as large numbers as possible. For Democrats to do this is no abandonment of principle; on the contrary, it is a definite step toward victory, and the ultimate triumph of Cleveland and Stevenson, and the principles they represent.

Thus it appears beyond dispute that Mr. Bryan's so-called "bolt" was made by request of the highest authority in the Democratic party, and through the medium of the very faction that did "bolt" four years later. That the arrangement Gov. Boyd mentions had been made by the national committee was so well known in New York at the time, that it is hardly possible Mr. Eckels should not have heard of it.

This arrangement was not confined to Nebraska. It was the committee's general policy with reference to Republican States which had become Populistic. In

Colorado (vol. v, p. 258) the Democratic convention nominated Weaver electors, and the minority left the hall and nominated a straight Democratic ticket. The national committee thereupon instructed the State committee of Colorado to ignore the action of the minority and to put the Weaver electors on the Democratic ballot. A similar course was followed by the national committee with reference to Nevada. Here is the story as related a year or more ago by W. L. Knox, a lawyer of Reno, Nevada. Referring to the above-described action in Colorado, Mr. Knox writes:

I will call your attention to my own State, Nevada, where this wise policy was pursued, and its vote cast for Weaver, when, had a different policy been carried out, its vote would have gone to the Republican candidate. After the nomination at Chicago in 1892, the member for Nevada of the Democratic National Committee, R. P. Keating, and other leaders of the party, had a conference with Mr. Cleveland, and knowing that there was no hope of carrying the State of Nevada for the Democratic candidates, it was arranged that an effort should be made to carry it for Weaver, who was very strong in the State. It was also agreed that Democrats should not lose status in the party in consequence of their voting for the Populist candidates, but should be considered in good standing and eligible to appointment to office. The Democratic State Central Committee of Nevada, by a vote of 18 to 9, voted not to put a Democratic electoral ticket in the field, but the minority revolted and met as a State Central Committee and nominated an electoral ticket. It received less than 7 per cent. of the votes, to 66 per cent. for Weaver and 26 for Harrison. After the inauguration in 1893 Mr. Cleveland inclined to repudiate the arrangement entered into before election, and to consider only the claims of those Democrats who voted for the Cleveland electors. It required some vigorous remonstrances from Wm. C. Whitney, who was a party to the arrangement, to induce Cleveland to keep his word. He did eventually appoint to office in Nevada some Democrats who had voted for the Populist candidate; but he also appointed some of the "bolters" whose factious opposition endangered the movement to carry the State against the Republicans. R. P. Keating is dead, but these facts are known to many prominent Democrats of Nevada. I think J. W. Adams, ex-governor of Nevada, was one of the persons present with Keating when the conference was had with Cleveland and Whitney in 1892.

Mr. Cleveland was more responsive to the pledge with reference to Oregon. There, too (vol. v, p. 322), the same arrangement was made. Harrison got only 3 of the 4 electoral votes of Oregon. Weaver got the other. Harrison would have lost all four had the arrangement been fully carried out. But orders did not come from the national committee until the Democratic electors had been chosen. When they came, one of the electors, R. O. Miller, obeyed by resigning in favor of the Populist. But the other three refused to resign. They were beaten at the polls, while the Populist was elected. The three recalcitrants got no political rewards from Mr. Cleveland. But Mr. Miller, he who had resigned in favor of the Weaver man, was faithfully rewarded by Mr. Cleveland with the registership of the Oregon city land office.

In view of these facts, which none of the Bryan haters dispute, would it not be the part of decency for them to cease their clamor about Bryan as a "bolter"? They cannot be ignorant of the truth of the matter, and one dislikes to draw the only other inference. If they wish to defend their own "bolt," well and good. "Bolting" is not a crime, though over anxiety on the part of "bolters" to boss the organization from which they "bolt" is not the best of form. Let them revel bravely in the enjoyment of their own "bolt;" but in the name of all that is manly, not to say veracious, let them stop apologizing for themselves by calling Bryan "another" when he isn't.

Another of the malicious slants at Bryan relates to the bequest by his friend Bennett, of New Haven. Envious politicians and boozy editors find in this episode an excuse for senseless attack. Yet the facts, perfectly well known to all who care to know them, wholly relieve Bryan from everything but the malice of those who hate him for the good morals he teaches.

His own statement succinctly and truly presents all the facts:

Philo S. Bennett died, leaving an estate valued at about \$300,000. He bequeathed \$100,000 to his widow, who is past 60 years of age and without children. He allowed her more than the Connecticut law requires. He left \$30,000 to a sister of about the same age. He left \$28,000 to a half-brother. He left about \$30,000 to various colleges and charitable institutions in New Haven. He left me \$50,000, with a suggestion as to its division. He left \$30,000 to be distributed, \$20,000 by me and \$10,000 by Mrs. Bryan, among colleges and charitable institutions. He left to other relatives and friends an amount over \$80,000. Had I accepted the \$50,000 direct, as he requested, there could have been no contest, but I told him that perhaps the time would come when I would not need the sum. He then gave me the alternative of distributing it among institutions as I saw fit. He left a letter of instructions accordingly for his widow.

While the will was written at my house, it was not signed by him until he reached New York, 1,500 miles away, where he signed it in the presence of witnesses summoned by himself. He placed it in a vault, where it lay three years and a half, during which time he could have altered it had he seen fit. During that time he was constantly with relatives and friends, while I saw him only once or twice a year. He felt that I could accomplish more toward the public work in which I am engaged if I wrote and lectured without compensation, whereas it is necessary to me at present to receive compensation. I am willing that my political opponents shall have the facts, but it is only fair that they should state the facts.

Another illustration of the necessary disintegration of trusts not thoroughly grounded in monopoly is afforded by the glass trust. This combination finds that its large aggregation of detail work has reached a point at which the trust is uneconomical. So the constituent properties are leased to separate companies for independent management. That is the beginning of the end of the glass trust.

Extraordinary almost beyond belief is the explanation President Hadly, of Yale, is reported to have made for declining to join in the Panama memorial (p. 641) of several of his colleagues. This memorial was a protest, in the name of international law and

morals, against President Roosevelt's conduct relative to the secession of Panama. Mr. Hadly did not sign it, and was supposed to have been absent. But here is his explanation as vouched for editorially by the Philadelphia Public Ledger:

I was unwilling to call attention to a point important in itself, but injurious to the party with which, on the whole, I was anxious to vote.

A land speculator of Chicago predicts a "famine in lots." Why predict what Chicago already has? Anything which is so scarce that, although it costs nothing, it commands a high price, has reached the famine stage; and that is the truth about Chicago lots.

Is that highly civilized mob of the superior race in Mississippi, which burned a Negro and his wife at the stake last week, to be considered as another missionary society for the regulation of Negro morals? Or will law-respecting people be graciously allowed to regard its members as the cowardly and cruel assassins they really are? The race question is so complex and subtle that one is never quite sure whether a crime is a crime or not when its victims are Negroes.

Where was President Roosevelt when the last American flag in Cuba was hauled down? How brief the time since he assured an applauding audience of jingoes that the American flag will never be hauled down from any place where it has once been put up! What did he mean? Or didn't he mean anything? Or if he did mean something, why does he make an exception of Cuba? Maybe Mr. Roosevelt is something of a demagogue.

Is it true that "order is Heaven's first law?" Not if coercive order is meant. Order in the sense of harmony is, indeed, Heaven's first law, but coercion is not harmony. The first law of Heaven is equity. Coercive order is the first law of Hell.

SOME RECENT INDUSTRIAL HISTORY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

That speculative land value is the underlying cause of the reverse industrial movement now in progress is attested, consciously or unconsciously, by every well-informed and intelligent chronicler of recent and current trade phenomena. The industrial history of the last half dozen years cannot be written without demonstrating that the prevailing system of taxation, which fosters this speculation, is the germ of monopoly, the chief impediment to independent enterprise, the insurmountable bar to scientific distribution of wealth, and, as such, the generator of frightfully wasteful conflicts between "capital and labor."

The general press comment upon the situation fairly bristles with evidences of this fact, the more important, where free from any purpose of pointing out the fundamental economic significance of the stated facts. The Iron Trade Review, of Jan. 21, 1904, for instance, contains two editorials crammed with historic citations of phenomena that clamorously proclaim their source in inequitable taxation:

In one of these editorials, comment is made upon the policy of maintaining "steady" prices on rails, shapes and plates, and the assertion is made that general prosperity has never existed in the iron and steel trade of the United States without the foundation of a large rail trade; and the inference from the writer's comment is that a diminished price would induce buying, and thus furnish such foundation. In support of this position he states that—

One of the foundation stones of the great boom of 1899 was undoubtedly the large tonnage of steel which the railroad business took out of the general market. One of the causes of the hesitancy in business in 1900, and of the final slump in prices, was unquestionably the high price for rails which the rail pool had fixed. The dissolution of the rail pool in the early part of 1897 caused a jump of nearly 50 per cent. in rail production in one year, and finally put the iron industry on its feet. The panic of 1893 had been followed by efforts on the part of the rail mills to maintain the price of \$28 and then at

\$23, and there were lean years until the effort was abandoned.

Those are plain statements of historic facts, a sequential re-statement of which would be: Following the panic of '93, the monopoly ("pool") arbitrarily suspended the law of competition, producing lean business, until the element of competition was permitted to resume its function, which caused, during the year '97, a jump of nearly 50 per cent. in rail production, and finally put the iron industry on its feet. Competitive prices induced large buying, contributing to the boom of '99. Now, again, the monopoly ("pool") fixed arbitrary high prices, causing hesitancy in business during the year 1900, and final slump in prices. The monopoly is now preventing business by means of holding prices at the top figure that has prevailed "during the period of remarkable prosperity which has just ended."

Throughout this period, of which the foregoing is an epitomized history, the crushing, business-depressing power of monopoly is strikingly contrasted over against the prosperity-making influences of competition, when the latter is permitted even a partial chance to operate.

From another editorial in the same issue of the same paper the following may be quoted:

The boom in the coke trade and the resultant demand for good coking coal caused a tremendous increase in acreage values and thousands of acres were purchased at prices four and five times as great as were paid in 1898. . . . Rather than meet the open competition and low prices of some of the independent operators, the Frick company proposes to let its cvens remain idle, thereby conserving its natural resources until prices can be secured giving a fair profit on the investment.

So extensive are the acreage holdings of the H. C. Frick Coke Company that all other concerns are quite naturally designated, several times over, in the editorial under discussion, as "the independent operators."

And so, because speculative land values have risen, within a short period, under the stimulus of industrial prosperity, to four and five times those of 1898 (only six years ago), a large part of the country's most valuable coke re-

sources is to be arbitrarily withheld from access until competitive industry shall have once more produced (in spite of the tremendous handicap that partial monopoly puts upon it), a wave of prosperity that will enable monopoly to extort a "fair profit" on capitalized speculative values!

What is "conserving natural resources" but shutting the public from them? And why does this great concern "conserve its natural resources," thus withholding from the industrial world a basic necessity of its life? Because it proposes to make a "fair profit" on the speculative land values that it has paid for.

The steel monopoly owns, according to Mr. Carnegie, a 60-year supply of ore in the ground; and it is this ownership of "natural resources" that enables it to hold up the public by compelling it to pay in the price of steel a profit on speculative land values, or suffer general business depression for want of free access to the source of industrial life.

Those two editorials in the Iron Trade Review reveal (unintentionally, no doubt, but therefore the more impressive) the fact that inequitable taxation enables a few individuals to determine the industrial fortunes of society. For if speculative land values were checked by taxation, the withholding of vast areas of mineral lands from use would be ruinous to the owners instead of profitable, as now, and society would thus at all times have free access to the most valuable natural resources, without paying tribute to any individual for the privilege.

Another deeply significant statement in the editorials referred to is, that "the argument then (the lean period following the panic of '93), was that, as buying power was limited a reduction of prices would not produce business"—a very frank recognition of the fact that prices were whatsoever monopoly chose to make them. The stupid shallowness of "the argument" was revealed, however, when the "dissolution of the rail pool. . . caused a jump of nearly 50 per cent. in rail production in one year, and finally put the iron industry on its feet."

Deeply significant, too, is the

statement that: "There was open competition and a very moderate price when the railroads bought their 1899 rails, and they bought with the greatest liberality; there was no competition and a very high price when the time came for buying their 1900 rails, and they bought most sparingly." That is to say: Industry thrives under competition and languishes under monopoly.

And what are we going to do about it? The position of the monopolist with regard to the question is fairly expressed in the characteristic imprecation: "The public be damned!" How would it answer for the public to see to it that the monopolists be taxed?

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Washington, D. C., Feb. 6.—Perhaps there is no subject so interesting in connection with the composition of the Democratic membership of the House as that of determining what has influenced their identification with the party. Of course, it is a truism to say that there are Democrats and Democrats, but this is not sufficiently descriptive. One of the most striking illustrations of the difficulty of apportioning some members as belonging to the plutocratic-Democrats or the democratic-Democrats is that of a gentleman now serving his fourth term and who has been mayor of a large Western city. Monday being District of Columbia day, there were a number of minor bills up for consideration, among them one to regulate Turkish bath establishments, with a provision for an annual license fee of \$25. Another made the docking of horses tails a crime and prohibited docked horses being brought into the District of Columbia. I asked this gentleman how he stood on the bill to license Turkish bath establishments. He said:

"Oh! I am in favor of that. They ought to pay a license just the same as any other business."

I replied: "True, just the same as any other business, but why any business? Have not people an inherent right to sell groceries and dry goods and to sell Turkish bath service?"

Later, I asked him his attitude towards the "docking bill." He said:

"Oh! I am against that! I don't think the government has a right to interfere with such things."

To this I replied: "Your attitude is to my mind most extraordinary! Here you are advocating interference with those things which are entirely proper and which every man has an inherent right to do, but when a measure is

proposed which says that people shall not be cruel, that they shall be prohibited from engaging in a cruel practice, you say it is an "invasion of their rights."

He confessed to not having regarded the matter from that standpoint before. Yet he is forceful, and I am convinced he is aggressively honest, and justly has the respect of every man in the House.

One of the curious episodes of the Fifty-eighth Congress happened on the 4th. A Democratic member desired to incorporate into the Record a letter addressed to him together with speeches delivered by another member some years previous. Not desiring to take up the time of the House by having them read from the clerk's desk he had arranged with the gentlemen controlling the time on both sides that he should have time to ask permission to insert these documents in the Record as an extension of remarks on the floor. Being recognized, he asked, without any preliminary remarks, for unanimous consent to so insert. A member at once said: "Mr. Chairman, that can't be done; the gentleman hasn't made any remarks."

"Oh! yes he has," replied the chairman; "he said: 'Mr. Chairman.'"

Thereupon the member who had said "Mr. Chairman," and nothing more, got the permission to "extend his remarks."

The only thing that prevented the reporters from making fun of the incident was the fact that a week before this member had made an extemporaneous speech of about 20 minutes' duration on the same subject. Otherwise they would undoubtedly have "guyed" him as the man whose speech consisted of the two words—"Mr. Chairman."

Perhaps no more ridiculous plea was ever advanced by a party leader than that of Congressman Dalzell, when, on behalf of the committee on rules, he brought in a resolution empowering the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, F. S. Degetau, to sit in the House with all the rights of a Delegate from a Territory. Upon Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, insisting that legislation should be enacted providing for the election of a delegate from Porto Rico, and conferring a Territorial government upon that island, Mr. Dalzell said that while such a measure would probably have the unanimous approval of the House, its defeat in the Senate was a foregone conclusion; that the Senate would almost certainly amend it out of all shape and substance as they had done in the last Congress.

To this Mr. Williams very properly replied: "You can't scare us with your bogey of an intractable Senate! The Senate is Republican, and the party is as much responsible for the

Senate as for the majority in this House."

Nevertheless the will of the people, as evidenced in the previous unanimous vote of the House is nullified. Yet we call the system that produces such a condition "popular" government.

ROBERT BAKER.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Feb. 11.

The war cloud which has for several months been hanging over Russia and Japan (p. 646) has burst at last, and deadly hostilities have begun.

To understand the cause of this war we must go back to the war between Japan and China (vol. i, No. 1, p. 10; vol. iv, p. 711) in 1894-95. Coming out of that conflict triumphant, Japan demanded as one of the fruits of victory the cession by China to her of portions of the Liaotung peninsula (on the southern extremity whereof Port Arthur is situated), of which she had come into possession through the fortunes of war. China was helpless to object, but Russia interfered, and with the support of France and Germany forced Japan to relinquish possession. Japan accordingly withdrew in 1896. In 1898 she joined Russia in an agreement acknowledging Corea (which occupies a larger peninsula between Japan and the Liaotung peninsula, and which had been under Chinese suzerainty), as an independent power. But Japan has never abandoned her ambition to secure a foothold upon the Asiatic mainland, nor has Russia receded from her manifest policy of extensive dominion in northeastern China.

Pursuant to her policy Russia promptly sent a fleet to Port Arthur, and in accordance with concessions from the Chinese government a Russian military force took formal possession (vol. i, No. 1, p. 10) on the 28th of March, 1898. When the "Boxer" troubles broke out in China (vol. iv, p. 441), all the powers, including Russia and Japan, united for the ostensible purpose of restoring order. But Russia, on pretense of protecting her frontiers bordering upon Manchuria (of which the Liaotung

peninsula, with Port Arthur at the southern extremity, is part), carried on a supplementary movement by herself in that province; and at the close of the "Boxer" troubles, and while restoration negotiations were under way between China and all the Powers, the Russians established (vol. iii, p. 617) a Manchurian protectorate,—an exercise of authority over the Chinese province which she has ever since asserted.

Objections made by Great Britain and the United States, as well as by Japan, evoked from Russia, early in 1901, the following assurance (vol. iii, p. 775):

As soon as lasting order shall have been established in Manchuria and indispensable measures taken for the protection of railway construction, which, according to formal agreement, China assured, Russia will not fail to recall her troops from these territories of the neighboring empire, provided the action of other Powers does not place any obstacle in the way of such a measure.

Notwithstanding this assurance, Russia immediately sought by diplomacy to secure further concessions from China relative to the Manchurian territory. This was disclosed by China (vol. iii, p. 823) in an appeal to the Powers to support her in her refusal to accede to Russia's pressing solicitations. Russia subsequently explained (vol. iv, p. 9) that her intention to restore Manchuria to China could manifestly—

only be carried out when the normal situation is completely restored to the empire, and the central government established at the capital independent and strong enough to guarantee Russia against a recurrence of the events of last year.

Russia was therefore understood to be formally pledged to withdraw from Manchuria when the Chinese government should have been restored to power and become capable of maintaining order throughout China. But Japan was still not satisfied. She was reported to have demanded of China (vol. ix, p. 25) either that Russia be ejected from Manchuria or that the temporary occupation of that province be made international. Japan's objection evidently grew out of her fear that if Russia were once firmly established in

Manchuria the Russians would extend their encroachments into Corea and finally withdraw that country from the sphere of Japanese influence.

Japan's uneasiness was subsequently justified by the continuance of the Russians in the occupation of Manchuria long after the complete restoration "to the empire of China" of "the normal situation," and the complete reestablishment of the Chinese government, had been effected. Regarding Russia's attitude in this respect as a menace, Japan began preparations for the conflict that has now come. Her first important precaution was to secure in January, 1902, a treaty of alliance with Great Britain (vol. iv, p. 712), under which the latter Power is now bound to use its efforts to prevent other Powers from joining with Russia in hostilities against Japan; and if any other Power or Powers should so join, to come to Japan's assistance and "conduct war in common and make peace in mutual agreement." The publication of this treaty was followed (vol. iv, p. 823) by the announcement of an arrangement in March, 1902, between the Russian minister to China and the president of the Chinese foreign office for the evacuation of Manchuria by Russia. A treaty to that effect, signed at Peking on the 8th of April, 1902, (vol. v, pp. 10, 40), provided as follows:

Russia agrees to restore the civil administration of Manchuria, without reserve, to the Chinese Empire; to evacuate Manchuria completely, so far as military or civil control is concerned, within one year from the date of the treaty; to remove her army, except a small force for the guarding of the Russian railway, within one year, withdrawing a part of the troops in four months, another part in eight months and the final quota in twelve months; and to surrender all claim to exclusive railway and mining privileges in Manchuria, pledging herself and China to the "open door" principle in that province.

With the disclosure of this treaty all just complaint on the part of Japan was regarded as having been removed. But the prescribed year went by, and still Russia remained in full occupation of Manchuria. Japan and England were reported last July as having

protested to China (p. 213), and from that time on Japan and Russia have been engaged in the diplomatic negotiations that have culminated in the present war.

The exact character of those negotiations was not made known until war had been virtually declared, although press correspondents ventured many guesses. Each nation has now formally stated its case.

Japan's statement came first. It was issued from Tokio on the 8th. From this statement it would appear that Japan's object is to safeguard the independence and territorial integrity of Corea and her own interests therein; that upon this consideration it is impossible for her to view with indifference any activity by Russia, contrary to her solemn treaty with China and her repeated assurances to the Powers, in not only continuing her occupation of Manchuria but in also taking aggressive measures in Korean territory. Should Manchuria be annexed to Russia, the independence of Corea would, as Japan believes, naturally be impossible. Accordingly on August 12, 1903, the Japanese government proposed to Russia through its representative at St. Petersburg, the basis of an agreement which was substantially as follows:

1. A mutual engagement to respect the independence and territorial integrity of the Chinese and Korean empires.
2. A mutual engagement to maintain the principle of an equal opportunity for the commercial industry of all nations with the natives of those countries.
3. A reciprocal recognition of Japan's preponderating interests in Corea and that Russia has special interests in railway enterprises in Manchuria, and a mutual recognition of the respective rights of Japan and Russia therein.

Not until October 3, according to the Japanese statement, did Russia present counter proposals; and these were of such a character that Japan absolutely rejected them. The Russian government is charged with refusing to join in guaranteeing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Corea; it is complained of for asking the Japanese to concede that Manchuria and its coasts are outside

of their sphere of interest; it is accused of proposing restrictions upon Japan's freedom of action in Corea,—as, for instance, refusing to allow her to occupy any portion of Korean territory for strategic purposes. The Japanese statement goes on to express surprise that the Russians, who profess no intention of absorbing Manchuria, should be disinclined to insert a clause in complete harmony with their own repeatedly declared principle respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of China. Furthermore, this refusal impressed the Japanese government all the more with the necessity for the insertion of a clause to the effect that Japan has important commercial interests in Manchuria and entertains no small hopes of their further development, and that politically Japan has interests there by reason of her relations to Corea which preclude all possibility of her recognizing Manchuria as being entirely outside of her sphere of interests.

Russia's statement, issued from St. Petersburg on the 9th, asserts that although the negotiations began in a friendly manner, Japanese social circles and the local and foreign press attempted in every way to produce a warlike ferment among the Japanese and to drive the government into an armed conflict with Russia, under the influence of which the Japanese government began to formulate greater and greater demands, at the same time taking most extensive measures to make the country ready for war. These circumstances induced Russia also to take military and naval measures. Nevertheless she declared herself ready to recognize Japan's privileged and commercial and economic position in the Korean peninsula, with the concession of the right to protect it by military force in the event of disturbances in that country. At the same time Russia insisted on three points:

1. A mutual and conditional guarantee of the principle of the independence and sovereignty of Corea.
2. An undertaking to use no part of Corea for strategic purposes, as the authorization of such action on the part of any foreign power was directly opposed to the principle of the independence of Corea.
3. The preservation of the full free-

dom of navigation of the Straits of Corea.

Continuing, the Russian statement asserts that this did not satisfy the Japanese government, which in its last proposals not only declined to accept the conditions which appeared as the guarantee of the independence of Corea, but also began at the same time to insist on provisions to be incorporated in a project regarding the status of Manchuria. Such demands on the part of Japan were regarded as inadmissible, since the question of Russia's position in Manchuria concerns China and all the powers having commercial interests in China. This is given as the reason for Russia's refusal to include, in a special treaty with Japan regarding Korean affairs, any provision concerning territory occupied by Russian troops. But Russia insists that she did not refuse to recognize (so long as her occupation of Manchuria shall last) both the sovereignty of the Emperor of China in Manchuria and also the rights acquired there by other Powers through treaties with China; and she protests that Japan was precipitate in breaking off negotiations without first taking into account these considerations and continuing the negotiations with a view to arriving at a peaceful understanding.

The last note in the diplomatic negotiations was delivered by Russia on the 4th. Japan's response, delivered on the 5th, was reported from St. Petersburg as being regarded by the Russian government as a declaration of war. It is as follows:

The independence and territorial integrity of the Korean empire being regarded by the Japanese government as absolutely essential to their own country's security and repose, they cannot view with indifference any action tending to render the position of Corea insecure. The Russian government has, by means of inadmissible amendment, successively rejected Japan's proposals respecting Corea, the adoption of which the Japanese government regarded as indispensable to assuring the independence and territorial integrity of the Korean empire and to safeguarding Japan's preponderating interests in the peninsula. This attitude on the part of the Russian government, coupled with their successive refusals to enter into an engagement to respect China's ter-

ritorial integrity in Manchuria, which is seriously menaced by Russia's continued occupation of that province, notwithstanding her treaty engagements with China, and her repeated assurances to the other Powers having interests in the same region, has rendered it necessary for the Japanese government to seriously consider what measures of self-defense they are called upon to take in the presence of the delay on the part of the Russian government in connection with the pending negotiations, which has remained largely unexplained, and of their naval and military activity, which it is difficult to reconcile with an entirely pacific aim. In the pending negotiation the Japanese government has exercised a degree of forbearance which it believes affords abundant proof of its loyal desire to remove from the relations between Japan and Russia every cause for future misunderstanding; but, finding in its efforts no prospect of securing from the Russian government any adhesion either to Japan's moderate and unselfish proposals or to any other proposals likely to establish a firm and lasting peace in the far East, the Japanese government has now no other alternative than to terminate the present futile negotiation. In adopting that course the Japanese government reserves to itself the right to take such independent action as it may deem best to consolidate and defend Japan's menaced position, as well as to protect its established rights and legitimate interests. The Japanese government, having exhausted in vain every means of conciliation with the view to removing from the relations of the two countries every cause for future complication, and finding that their just representations and moderate and unselfish proposals, made in the interest of permanent peace in the far East, were not receiving from the Russian government the consideration which is their due, have resolved to sever their diplomatic relation with the Russian government, which, for the reason named, has ceased to possess value.

Pursuant to the foregoing note of the 5th Japan dismissed the Russian minister on the 7th and on the same day recalled her own minister from St. Petersburg. Following this severance of diplomatic relations she sent warships to sea on the 8th with instructions to attack the Russian flag wherever found, and began to throw troops in large numbers into Corea for service on the Asiatic mainland.

Actual war began at midnight on the 8th, when Japanese torpedo boats attacked the Russian fleet at Port Arthur under cover

of darkness. On the morning of the 9th an open attack was made by a Japanese squadron. Reports from the battle are not yet sufficiently full or trustworthy to warrant any extended description or statement of results. Some Russian warships seem to have been disabled, and two Russian transports with 2,000 Russian troops appear to have been captured. The Japanese were reported on the 11th to have taken possession of Seoul, the capital of Corea.

Formal declaration of war was made by the Czar of Russia on the 9th, immediately after the attack by torpedo boats upon the Russian fleet. It is in these terms:

By the grace of God, we, Nicholas II., Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias, etc., make known to all our loyal subjects:

In our solicitude for the maintenance of peace, which is dear to our heart, we made every exertion to consolidate tranquillity in the far East. In these peaceful aims we signified assent to the proposals of the Japanese government to revise agreements regarding Corean affairs existing between the two governments. However, the negotiations begun upon this subject were not brought to a conclusion; and Japan, without awaiting the receipt of the last responsive proposals of our government, declared the negotiations broken off and diplomatic relations with Russia dissolved. Without advising us of the fact that the breach of such relations would in itself mean an opening of warlike operations, the Japanese government gave orders to its torpedo boats to attack suddenly our squadron standing in the outer harbor of the fortress of Port Arthur. Upon receiving reports from the viceroy in the far East about this, we immediately commanded him to answer the Japanese challenge with armed force. Making known this our decision, we, with unshaken faith in the Almighty and with a firm expectation of and reliance upon the unanimous willingness of all our loyal subjects to stand with us in defense of the fatherland, ask God's blessing upon our stalwart land and naval forces. Given at St. Petersburg, Jan. 27, 1904, A. D. (new calendar, Feb. 9, 1904), and in the tenth year of our reign. Written in full by the hand of His Imperial Majesty
NICHOLAS.

Upon the outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Japan Secretary Hay, of President Roosevelt's cabinet, addressed diplomatic notes to Great Britain,

France and Germany, inviting them to join in a notice to Russia and Japan that the war must be restricted to Manchuria and not involve any other part of the Chinese empire.

The greatest conflagration in an American city since that of 1871 which raged in Chicago, occurred at Baltimore on the 7th. It began with a series of explosions during the forenoon, while thousands of people were in the churches, and was not got under control until the next day. Firemen with their engines came from New York, Philadelphia, Wilmington, Trenton, Washington, Jersey City, Harrisburg and Newark. The plants of four newspapers—the Baltimore American, Herald, Sun and Evening News—were destroyed, as were the court house, the post office and many of the largest and most expensive business buildings. Steel structures seemed to melt before the great waves of flame. One remarkable thing in this connection is noted. The United States bonded warehouse, at Lombard and Gay streets, which is only three stories high, and was built in 1835 according to old time methods of construction, stands almost uninjured, while skyscrapers supposed to be fireproof which surrounded it are masses of ruins. The fatalities are so few that but little attention has been given to that result by the reports. It is even reported that there were none. But the loss of property is estimated as high as \$125,000,000. Notwithstanding the slight loss of life, however, the suffering of the homeless—a tenement district having come within the fire field along with the great business district—has been intense.

NEWS NOTES.

—A special grand jury to investigate the Iroquois theater disaster (p. 678) was organized at Chicago on the 8th.

—A national arbitration society, with Edmund J. James as president, was organized at the Northwestern University, Evanston, on the 6th.

—To obtain a sleeping berth on a trip from Springfield, O., to Mobile, Ala., on the 5th Bishop F. W. Arnett, of the African M. E. Church, was obliged to charter a sleeping car.

—A conference on the case of John Turner (p. 660) is to be held at Brick-

layers' Hall, Chicago, on the 14th at 2 p. m. under the auspices of the Chicago Federation of Labor.

—At Havana on the 4th the American flag was lowered from the Cabana barracks and the last American soldier left the island republic. This completes the American regime (p. 698) in Cuba.

—To protest against the military regime in Colorado (p. 631) in connection with the miners' eight-hour strike, a meeting is to be held at Clark and Erie streets, Chicago, on the 14th at eight o'clock.

—In the Federal court at Jacksonville, Fla., on the 10th Helen Wilmar's Post, of Sea Breeze, Fla., editor and publisher of Freedom (p. 362), was convicted of using the mails to defraud by means of mental science treatment of the sick.

—On the 9th the judiciary committee of the Chicago city council recommended the passage of the Dunn ordinance (p. 626) prohibiting the aldermen, the mayor and all city employes from accepting passes of any kind, including street car passes.

—Col. Edward Butler, the millionaire St. Louis politician, was acquitted on the 6th on the charge of having bribed 19 members of the house of delegates at St. Louis in 1899 to secure the passage of a lighting bill. This was one of the principal "graft" cases of St. Louis. It was tried at Fulton.

—A congress of industrial and commercial cooperative societies in the United States and Canada is called to be held at the World's Fair grounds, St. Louis, on the 16th and 17th of June for the purpose of organizing an American Cooperative Union. The chairman of the committee of arrangements is N. O. Nelson, of St. Louis.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 633) for January shows on hand January 31, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash	228,745,084.14
Total	\$378,745,084.15
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	384,394,275.58
Decrease	\$ 5,649,191.43

—In its issue of February 14 the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat will celebrate Lincoln's birthday with a special number, among the contributors to which are the following distinguished men: Ex-Secretary George S. Boutwell, William Lloyd Garrison, Gov. L. F. C. Garvin, William Randolph Hearst, Tom L. Johnson, William Sulzer, Robert Baker, Herbert S. Bigelow, William Jennings Bryan and Edward M. Shepard. The Johnstown Democrat is itself distinguished for the Lincolnian radicalism of its democracy.

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see p. 633) for the seven

months ending January 31, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$154,989,727.01
Internal revenue.....	139,192,314.21
Miscellaneous	25,243,801.79
	\$319,425,843.01
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.....	\$82,450,313.00
War	71,402,827.83
Navy	58,347,374.47
Indians	6,328,568.98
Pensions	83,661,615.48
Interest	16,193,463.92
	\$317,784,163.63
Surplus	\$1,641,679.38

—A decision made on the 8th by the Appellate court of Cook county, at Chicago, hold invalid a city ordinance which requires owners of automobiles to take out licenses as a condition of using their automobiles on the streets for their own business or pleasure. The court says: "The speed of the automobile may be regulated and reasonable safety appliances, such as gongs and brakes, may be required; but to compel one who uses his automobile for his private business and pleasure only, to submit to an examination and to take out a license (if the examining board see fit to grant it) is imposing a burden upon one class of citizens in the use of the streets not imposed upon others."

—The Illinois Tunnel Co. opened its tunnels on the 10th to the inspection of the Chicago Press Club. These tunnels now aggregate 20 miles in length 40 feet under the streets of Chicago, and will soon be engaged in doing most of the work that is now done by surface teamsters. Few inhabitants of Chicago have more than a hint of their existence, so unostentatiously has the work of excavation been done. The president of the company explained to the Press Club that, contrary to the custom in London, Paris and Boston, Chicago is to carry its freight instead of its people underground. He added:

The first transportation business to be done by the company will be to deliver coal to all the office buildings and take away the ashes; then it will connect the tunnels with the important wholesale houses handling large tonnage of freight, and through these tunnels, this company will be transporting several tons of freight daily before the end of this year. When this is accomplished, and the transportation department of this company is in full operation, it is the purpose of the company to extend its tunnels throughout the north, west, and south sides of Chicago, and do the package delivering business of the city.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE REAL GLORY OF THE FLAG.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Feb. 5.—Never has the American flag occupied a prouder position than it did yesterday, when its folds fell about the base of the staff on the Cabana barracks; not in all the marvelous history of this nation has a finer thing been done than the voluntary lowering of the Stars and Stripes in Cuba. On few occasions since men adopted the flag as a national emblem has such signal honor been paid to departing colors as the grateful Cubans gave when Old Glory, more glorious than ever, drooped its proud stars and acknowledged the sovereignty of Right.

THE TURNER CASE.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (Dem.), Feb. 4.—He was the first person arrested under the law forbidding the landing of any person "who disbelieves in or who is opposed to all organized government." He is, therefore, the first man ever arrested on the soil of a republic for holding an opinion, and this a republic where freedom of speech and of the press are constitutional rights.

Liberal Review (free thought), February.—What is John Turner's crime? He does not believe in government. But if we can allow people to deny God, why not extend the same courtesy to those who deny the King or the Republic? Would not the government become fearfully despotic, if it could suppress all criticism of itself? It is true of government, as it is of men, that "he who will have no judge but himself, condemns himself." No one should be at liberty to preach violence as a means of making converts. Such a course would be the negative of liberty. But to suppress intellectual opinions, about or against the government, and the free expression of them, is a species of violence. If a government resorts to violence, it is sure to set a bad example to the people.

ROOSEVELT AND THE TRUSTS.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Feb. 5.—The evidence has at last come out that all the talk of President Roosevelt's opposition to the trusts and Wall Street was sheer political buncombe. The list of guests present at the White House at the dinner to the Supreme court included A. J. Cassatt, president of the Pennsylvania railroad; James Stillman, president of the First National bank of New York and head of the Rockefeller banking syndicate; William F. Draper, head of the cotton machinery trust; Representative Littauer, charged with illegal profits from army contracts; Norman B. Ream, director of the steel trust, besides other great financial magnates and corporation attorneys. . . . Those Republican newspapers which have been attempting to fool the people into believing that they had a trust buster in the White House will soon have to be singing a new song, the burden of which will be that the great financial interests of the country are united in support of the party and its nominee, who alone will conserve the great business interests. The exigencies of the campaign may require this open alliance between President Roosevelt and the trusts that the campaign coffers may be filled, without which the wheels of the Republican chariot would drag heavily and the voice of their spell-binders be hushed.

BASIS OF THE TRUSTS.

(Chicago) Farmer's Voice and National Rural (ag'l), Feb. 6.—Scratch a trust, and you will find it a beneficiary of special privileges every time. Will the beef trust have its peculiar privileges taken from it? Not a bit of it! Everybody knows that if the beef trust were put on the same level with independent shippers by the railroads—not only so on the surface, but actually so—competition in buying live stock and selling meats would be had within a month in this country. . . . Whenever the people have sense enough to throw off this hydra-headed monster, whether he deal in coal, or oil, or meat, or railway traffic, by crushing out private monopoly, they will be free from it; but not before.

Savonarola labored for "the moral welfare of men—not by vague exhortations, but by striving to turn beliefs into energies that would work in all the details of life."—George Elliot, in "Romola."

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 38 of that publication.

Washington, D. C., Feb. 1-6, 1904.

Senate.

On the 1st Senator Morgan addressed the Senate at length (p. 1547) on the purchase of the property rights of the New Panama Canal Company. The same subject was discussed on the 2d (p. 1606) by Mr. Fairbanks. The urgent deficiency bill was considered on the 3d (p. 1628), 4th (p. 1706) and 5th (p. 1736). Also on the 5th the Panama question was discussed (p. 1744); after which adjournment was taken to the 8th.

House.

On the 1st the House began consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill (p. 1582). The question of investing the "resident commissioner to the United States" from Porto Rico with the right of Territorial delegates (p. 1613) was discussed on the 2d. Consideration of the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill was resumed (p. 1659) on the 3d, and continued on the 4th (p. 1679), when the bill was passed (p. 1683). Consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill was begun on the 5th (p. 1754), and the bill was passed on the same day (p. 1772), whereupon the House adjourned to the 8th.

Record Notes.—Speech of Senator Bacon on Panama question (p. 1517). Text of Morgan resolution, as modified, calling for information as to purchase of Panama canal and railroad (p. 1547). J. Adam Bede's comic speech (p. 1593). Speech of Robert Baker in favor of leasing instead of selling public lands (p. 1673), and on Cincinnati election frauds and Boss Cox (p. 1679). John Lind's speech on Canadian relations (p. 1682). Senator Tillman's speech on recess appointments (p. 1694).

MISCELLANY

PANAMA.

SURPRISE AT WASHINGTON.

"The department has read with surprise." Mr. Hay comments, "your repetition of gross imputation upon the conduct and motives of this government, which are said to have appeared in reputable American newspapers." — Extract from Secretary Hay's letter of Jan. 5th, 1904, in reply to Gen. Reyes.

Sir: I'm anxious to forget a Most ungentlemanly letter; Or, perhaps, it might be better Just to treat it with surprise. When such dreadful things are stated, And such incidents related, Yes, and actually dated, It is best to show surprise.

So I treat it with surprise; I can scarce believe my eyes; Such disgraceful imputations Cause me sorrow and surprise.

You assert, marines were landed, And your men by us disbanded. That we bluffed you single-handed.

You occasion me surprise! What? assist a revolution With a naval contribution, And upset your constitution? Why, you fill me with surprise!

Yes, you fill me with surprise, Indignation and surprise; That I never heard such language Is a fact I can't disguise. Then, in infamy you drape us From our reputable papers,

Whose disreputable capers
 Long have caused me deep surprise.
 When I read your repetitions
 From these papers with positions,
 I'm reduced into conditions
 Almost speechless with surprise.

Almost speechless with surprise;
 I would gladly close my eyes
 To their reputable calumnies,
 But, cannot for SURPRISE.

BERTRAND SHADWELL.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS A PRIOR CLAIM TO CRIMINAL AGGRESSION.

Senator Clark, of Arkansas, says that in view of the provocation given by Colombia, President Roosevelt might have been expected to have gone farther than he did in advancing the cause of Panama. In other words Senator Clark holds that if you cannot buy a thing you want at your own price you should flich it, by hook or by crook.

This man Clark evidently belongs heart and soul in the ranks of the criminal aggressors, that is to say, the Republican party, not to draw too fine a point on it. Democrats should beware of compromising with that policy. It is bad morals and bad politics.

Criminal Aggression may be right or it may be wrong. But let us have no dissembling. The Republicans have prior claim as champions of that policy, and Democrats have no right to it. If they believe it to be right they cease to be Democrats.

Carl Schurz has said that the Democrats did not seem to have the knack of getting into power. Well, as long as they insist on being so near like a Republican that the difference is not discernible to the naked eye, I see no reason why they should get into power.

They were taken at their word not long since and put into power, but they acted so much like Republicans that their splendid majorities were overwhelmingly reversed within two years thereafter.

The Republicans have taken a step backward by embracing Criminal Aggression, which history has condemned. The Country looks to the Democratic party to reinstate the ways of peace, the source of our greatness and progress.

Ratification of the present treaty would be a covert approval of governmental lawlessness. By so voting, those who disapprove what has been done will be selling their souls for a mess of pottage indeed.

The canal can wait. Honor once smirched is hard to cleanse.

As repentance is the only road to salvation, the Democratic Senators will surely be doing the country a great service by killing the treaty; paving the

way for a reparation of the wrong done, and a canal treaty of honorable and legitimate birth.

W. E. JACKSON.

929 Chestnut St., Philadelphia.
 Feb. 6, 1904.

BISHOP POTTER'S ELEPHANT.

The theme of Herbert S. Bigelow's address at the Vine street Congregational Church, in Cincinnati, on the evening of February 7, was suggested by a published interview with Bishop Potter, of New York, on the subject of Capital and Labor.

Bishop Potter takes the ground that wages are going up while interest is going down; that labor is annually getting a larger share of the profits of industry; that, if anyone is entitled to our sympathy, it is the capitalist; but that everything will come out all right, and that matters will regulate themselves. Trust to luck and cheer up. That is not the advice one would offer to a schoolboy who has a difficult problem to solve. No schoolboy would expect the problem to come out all right anyway. But with this problem of the distribution of wealth, the bishop tells us not to be worried; that it will solve itself.

To illustrate his notion of the relation between capital and labor, the bishop refers to the elephants that are used in the far East to load, unload and stack lumber.

Their intelligence seems wonderful, and their ability beyond conception. As you look closer, however, you see a little black figure on the neck of each elephant. . . . Watch him closely and you will see that his bare heel rests with an intermittent pressure on the neck of the huge animal he rides, and there you have the secret of the whole business. The brute obeys the man. . . . That is how the genius of capital uses labor—by invention, construction, organization and direction.

Is that the secret of the whole business? Does that metaphor go to the root of the matter? Does it not rather ignore a factor of very great importance?

The little black figure on the neck of the elephant is not a capitalist. He is a hired man. He is just as clearly a laborer as the elephant. He works with his head, it is true, while the animal works with his trunk. He is none the less a worker. The inventors, organizers and directors of industry are, properly speaking, working-men. The capitalist can buy one kind of labor as well as another. It often happens that laborer and capitalist are combined in one person, where a man not only owns but also superintends a factory. His share then will include his earning as a manager as well as the interest on his capital. Each man should

be rewarded according to his abilities. The vital question is this: Are there any who reap rewards, not by reason of their labor or their ability, but by reason of social advantages and monopoly privileges which are conferred upon them by law, and which make them masters, not only of the elephant of labor, but also of the man on his neck?

Our grievance is not that brains command a higher price than muscle; but that both brains and muscle are made the servants of monopoly. Of course it requires some brains to secure these monopolies. Likewise, it requires no small degree of intelligence to break a safe. But it makes a vast difference to the community whether a man uses his brains to ride elephants and add to the sum of wealth, or whether he uses them to ride legislatures and secure the power legally to take the wealth of others. Monopoly is the key to the whole matter. He who attempts to discuss this question and ignore monopoly, gives evidence that he has not himself escaped the confusion from which he promises to deliver others.

UNCLE SAM'S LETTERS TO JOHN BULL. HE DON'T WANT HIS FRIENDS TO FIGHT.

Printed from the Original MS.

Mr. John Bull,

Sir: Seems to me you are a backin' up this Japanese-Russian fight, an' I don't like it. They are friends of mine—both of 'em; an' you'll back Japan till she once gets into a fight, an' then you won't be there. "Perfidious Albion," is your old reputation in Europe, John. Of course, if you could get me an' a lot of fellows in, so it was a sure thing, you would stand to it, and stop Russia, as you did in the Crimean war; but I don't see that I'm called, Washington and all my level-headed boys was always agin it.

More than that, I'm on both sides. I see that Russian progress south menaces Japan; and I see, too, that Russia has a right to get to salt water. Everybody has a right to land, water, air, and their own kind of government—their's my sentiments.

And, John, Russia ain't the barbarian you make her out. Every time I read somethin' in print specially mean about Russia, I look up an' see it's dated "London." You hain't said a good word for Russia, John, in forty years, all because you are afraid she'll come down in Asia and take your Indian empire. I don't believe the Indians would fret none.

Russia is barbarous, I guess—some-what—but let's give Russia a little Brit-

ish fair play! She freed ten million serfs ten years before I freed my slaves, I notice; and it hain't been a year since one of her big generals resigned because he did not want to kill innocent people. My Gen. Bell, of the Philippines, said in New York that one-sixth of the people of Luzon had been slain within two years, or had died of fever. You might mention the names of any of my generals, John, that resigned to keep from killin' the innocent. Yes, and also any of your own generals that you have in mind. Don't call up any, do you? No? Then the Russians get the mark.

Let's try again: Take the pinter, John, an' pint out on the map a country havin' a humanitarian writer the equal of Tolstoy. Take your time. Can't do it, eh? You are right. He is one of the greatest teachers since Christ. Well, then, try this: pint to a country anywhere on the map whose Czar, Emperor, King, President, Governor, or hog-reeve, has given the world a Hague Court. You dropped the stick, and right you are; the Russians mark again. But it's put up or shut up, with me, John; an' I guess we'd better quit callin' Russia barbarian until we can rank her, eh?

Yes, I'm thinkin, too, about the Jewish massacres, and just as soon as the lynch fires die down, and their baleful light fades away in my own America, I'll take it up with her.

And, John, this Tolstoy is not merely a Russian. He lives there. He don't have to live abroad. He don't live in Switzerland, but at home, tolerated there. I don't believe I'd tolerate him in New York. Why, my administration's got a man in an iron cage in New York for not agreedin' in politics. But Tolstoy lives and thrives in Russia—the old Russia of the serfs, the knout and the Siberian mines; the new Russia of a certain liberality and of enlightened, world-advancing leaders.

The Russians call their leader The Great White Czar. I'm no friend of titles—don't keer fer 'em. It never had no meanin' to me till Nick gave us the Hague Court. Now I own up I put my stamp on him. He's the Great White Czar all right, all right; and I'm proud to give him the title.

But why fight? Let Japan and Russia establish their enlightenment as well as their leadership, and arbitrate their questions.

Little women are crying to-day in the streets of Tokyo; others will cry in St. Petersburg. Why waste the flower of the two great nations? Why not use and effectuate the gift to the world of Nicholas the present, and The Great? Why not carry the war to the Hague Court?

UNCLE SAM.

FOREIGN PRICE LISTS PRODUCED.

New evidence is coming to hand every day showing the great difference in prices of our manufactured goods when sold for export, or when sold for home consumption. Nearly every number of the Iron Age contains information of this kind. Some time ago it contained letters from manufacturers complaining that goods exported to Hawaii or Porto Rico were being reimported and sold here at prices lower than those charged for the same goods by our manufacturers. The writer blamed other manufacturers for giving export prices to these countries which now fly the American flag, and which, therefore, should pay full protection prices for our goods.

On November 12, the Iron Age quoted American steel bars in England at 82 shillings, or less than \$20 per ton, and in America at \$1.42½, or \$31.92 per ton. Thus the independent manufacturer of tin plate in America, who has to buy his cars of the steel trust, must pay more than 50 per cent. more for his chief material than is paid by his foreign competitor. This is "protection" to home industries with a vengeance.

The same number of the Iron Age tells us that American steel beams, plates, angles, channels and rivet steel are being sold in Canada at from \$9 to \$11 per ton less than the prices charged here.

The Iron Age, of December 17, enumerates a great number of articles of American make which are sold largely in South Africa. Nearly all are sold there at prices far below those charged here. Thus it appears that shovels which our shovel trust sells here at 90 cents each are sold there at 36½ cents. This Iron Age also contains information showing that the United States Steel corporation was, early in January, offering steel billets in Lanarkshire, England, at 75 shillings per ton. Deducting five dollars for freight and other transportation costs, the trust gets about \$14 per ton for billets for export, while its price to American consumers is \$23.

Late in January the newspapers announced that the steel trust had sold 20,000 tons of steel rails to Beirut, in Turkey, at \$21 per ton, delivered. This means only \$15 or \$16 per ton at Pittsburg, against \$28, the price to American consumers.

The American manufacturers, mostly in big corporate trusts, guard their export prices so well that it has become next to impossible to obtain export price lists or catalogues in this country. In 1902 the Democratic Congressional Committee, having failed to obtain a certain important export price list, advertised, offering \$100 for it. In

this way it obtained the list from a foreign country. Its 1902 campaign book contained 15 pages of photographic reproductions, showing scores of important articles on which the home price is from 20 to 300 per cent. above the export price.

Recently the Literary Bureau of the Democratic Congressional Committee received a letter from Henry Russell & Co., Limited, Sheffield, England, large manufacturers and dealers in files and tool steel. This letter says:

As an illustration of the unfair manner in which the home buyers of files are treated by the U. S. A. manufacturers, I inclose herewith a comparison of the prices charged to the buyers in U. S. A. with those offered by the same manufacturers here.

Some of the prices on the list enclosed follow:

Comparative prices of American files in America and England:

	—Price Per Doz.—	
	Eng-United	Differ-
	land, States.	ence.
Flat bastard, 4 inches...	\$0 34	\$0 92
Flat bastard, 6 inches..	50	1 07
Fiat bastard, 10 inches..	1 08	1 75
Hand bastard, 4 inches.	38	92
Hand bastard, 10 inches.	1 30	1 87
Hand bastard, 6 inches..	62	1 07
Half-round bastard, 4 in.	34	1 20
Half-round bastard, 6 in.	50	1 52
Half-round bastard, 10 in	1 08	2 27
Round bastard, 4 inches.	34	75
Round bastard, 6 inches.	50	87
Round bastard, 10 inches.	1 08	1 40
Square bastard, 4 inches.	34	95
Square bastard, 6 inches.	50	1 15
Square bastard, 10 inches	1 08	1 85

From these figures we see that the American File Association, which has not revised its price list to American buyers since November 1, 1899, is charging us, for most kinds of its small files, more than twice as much as it charges Englishmen for these same files; and, for the half-round files, we must pay three times the price charged Englishmen.

With our big trusts selling all kinds of steel and tools to foreigners at one-half or one-third the prices charged Americans, is it any wonder that our small manufacturers cannot compete with their foreign competitors? It is only a question of time, and not a long time either, when our small manufacturers, squeezed by our great and greedy trusts, will be driven entirely out of foreign markets, even if they are not driven entirely out of business.

When will the American people put a stop to this infernal business by abolishing all duties on trust products?

BYRON W. HOLT.

"Has the Ship Subsidy bill been passed?"

"For the present, I hope."

G. T. E.

SAFETY LIES IN FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Remarks made by the Rev. L. M. Powers, of the Church of the Messiah (Universalist), at a meeting held in Buffalo, January 25, to protest against the deportation of John Turner, and section 38 of the Immigration laws as amended March 3, 1903. Other speakers were Frank C. Ferguson, W. S. Rann, C. B. Matthews, Wilson Larey and John Shillady, in the capacity of chairman.

Secretary Cortelyou has interpreted the anti-alien and sedition law to mean the exclusion of John Turner.

John Turner is known in Buffalo. He spent some weeks here not many years ago. It is the testimony of all who met him that he is an intelligent gentleman, opposed to every kind of violence. Whether the law was intended to exclude a man of this kind is now before the courts.

Now, if the law was designed to exclude any people save those who advocate crime and violence, it is a bad law. If this law be held to exclude John Turner, it would exclude Tolstoi, the foremost citizen of the world, and Elisee Reclus, one of the foremost scientists of France. It would exclude George Fox and the founder of the Christian religion, were they living, for John Turner is no more an anarchist than these men, or, to speak more accurately, he is the same kind of an anarchist as these men. It may seem to some irreverent to speak the name of Jesus of Nazareth in this connection, but if the words of Jesus are correctly reported, he did not believe in government by force. Quakers and Shakers, Menonites and non-resistant Christians of many kinds, have all believed that they could not be consistent followers of Jesus while participating in a government founded by and supported by force. Without a religious, or at least a Christian basis, John Turner believes precisely as these do; and if Turner is an anarchist, then Quakers are anarchists, and any law that would exclude Quakers is a stupid law.

It is a strange fact, but it is a fact nevertheless, that the gentlest people are the ones that apparently are hated most. Our Puritan forefathers used Quakers worse than we now use assassins, for they burned them. And what was their offense? Why, they would not go to law and they would not fight. They relied on intelligence and love to rule the world, instead of force.

Now this is anarchy, and John Turner, believing this, is an anarchist. In the popular thought an anarchist is one who believes in assassination. This misunderstanding is perhaps natural, since the man who killed President McKin-

ley claimed to be an anarchist. But the man who killed Garfield claimed, I believe, to be a Baptist. He certainly claimed to be a Christian. Yet no one assumes for this reason that Baptists or Christians are dangerous people. Of all men the anarchist is the one whose belief pledges him to the most peaceful methods.

I am not an anarchist, because I believe force is still needed in this world; but I believe we need much less than we have, and that more and more intelligence and love are to take the place of force. I believe we can all safely say with Thoreau: "I heartily accept 'the motto, 'that government is best which governs least,' and I should like to see it lived up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out it finally amounts to this, which also I believe: That government is best which governs not at all; and when we are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government they will have."

I believe that any man who advocates violence or murder should be locked up as a lunatic. But any law that makes it a crime to invite Tolstoi to visit this country, is a very stupid law. Milton said: "The whole truth has nothing to fear from the whole error." The world's experience shows that Milton was right.

Life and property are always safest where thought and speech are freest. England, where anarchists of every type of thought are given freest utterance in Hyde Park every Sunday, is almost the only country where a ruler has not been assassinated in recent years. There is no line we can draw marking a limit beyond which speech may not safely be free. The moment we say of any idea, "It is dangerous," the way is open to all tyranny. If the people cannot be trusted to decide what ideas are wise or foolish, democracy is a failure. The best way to cure a fool of his folly is to let him make a fool of himself, provided, of course, his folly harm no one else. If it be folly to believe that we can get along without a government of force—and all governments mean force—it is a folly that harms no one, since we have had Quakers and Shakers, and Passive Resistent Christians among us for a long time, and the world is the better for them all.

Turner has no wish to come to America, if America does not want him. He is willing, however, to spend six months in prison, treated as though he were the worst kind of a criminal, if by so doing he may help to preserve free speech in this country that has used him so badly. If this does not stir us to speech and action, and cause our

hearts to go out to him, then is there little hope for us left.

THE HOPE OF NEW ENGLAND DEMOCRACY.

Address of the Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, Governor of Rhode Island, etc., at the banquet of the New Haven Democratic Club, January 11, 1904. (See Public of January 16, page 647.) As reported in The Commoner of February 5.

Formerly New England was half Democratic; whilst Vermont, Massachusetts and Rhode Island were in the Whig column, Maine, New Hampshire and Connecticut inclined to Jeffersonian Democracy. At that time the population was more rural and more native—conditions which one would naturally expect to have favored Whig supremacy.

Notwithstanding the increase of urban and manufacturing and foreign-born population, all of which changes should count for Democratic gains, New England to-day is solidly Republican. How can such an apparent anomaly be explained? Wholly, I believe, by the increased power of money in elections, accompanied as it has been, by the drift of nearly all men of wealth into the Republican party.

The influence of money in determining the result of an election is almost unbounded. In the first place the daily newspapers of our large cities are great business enterprises, are owned by wealthy men and corporations, and find their largest profits in the advertising patronage of rich men and corporations engaged in other lines of business. Very naturally nearly all of these papers in New England are Republican in their politics, or, if nominally independent or Democratic, they are but half-heartedly so, having a bias, unconscious, very likely, towards the views of their customers and associates of the wealthy class.

The press is an influence at work all the year round to mould public sentiment; and most persons who depend upon one daily paper for their knowledge of public events, inevitably are influenced by the views it inculcates.

But money is another far more direct, and no less potent, influence upon the result of an election. I refer to its power of purchasing a strong party organization. "The cohesive power of public plunder" is spoken of, but it is trifling as compared with the cohesion which is effected by an abundant supply of funds placed at the absolute disposal of a shrewd party manager. The many ways of using campaign funds I need not specify at length. Clubs are sustained, workers are hired to qualify voters and then get them to the polls, lavish ad-

vertising and spectacular public meetings are paid for, teams for getting out the vote and a multitude of other "legitimate expenses" are provided. No doubt in a large majority of New England towns the result of an election is determined beforehand by the knowledge that the Republican local organization is well supplied with funds, and that the Democrats are destitute.

If any doubt exists in the minds of the managers of the dominant party as to the result of an election in any legislative district, then without hesitation illegitimate methods are called into use, to-wit: Direct bribery, and what is more effective in populous localities, the corruption of election officials and of active members of the Democratic organization.

Is it strange under these circumstances that the rich Republican party has permanent control of every New England State? Only sporadically, at long intervals, by a fluke, as it were—a fluke, by the way, which has not happened in any New England State for many years—can an opposition party ever get control of the State's government.

Nevertheless, and notwithstanding its perpetual minority, the people of New England at heart are democratic. Every state, every city, nearly if not quite every town, and certainly every party, contains a majority of voters who believe in democratic principles.

A very large majority of the Republicans of New England are in sentiment democrats. They are opposed to the policy carried out by their State governments, and regard the most important acts of legislation to be wrong. They rejoice in every veto of a party measure and wish they were more numerous.

The truth is that the monied men who supply the campaign funds, and they are very few when compared with the whole number of Republicans, also dictate the policy of the party. They see to it that legislation is in their own interest and not in that of the rank and file of their party.

It would seem strange that, even with the unlimited use of money, a party organization hostile to the people in almost its every act, can retain permanently the support of a plurality of the voters. And yet it does so succeed, aided no doubt by race prejudice, party spirit and a machinery of elections which invites and makes effective corrupt practices.

Whilst it is true that the Democratic party need not expect permanent control of any New England

State under present conditions, yet as believers in government by the people, we need not despair. John Stuart Mill held that man's will is free only to the extent that he can change his environment. However that may be, I am convinced that the one way in which New England democracy can acquire liberty is through an alteration of its constitutional environment. Although we cannot under present conditions carry elections, we can change our State constitutions.

In order to do so, however, in such a way as effectually to change the environment, we must agree upon a single amendment sufficiently fundamental to destroy the dominance of money in elections and to substitute therefor the real will of the majority.

An amendment which will accomplish this result and which because being "in the air," is easy of attainment, is what we call in Rhode Island the constitutional initiative. By that term we mean a constitutional provision which will enable a reasonable minority of the legal voters, say five per cent. of the total qualified electors of the State, to propose amendments to the State constitution. At present, as you are fully aware, all propositions of amendment must come through the State legislatures, which is another way of saying, must meet the approval of the monopolists who furnish the campaign funds of the dominant party. But public sentiment even now is a mighty power, and can force any legislature to do some one thing upon which it has determined. The trouble has been that public opinion has almost invariably concentrated about some minor and unimportant reform, which, when accomplished, left things very much as they were before.

At present, however, there seems to be a widespread wish, which ought to be stimulated, in favor of direct legislation by the people, or, as it is called in Switzerland, the initiative and referendum. For constitutional amendments we already have the referendum; it only remains, therefore, for us to amend our State constitutions so as to grant the popular initiative.

The power of money in elections is not peculiar to New England. With scarcely an exception the monied party is in control of every State. What has long been true of many of the States is more and more becoming true of all, and now is fast becoming true of the nation as a whole. It is a serious question, and one pregnant with grave forebodings, whether under existing conditions the democracy of the nation will ever again have a real rep-

resentative in the presidential chair. In my opinion it is very doubtful.

The wealth of the country, almost as a unit, is tributary to the national Republican organization. Through the party it secures the legislation which gives its holders excessive pecuniary returns. For tariff, franchise and other monopolies obtained through Republican legislation, State and national, the beneficiaries in return contribute lavishly to campaign expenses, thus constituting a vicious circle by means of which the people are exploited and equal rights denied. The speediest and surest remedy seems to be for the people to gain direct and complete control of their State and national constitutions.

UNCLE SAM COGITATING.

Ef Johnny Bull owned Panama
Would I be thar with ships and sich,
Preparin' fur to dig my ditch
An' eggin' on my friends tu war?

Ef William, Emperor by God's grace,
Owned a square foot in that 'ere clime
Would my marines be markin' time
Round there or in some other place?

Ef in that picturesque morass
John Crapeau in profoundest peace
Was croaken uv the Marsellaise
Would I go pokin' raound the grass?

Wall, I dunno, I reckon not,
But these 'ere chaps are small, ye see,
An' they just know how big I be,
An' what a critter I'm when hot.

Traditions? Huh! an' treaties—bosh!
In this free land it's might that's right!
An' I'm jest dyin' fur a fight,
Fur I'm almighty naouw, b'gosh,
—New Haven Register.

It is not apparent that the administration has yet instructed "Manifest Destiny" as to the part we shall take in the Russian-Japan difficulty. G. T. E.

The administration goes into ecstasies because its act of recognizing the Republic of Panama was regarded so favorably by the European governments that they followed suit. But it is not altogether doubtful that its rapturous exaltation would cease did those governments continue their imitation to a finish by declaring that they would defend the new republic against all aggressors. G. T. E.

While some of us are engaged with such trivial matters as whether Gov. Garvin has insulted and made a laughing stock of his State, in which the purchasable vote is said to exceed 5,000, by trying to put a stop to bribery here; in trying to induce wise action in respect to land, and money, and the unemployed, etc., some cultured Boston people are discussing such vital themes as, Which is the most picturesque, re-

fection in a lake of the foliage of neighboring trees, or the wavelets upon its surface when agitated by the breeze?—Daybook & Ledger, of Oak Lawn, R. I., for Jan. 27.

The Review of Reviews lately reported the President as saying:

In John Hay I have a great Secretary of State; in Philander Knox I have a great Attorney General; in other Cabinet posts I have great men.

Mistaken, Mr. President. You have no great Hay, no great Knox, no great man whatever. It is the country that has them. They are not your men; they are ours. They are not working for you; they are working for us, just as you are. You should not make breaks like these. It makes people laugh. But if you must speak like a king, at least choose a time when there is no one near who will rush your words into type.—Life.

BOOKS

THE PEOPLE OF THE ABYSS.

It is hard to describe in a brief review Jack London's new book, telling of his life and what he saw in the East End of London (*The People of the Abyss*, Macmillan, \$2). It is one of the great first-hand books that come along about once every half-century. There are indeed many books dealing at first-hand with social conditions, but there are not many great ones, written, like this, by a man of genius.

"It will be readily apparent to the reader," says the author in his preface, "that I saw much that was bad. Yet it must not be forgotten that the time of which I write was considered 'good times' in England. The starvation and lack of shelter I encountered constituted a chronic condition of misery which is never wiped out, even in the periods of greatest prosperity." Farther on in this preface he says: "It has been urged that the criticism I have passed on things as they are in England is too pessimistic. I must say, in extenuation, that of optimists I am most optimistic." This brings up again the false and silly attitude of people who cry out pessimism against those who simply look facts in the face. The real pessimists are those who try to make themselves think that things are about as good as can be expected, and that all that can be done for what is bad is to apply rose-water charity.

It is to be feared that many self-styled optimists will not read this book, which is a pity. It would do them good. They would have to believe it, because it bears the sure impress of truth—even in its hardest sayings. And yet the author says: "It is rather hard to tell a title of what I saw. Much of it is untellable." But surely what he does tell ought to be told and retold, until the ignorant West End can be made to hear.

"The dear soft people," says Mr. London, "of the golden theaters and wonder-mansions of the West End do not see these creatures, do not dream that they exist. But they are here, alive, very much alive in their jungle. And woe the day, when England is fighting in her last trench, and her able-bodied men are on the firing line! For on that day they will crawl out of their dens and lairs, and the people of the West End will see them, as the dear soft aristocrats of feudal France saw them and asked one another, 'Whence came they?' 'Are they men?'"

Nor is the distressing condition confined to the city of London. Mr. London insists that "whatever is true of London in the way of poverty and degradation, is true of all England." "Mr. B. S. Rowntree," he says, "by an exhaustive analysis, has proved for the country town what Mr. Charles Booth has proved for the metropolis, that fully one-fourth of the dwellers are condemned to a poverty which destroys them physically and spiritually; that fully one-fourth of the dwellers do not have enough to eat, are inadequately clothed, sheltered, and warmed in a rigorous climate, and are doomed to a moral degeneracy which puts them lower than the savage in cleanliness and decency." Truly does it seem, as he says, that the 40,000,000 people of England are keeping house badly. "The income is all right, but there is something criminally wrong with the management."

What he says of the drink problem ought to be taken to heart by the temperance advocates everywhere. "It is of no avail," he says, "to preach temperance and teetotalism to these people. The drink habit may be the cause of many miseries; but it is, in turn, the effect of other and prior miseries. The temperance advocates may preach their hearts out over the evil of drink, but until the evils that cause people to drink are abolished, drink and its evils will remain." Those who have heard Father Huntington speak on this subject, will recall that he has repeatedly given the same testimony from his own intimate acquaintance with the slum-life in American cities.

But what is to be done? College settlements, missions, charities, and what not—how little have they accomplished, how little can they ever do! "In the nature of things," says Mr. London, who saw such efforts, "they cannot but be failures. They are wrongly, though sincerely conceived. They approach life through a misunderstanding of life, these good folk. . . . The very money they dribble out in their child's schemes has been wrung from the poor." Shall thrift be preached? "It is sheer bosh and nonsense," he replies, "to preach thrift to the 1,800,000 London workers who are divided into families which have a total income of less than \$5.25 per week, one-quarter to one-half of which must be paid for rent."

These good people who try to help! Mr. London says of them just what Henry George and Tolstoy have said—"they do everything for the poor except get off their backs."

It is greatly to be wished that the publishers will issue a cheaper edition of this book. The pictures may very well be omitted. They add nothing to the value and interest of the work, and the modern smooth-finish reproductions from photographs invariably give false impressions.

J. H. DILLARD.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

—"The Story of the Lopez Family; a Page from the History of the War in the Philippines." Edited by Canning Eyot. Boston: James H. West Company. Price, \$1.00. To be reviewed.

—"Organize the World," by Edwin D. Mead. A pamphlet including also two other of Mead's tracts in behalf of permanent peace; namely, "Kant's 'Eternal Peace,'" and "Charles Sumner's 'More Excellent Way.'" Boston: American Peace Society, 3 Beacon street. Price, 10 cents.

—"The Principles of the Founders," by Edwin D. Mead. Oration before the City Government and citizens of Boston, at Faneuil Hall, July 4, 1903. Boston-American Unitarian Association. Price, 50 cents net. A Fourth of July address of extraordinary historical value and absorbing interest.

—"Socialism vs. Single Tax." A verbatim report of a debate held at Twelfth Street Turner Hall, Chicago, December 20, 1903. For Socialism, Ernest Untermyer, Seymour Stedman, A. M. Simons; for Single Tax, Louis F. Post, Henry H. Hardinge, John Z. White. With portraits of Karl Marx, Henry George and the six debaters. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co., (Cooperative), 56 Fifth avenue. Price, 25 cents; five copies for \$1.00; 12 copies for \$2.00. Postage included.

PERIODICALS.

"President Hadley is a reformer, a mugwump, an apostle of the higher patriotism—in his books. When it comes to acting, he is eligible to join David H. Lane's section of the Quay machine." J. H. D.

More and more people are finding out that what "prominent personages" say and write is one thing, and what they really think is quite another. One of the charms of Mr. John Graham Brooks's book, "The Social Unrest," was, as he stated in the preface, that he went behind such talk to the real opinions of people as expressed in private conversation. The Philadelphia Public Ledger has been analyzing President Hadley, of Yale College, and comes to the following conclusion: "President Hadley is a reformer, a mugwump, an apostle of the higher patriotism—in his

BOOKS FOR STUDENTS

By JOHN P. ALTGELD.

Live Questions, 1,000 Pages.

Containing all his important public addresses on social and political questions, together with official state papers written while Governor of Illinois, such as reasons for pardoning the anarchists, and protest to President Cleveland for sending U. S. troops to Illinois during Railroad Strike of 1894. In cloth, \$2.50; postage, 30c. Oratory, cloth, 50c. C. S. Darrow, "Pearl and Pearl," \$1.50; "Resist Not Evil," cloth, 75c. John Mitchell's Book on Organized Labor, cloth, \$1.75.

GEO. A. SCHILLING,
519-55 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

A RECEPTION AND BALL

(Postponed from January 15), will be given by the Ladies of the Henry George Association, at Schiller Hall, 103 Randolph Street, Friday Evening, February 26, 1904. Tickets: Gentlemen, 50 cents; Ladies, 25 cents. Tickets of January 15 will be recognized.



LOST!

Mr. Bull—What's wrong, Sam? Lost anything?
 U. S.—Yes; Some doctrines and principles about Liberty, Right, and so forth.
 I must have left them in my other clothes!

book. When it comes to acting, he is eligible to join David H. Lane's section of the Quay machine." J. H. D.

It is a great truth which the president of Brown University utters when he says: "We are frequently tempted to mistake the little for the large, and the transient for the permanent." He then goes on to show the injury being done by a certain class of newspapers which emphasize the wrong things. In education, for example, there can be little doubt that newspapers have been far more hurtful than helpful. They emphasize the loud and vain, for in the very nature of things they know nothing of the sincere work of educational institutions. Nor, as the Springfield Republican remarks, "is the false perspective lifted up alone by yellow journalism. It seems now as if most of the daily print were handed over to the devil of profligacy and vanity." J. H. D.

Now we know what anti-imperialists are like. They are "eyeless amphibia." It seems that President Wilson, of Princeton, said in a recent address: "Because of our Americanism we had no patience with the anti-imperialist weepings and wallings that came out of Boston." To which the New York Independent adds that "The weepings did not represent so much Boston as sub-Boston and sub-Springfield and sub-New Haven—the Gamalletes of the lower caves where grope the eyeless amphibia, and out of which wall the gusty sobbings and sobbings which imaginative souls take to be the voices of Themis and the Erinyes." It is to be hoped that top-Boston will duly appreciate this defense, which was clearly given a classical turn for its special benefit. J. H. D.

A most remarkable and vigorous editorial appears in the Springfield Republican, of January 27, entitled: "From the Radical Viewpoint." It is perhaps not going too far to say that the editorial page of this paper is the ablest of all among American dailies. It is earnest, clear-eyed, conservative of our best ideals, and, withal, inclined to be wisely progressive. Therefore, such an editorial as the one alluded to deserves attention. The gist of it is that Mr. Bryan, by adhering at present so tenaciously to free silver, is harming the chances of the Democrats who are oppos-

ing the conservative wing of reorganizers. "There isn't," says the editorial, "a democratic, or radical, or labor, or socialistic party in Europe that would touch free silver with a pair of tongs, although the soul of their political existence is opposition to the aristocracies and plutocracies of their respective countries." The writer likens Mr. Bryan to a great general "who insists upon holding as a vital part of his line of battle a single salient that is utterly incapable of defense. Mr. Bryan is thus, thinks the Republican, actually playing into the hands of the plutocrats, who would prefer a conservative Democrat to Roosevelt. But, after all, the Republican should do justice to Mr. Bryan's later interview in which he distinctly asserts that free silver is not a leading issue in the coming campaign. J. H. D.

Clubs of Three

To extend the circulation of The Public among new readers, and at the same time to relieve of expense such regular readers, or others, as take the trouble to procure us new subscriptions, we will supply three subscriptions for the price of two, on the following terms:

- A Club of Three Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new)..... \$4.00
- A Club of Three Semi-Annual Subscriptions (at least two of them new)..... \$3.00
- A Club of Three Quarterly Subscriptions (at least two of them new)..... \$1.00

Any person soliciting new subscribers will be allowed the same terms. For every two new subscriptions for which he forwards us cash at regular rates we will honor his order for a third subscription free.

Make all Checks, Money Orders, etc., payable to
THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO.,
 Box 687, CHICAGO, ILL.

The Public

is a weekly review which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of radical democracy, 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. Familiarly with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

TERMS:—Annual Subscription, \$2.00; Semi-Annual Subscription, \$1.00; Quarterly Subscription, 50 cents; Trial Subscription (4 weeks), 10 cents; Single Copies, 5 cents. Free of postage in United States, Canada, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. All checks, drafts, post office money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING CO. Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Published weekly by THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, 164 1 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

EWING & BING,
 ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,
 HOUSTON, TEXAS.
 Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Bing.

FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,
 COUNSELLOR AT LAW,
 BENNETT BLDG.,
 90 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,
 Tel. Call, 4094 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1012,
 NEW YORK.

CONTRACTORS.

GEORGE H. ATKINSON,
 CONTRACTOR.
 Telephone, Electric Light, Trolley and Municipal Work.
 Trolley Roads built complete and financed.
 36 Liberty Street, New York.

JOHN Z. WHITE'S MOVEMENTS

Mr. White completes his engagement at Winona, Minn., Saturday evening, February 13th. He speaks at Stillwater, Minn., Monday, February 15; at St. Paul, Minn., Tuesday, February 16; before the State Municipal League, Wednesday, February 17th; before the Political Economy Class of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., on Thursday, February 18th, and at Milwaukee, Wis., on the 19th, 20th and 21st. On March 1st he begins a tour South. Friends in Missouri and throughout the Southern states are invited to correspond for open dates.
 F. H. MONKOE, President,
 Henry George Association,
 134 Washington St., Chicago, Ill.

SOCIALISM vs. SINGLE TAX

The Turner Hall Debate between Post, Harding and White for the Single Tax, and Untermyann, Stedman and Simons for Socialism, is now ready and selling rapidly. It is a handsome book of 72 pages, including eight full-page portraits. Price 25c. Five for a dollar, a dozen for two dollars, postage included. Address: **CHARLES H. KERR & CO.** (Co-operative) 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago

FOURTH DEBATE

There will be a debate between the Socialists and the Single Taxers at the Vorwaerts Turner Hall, 1168 West 12th Street, near Western Avenue, on Sunday, February 21st, at 2:30 p. m. Western Starr, member Henry George Association will represent the Single Taxers; A. M. Simons, Editor "International Socialist Review" will represent the Socialists.

LINCOLN ANNIVERSARY EDITION

Johnstown, (Pa.) Democrat, February, 14—Notable array special illustrated contributions—Boutwell, Garrison, Garvin, Post, Hearst, Hoyt, Sulzer, Baker, Shepard and many others. 4c each by mail.