

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1904.

Number 335.

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.

Among the many explanations of David B. Hill's promised withdrawal from politics, the most encouraging is the suggestion that he has been made to realize the futility of expecting preferment under Parker should the latter be elected.

It has been assumed that Hill would be Parker's Secretary of State, and it is difficult to see how that appointment could be refused him. In the public eye Hill has for two years appeared to be Parker's manager. He has stood out in bold relief as the party leader on the conservative side of the reorganized Democracy. He and Parker are fellow workers of old in politics. Parker's methods preceding the nomination were the familiar Hill methods. For these and other reasons it would seem to be impossible for Parker to refuse Hill the recognition that Garfield gave to Blaine.

Yet it may be that Parker has had no such purpose. It may be that Hill's overshadowing attentions have been unwelcome. It may be that Hill has been an intruder instead of a manager. Color of probability is lent to this inference by the fact that Parker sent his St. Louis telegrams to Sheehan and not to Hill. It may be therefore, that Hill, scenting humiliation from afar, has decided to make the best of it by a magnanimous withdrawal of the burden of his personality which Parker has been staggering under.

If this is indeed the true explanation of the Hill episode,

there may be reason to hope that in his letter of acceptance Judge Parker will sufficiently encourage the democratic-Democracy of the country—not by platitudes, but by courageous pledges—to see in the whole situation a convincing sign that the reorganized Democracy is after all something better than an organic office-hunger. A belief that Parker is not the alter ego of Hill would be much in itself; but it must be supplemented, to be effective, with a conviction not only that Parker is not of the tribe of such political gamblers as Hill, and stands for Democratic principle in the abstract; but also that he has the courage to identify himself with purposes and policies in furtherance of that principle, and the disposition to ally himself less with the plutocratic and more with the democratic elements of his party.

Another hopeful thing about the Democratic situation is the possibility of the nomination of Edward M. Shepard by the Democrats for governor of New York. Mr. Shepard is not an all-round radical Democrat. He could not properly be called, even in the truest sense of the word, a radical in any respect. His temperament, his training, his professional and other associations all tend to make him conservative of existing adjustments and fearful of sudden disarrangements. But in principle he is a democrat. And though in practice a conservative who would incline to over caution, his tendency is steadily toward the uttermost goal of genuine democracy. Considering that Mr. Shepard is a man of great ability and undisputed probity, the fact that he is politically unwelcome to the plutocratic elements of the party is highly significant. At a time when the line between plutocracy and democracy is not

clearly drawn, the shrinking of the distinctly plutocratic classes from any man of ability and honesty when he looms up in politics, is in itself a certification to that man's democratic tendencies.

Should Shepard be nominated by the Democrats for governor of New York, with the hearty approval of Parker, it might go far toward reconciling the democratic-Democrats of that State to a national ticket which has not appealed to them—which, indeed, has repelled them. We do not mean that it would draw back those Democrats who in disgust at the plutocratic atmosphere which has enveloped the Parker candidacy, have committed themselves to third parties. This element, which might have given great strength to the Democratic party, is irretrievably lost so far as the present campaign is concerned. But there are many democratic-Democrats who, belonging to the party organization, have felt that they must retain their connection with it, realizing that other campaigns are coming—men whose view of the complex situation is represented nationally by William J. Bryan and Tom L. Johnson. It is difficult work for these men to hold their following together in support of Parker. The following of such men is an intelligent following. It cannot be shifted now this way and now that, as a leader dictates. But everything that occurs to give true democratic color to the Parker candidacy makes the task of the Bryans and the Johnsons, little and big, all over the country, an easier task. Shepard's nomination for governor of New York would be one of these things. And if that could have the background of a courageous democratic declaration from Parker in his letter of acceptance—something which would

ring as true and seem as courageous to the democratic-Democrats as did his gold standard telegram to the plutocratic Democrats—there would be something for the leaders of democratic-Democracy to work for with hope for the future, and with enthusiasm and effectiveness in the present.

Eastern Democrats are at present threatened with future mental suffering, by John P. Hopkins and Roger C. Sullivan, of Chicago. These delectable Democrats assure their Eastern coadjutors not only that Illinois will give its electoral vote to Parker (which politically is proper, since they are responsible for Illinois), but that Indiana is a "sure thing" and that prospects are bright for Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Nevada and Utah. When Hopkins and Sullivan return to Illinois, which they themselves have made hopeless, they will doubtless report bright prospects in another quarter. They can't fool Western Democrats with glittering predictions about such States as Illinois, Montana and Colorado; but they might arouse enthusiasm over prophetic victories in Maine, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

Municipal-ownership advocates who object to municipal operation, might profit by an object lesson in Union county, New Jersey. There is a trolley line in that county, in the region of Roselle, which is owned by the county but operated by a private corporation. Behold the result. The private corporation has a lease which is virtually perpetual; the fares cannot be regulated; the private company is as masterful and arrogant as if it owned the property of which it is only a tenant; and the county not only furnishes the trackage and other line equipment, but keeps them in repair. The net benefit, therefore, to the county is nothing, minus cost of erecting and maintaining the line; to the operating company it is the same as private ownership, plus the advantage of having a line furnished and maintained for it free by the county.

Traction is not the only subject regarding which Union county, New Jersey, affords valuable object lessons. This is one of the localities in which even the water supply is furnished by a private corporation. Water, gas, electric lighting, street car service, steam car service, trolley service—all but the one county-owned trolley line—are under private ownership, and all are under private operation. Union county, therefore, is a place where the beauties, comforts and general perfection of private enterprise in the management of public utilities may be expected to shine forth. But it doesn't shine. The character of the water service in comparison with cities that own and operate their water supply may be inferred from the fact that in this region of abundant water conveniently located, the charge for serving a cottage is over \$30 a year. And as to "graft," what is the graft of the graftiest political grafter in comparison with the enormous graft of the owners of this Union county water privilege? Nor is it a matter alone of graft and dear service. The owners of this water supply privilege dominate both political parties with a degree of arbitrary power which might make any mere political boss envious to distraction. Look to it, you who are doubtful of the wisdom of municipal ownership and operation of municipal utilities! Investigate the wretched experiments in private ownership and operation of Union county, New Jersey, before you close your minds to the successful experiments in public ownership and operation elsewhere.

Two or three weeks ago it was announced that Eugene V. Debs had been requested by McClure's Magazine to reply to ex-President Cleveland's defense in the same periodical of his action in the Chicago strike (p. 195), and that the magazine had been obliged to reject Mr. Debs's article because it was abusive. What purports to be the same article has

now appeared in the Socialist papers,—among others, in the Chicago Socialist of August 27. As it is there printed, we fail to find anything in the Debs article that can fairly be characterized as abusive. It is certainly not as abusive as Cleveland's. Controversial it is, and overwhelmingly destructive of Cleveland's defense of his action. But if this constitutes abuse, Mr. Cleveland should be wrapped in paraffine paper and put in a glass case where he may be admired but not "abused." McClure's was under no obligation to print any reply to Cleveland. There are good reasons why it should have refused, for it is doing vigorous and valuable work against plutocracy at great risk and may be pardoned for avoiding further risk. Besides, the publication of Cleveland's article may be justified on the business ground that it would largely enhance the demand for the magazine, whereas, on the other hand, Debs's would have little or no effect of that kind, if, indeed, it might not be prejudicial. But nothing can excuse the rejection of Debs's reply as abusive, if it was not more abusive than its present publication shows it to have been.

It is a great mistake, we beg to remind both the confident conservative and the impatient progressive—a very great mistake, to suppose that the Henry George movement, because it makes little or no organized display, is making no progress. In one way and another, here in advancing legislation and there in developing public sentiment, in one place crudely, in another timidly, in a third boldly, but everywhere persistently, this movement is advancing with leaps and bounds, though many there be who having ears hear not and eyes see not. Its advances in Australasia, in Great Britain, in Canada, and even in the United States are notable; but in Germany it is supposed to have made none whatever. Yet now come reports from Germany which show that even there, crudely and without

premeditation but unmistakably, it has been silently gathering force until now its beneficent effects are manifest and its single tax characteristics obvious.

A very good though unfriendly editorial explanation of this development in Germany may be found in the New York Evening Post of August 23d. We reproduce it in the Miscellany Department. The editorial is based upon a German municipalities' report made at a British conference on housing reforms. It appeared from this report that Germany has adopted a thorough policy—paternalistic in many features, but impregnated nevertheless with the individualism of the single tax—of municipal land-purchase, street planning, site control, building regulations and taxation of vacant lands on the outskirts of towns.

That public sentiment even in conservative New York, is feeling the effect of this irresistible tendency toward encouraging building by exempting buildings from taxation and discouraging land monopoly by concentrating taxes upon sites in proportion to their values respectively, is evident from a real estate news article in the Brooklyn supplement of the New York Herald of August 29. That article tells of the exasperating rise of rents along with, and even ahead of, advances in public improvements. It appears that Brooklyn rents have in some places risen within a few months from \$15 to \$20 a month; from \$18 to \$22; from \$15 to \$25; from \$13 to \$23.50, and so on. These appalling increases are explained in the article by a real estate owner whom the report quotes as follows:

The new bridge, the contemplated Blackwell's island bridge, and the Pennsylvania tunnel, with its promised improved facilities, have made a boom over all Long Island. The rush of people early this year out of New York has made houses valuable. [He means sites, of course, for houses do not rise in value. When they tend in that direction, new houses are built to compete with them. But you can't build new sites. Consequently, it is sites, not houses, that rise.]

Therefore rents have jumped. Small houses "for persons of ordinary circumstances" at reasonable rents are eagerly snapped up, which shows them to be a good investment. Few men who are employed in this city live in the country from choice. It is the penalty they pay for being fathers. But rents are bound to be abnormal here because the price of land increases by leaps and bounds. There is a piece of land [pointing to a wooded tract] that has trebled in value in less than ten years, and they are growing corn on it! There is one farm on the west, another property on the east, two large tracts on the north. And if the owners of these and other tracts could be made to let go their holdings at reasonable prices there might be hopes of cheaper homes. Certain families hold their lands at from \$4,000 to \$12,000 an acre, if anybody desires to buy; but when the assessor comes around the value sinks amazingly, the rate being fixed at from 12 to 17 percent of the price it would bring at auction. These complaining tenants you speak of have much of justice on their side. I feel that this persistent rent raising will result in a decrease of population. If, however, we could reach the influences that are causing congestion in a territory where thousands of acres of land are totally unoccupied or unprofitably used, it would do much to cheapen the cost of land. Take an instance: I am paying on my house and lots on a valuation of \$4,000, more than 70 per cent. of the selling value. Across the street is a farm of 16 acres or thereabouts, which is taxed on a valuation of about \$900 an acre. Yet the family owning it has to my knowledge refused \$9,000 an acre. What is true of that farm is true of all the large tracts around here. Now, suppose the assessor in his judgment should decide to make the owners of these tracts pay taxes on 70 per cent. of their own valuation, what would happen? They would be compelled to throw their tracts into the market, because they could not raise enough corn on them to pay the taxes. Then we would have cheaper land, and ordinary houses could be built upon them for sale or rent at a moderate price.

The common sense of the latest in a long line of sheriffs of New York county has called public attention to a scandalous practice which has endured in that city decade after decade for generations. For the detention of prisoners charged with crime under the State law, there has all this time been a city jail, colloquially known as the "Tombs." The old county prison has survived, however, and has been known colloquially as "Ludlow

street jail." It has been used as a debtors' prison, for be it known that imprisonment for debt still exists in New York. If by hook or by crook it can be made to appear that a debt is tainted with fraud, plump goes the debtor into Ludlow street jail, there to stay, unless he can give bail not to leave the county on pain of making his bondsmen liable for the debt, until he divests himself of every tangible aid to getting a new start in the world. There are instances of incarceration in Ludlow street jail for debt for years and years. And the incarceration is not in the company alone of unfortunate debtors. While the State does not detain in this jail persons charged with crime the Federal government does. That government detains its accused prisoners in county jails. Consequently those prisoners in New York go not to the "Tombs," but to "Ludlow street jail." As a result some of the most seductive of professional criminals, the counterfeiter class, are brought into close daily intercourse with unfortunate debtors. It would not be easy to contrive a better plan for educating criminals. With professional counterfeiters for the faculty, and unfortunate debtors (somewhat unscrupulous, perhaps, or so believed to be) for the student body, this college of crime ought to rank high. And no one has ever tried to break it up. Federal judges and county sheriffs have come and gone, each patronizing the crime-breeding institution, thoughtlessly, of course, until Sheriff Erlanger, now in office, puts down his foot and cries "Stop!" His method is very simple. It could have been adopted long ago, and would have been if officials had felt any sense of responsibility. He has merely had the Tombs declared officially to be a county jail; and now he notifies the Federal authorities that their prisoners must be placed in this county jail or they will not be received by the sheriff at all.

All that is necessary to justify the people of Chicago in condemn-

ing the proposed traction extension ordinance and its sponsors (p. 305), is now at hand. Judge Murray F. Tuley's careful analysis of its provisions and exposure of its iniquities is in itself enough. His ability and sincerity, for which his reputation is established beyond question, are a guarantee both of the good faith and the soundness of his objections. But if Judge Tuley had never spoken, Mayor Harrison's treatment of the Referendum League's protest should be a sufficient warning to the public to accept this ordinance with the utmost caution. If the ordinance were not corrupt, the Mayor, as its chief official champion, would be under no great temptation to descend to the level of the buffoon and indulge in the pettifogging which characterizes his response to the Referendum League. Their protest is dignified and argumentative, and as the protest of the useful organization that has secured every public policy petition thus far voted on, it was entitled to respectful consideration at the hands of the Mayor of the city. Instead of that, the members are regaled with artful dodging and insulted with vulgar abuse. When the chief magistrate of a great city can find no better response to a respectful protest against a public policy which he proposes, what is to be thought of that policy—especially when it involves a violation of his pledges, and, as Judge Tuley pointedly intimates, its success would enormously enrich a traction ring at the expense of the city?

GRAFT IN SOCIETY—A NEGLECTED BRANCH OF HISTORY.

Historians have often passed over the interesting stories that tell what far-reaching results often come from apparently insignificant circumstances. Clodius one evening takes a drop too much, goes forth on a lively venture and perhaps changes the course of history. This has got into the books, but is the exception. The Duchess of So and So becomes miffed at Lord Blank and can command

enough votes to turn the scale and oust the government. Only a belated diary will tell this inside history. The wife of Senator Simkins gives a function; and social cards are played so skilfully that a bill is killed at the punch-bowl, or amid the waving palms of the conservatory. Such things happen, but they are told neither in dignified history nor in the Associated Press.

What paper publishes the fact that Mayor Timkins lunches five days in the week with A. B. Tomkins, president of the Crown City Water Works? It may be that the water works transgress their charter, give muddy water and charge what rates they please; it may be that some officious citizens protest—but what does it amount to? Timkins lunches with Tomkins.

It is disagreeable to be suspicious and cast aspersions. And society's functions are jolly and delightful. The son of C. D. Goster, president of the Crown City Railways Company dances the mid-winter German with the daughter of the city attorney, Captain Foster. And besides, Lieutenant Governor Gloster lunches with President Goster whenever he comes to the city. The Lieutenant Governor is a countryman, more or less green, and he is much flattered at lunching in the swellest clubs with the elegant Goster. How can the city attorney put heart into a suit against the company for not doing the agreed amount of paving, seeing that his daughter has given all her heart to the president's son? Or how can the Lieutenant Governor fail to throw his influence in the legislature on the side of his friend, the elegant Goster, who has been so nice to him? What in fact is the chief function of the elegant Goster? He himself once whispered it to an intimate friend. It is to be nice to lieutenant governors, mayors, councilmen, etc.

The following story is authentic. The Crown City Hardware Company is one of the mammoth establishments of the world. It does an enormous business in all parts of this great country and even abroad. The Crown City Hardware Company enjoyed most valuable switch-track privileges on various streets. One day an influential new member of the city

council was sitting in the office of a certain lawyer, who was as eager as the new member to do something startling and distinguished. The question arose of the "pull" the Crown City Hardware Company seemed to have, and the attorney happened to know how it came about, and on what slender thread of right the pull hung. So these two patriots and champions of the people's rights then and there determined to make a test of the matter. Of course the C. C. H. Company pretty soon got wind of this intention. And how did the president and manager circumvent the obnoxious inquiry? To cut short a long and touching story Mr. and Mrs. New Member and Mr. and Mrs. Attorney found themselves invited to dinners and receptions which had been previously longed for with far-off eyes. The gates of the social heaven were suddenly opened to them; for Mrs. President and Mrs. Manager were both high up in the ranks and the two together could make a go of anybody they would take up. Thus did the investigations of the switch-track privileges cease. There are more ways in the great world of graft to get things done or not done than by the mere vulgar fashion of paying actual cash.

Besides the happy parties to the deals, only those who are privileged to catch occasional faint whispers from the inside can ever know how many appointments, elections, passings of ordinances, and non-enforcements of laws, depend upon pattings on the back in the shallow fellowship of clubs and the social swim. For just as personal likes and dislikes, personal slights and favors have, as we may read in old diaries and memoirs, turned the fates of kings and governments, so to-day the personal associations of modern society play their part in our all absorbing games of graft and ambition.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, September 1.

It appears from the reports of fighting at the seat of the Russian-Japanese war (p. 327), which, however, are not altogether trustworthy, that the Japanese have

shifted their active operations from Port Arthur to the region of Liaoyang in the north. It was reported on the 27th that the direct attack upon Liaoyang had then begun; and on the 28th that Gen. Kouropatkin had been driven back into Liaoyang, where he was making desperate resistance to the advances of the Japanese under Kuroki from the east, Oku from the south and Nodzu from the west. The fighting is described as furious, with some 300,000 Japanese against 200,000 Russians. At latest reports the engagement had become general and the battle was still being fought.

Port Arthur was undergoing attack (p. 327) on the 26th, according to official reports, notwithstanding the circumstances which had shifted the center of interest from Port Arthur to the larger operations in the north. The condition of the Russians at Port Arthur was reported on the 28th as desperate. Since that date no news of these operations, at all trustworthy, has been received.

Besides the international incident at Chefoo (pp. 309, 324), somewhat similar complications have arisen at Shanghai. The Russian cruiser Askold, and their torpedo boat destroyer, the Grozovoi, took refuge in Shanghai for the purpose of undergoing repairs. But they did not disarm, as the Japanese discovered upon sending a warship into the harbor to investigate. The Japanese, therefore, threatened, if they persisted in refusing to disarm, to capture them in the port. Thereupon the European powers interfered, and in their behalf an American man-of-war anchored between the Russian and the Japanese ships. After much international agitation on the subject the Czar, on the 25th, ordered his vessels to disarm, and they accordingly did so.

The civil war in the South American republic of Paraguay (p. 327), has not subsided, although the bombardment of Asuncion has been abandoned. In explanation a Paraguayan representative of the revolutionary party states that the government had taken cannon from the city's fortifications and lodged them in front of the private houses of revolution-

ary sympathizers, so as to force the insurgents to fire in that direction. The same representative asserts that the object of the insurrection is to overthrow a minority government which is corrupt. The insurrection is under the leadership of Gen. Ferreira, who declares that he will accept a provisional presidency only, and that on the complete extinction of the present government the insurgents will elect a non-partisan government. The conflicting parties are known as "coloradoes" or "reds," and "liberals." The "coloradoes" have been in power since 1873, and are charged with extreme partisanship.

In Uruguay a revolutionary war between conflicting parties, "coloradoes" or "reds," and "blancos" or "whites" has been in progress for six or seven months. The causes are much the same as those that have produced the insurrection in Paraguay, the "colorado" party in Uruguay having been in power since 1865. News of an important and probably decisive battle between the government forces of Uruguay and the Uruguayan insurrectionists was expected at Buenos Ayres on the 25th, but no such news is yet at hand. On the 28th, however, in Argentina waters, the government forces attacked an insurrectionary force on a steamer, capturing the vessel and killing and scattering the troops. Because this was in Argentina waters, the Argentine government has protested and its diplomatic relations with Uruguay are strained.

The political situation in the United States has been disturbed during the week only by the withdrawal from politics of ex-Senator David B. Hill, of New York. On the eve of his 61st birthday, the 28th, Mr. Hill published from Albany an announcement that on Jan. 1, 1905, he would retire from politics; that he never would run for an elective office again; that if the Democracy is successful in the State of New York and the nation he will accept no appointment at the hands of the President or Governor, and that he will relinquish the leadership of his party in his State.

In a letter of the 24th to John

G. Milburn, of Buffalo, Judge Parker explains that part of his acceptance speech (pp. 289, 295) in which he discussed the Philippine question. Mr. Milburn had called attention to criticisms of Judge Parker's use of the word "self government" instead of "independence," and in his reply Judge Parker says:

You are entirely right in assuming that as I employed the phrase "self government" it was intended to be identical with independence, political and territorial. After noting the criticism referred to by you, I am still unable to understand how it can be said that a people enjoy self-government while another nation may in any degree whatever control their actions. But to take away all possible opportunity for conjecture, it shall be made clear in the letter of acceptance that I am in hearty accord with that plank in the Democratic platform which advocates treating the Filipinos precisely as we did the Cubans, and I also favor making the promise to them now to take such action as soon as it can prudently be done.

Wm. J. Bryan made his first political speech of the campaign at Nevada, Mo., on the 30th, at a gathering of 6,000 persons. In the discussion of national issues he stated that his plan is to appeal to the Democrats who believe as he does on public questions to support the national ticket this year, in order to remove the issues that stand in the way of the consideration of economic questions, these issues being imperialism, militarism and the race question. He argued that those issues, brought into the political arena since 1896, have interfered with the calm consideration of domestic problems. Referring to the personality of the candidates he exclaimed: "Give me a President who stands for peace in preference to a President who stands for war."

An attempt by workmen to organize a new Democratic party at a national convention called to meet in Chicago on the 29th (p. 279) was not successful in point of numbers. The informal convention was presided over by T. C. Wilson, of the laundry workers' union; and the platform proposed by T. C. Quinn and adopted by the convention, was as follows:

The wealth producers of the United States of America regard the Declara-

tion of American Independence as the great charter of human liberty and its author as the greatest philosopher and most constructive statesman of any age or time. In convention assembled we pledge ourselves to carry forward in letter and spirit both the Declaration and the political philosophy of its author, and to this end we protest against either of the two old political parties being given power over the American people. Both parties are but the mere hirelings of plutocracy and the instruments by which the fundamental democracy of our country is being assassinated and the masses of our people reduced to a condition of serfdom. Recognizing the impracticability of launching a new political party this year, first, owing to the shortness of time, and, second, to the presence in the canvass of two candidates representing the highest type of personal integrity, intellectuality and progress, Thomas E. Watson, candidate of the People's party, and Eugene V. Debs, candidate of the Social Democratic party, we at present deem it best to confine ourselves to the work of organization on the lines laid down by the Chicago organization, with the addition that said organization will be conducted on the principle: (1) that labor produces all wealth, (2) that all wealth belongs to those who produce it, (3) that every law enacted in support of the institution diverting wealth from its natural owners into the pockets of parasites should be immediately repealed, (4) that the emancipation of wealth producers must come as Jefferson would have it, through increased liberty, not as any of our present political parties wish it, through the enactment of more laws, which must lead to a greater paternalism and a recurrence of the present or worse condition.

The name of the projected party is the Jeffersonian Democracy.

Another third party, the Continental (p. 279) was organized at Chicago on the 31st, with Gen. Charles H. Howard, of Illinois, for President and George H. Shibley, of Washington, D. C., for Vice President. Its platform declares in favor of reciprocity, the government issuance of money, government ownership of railways, the right of labor to organize, an eight-hour day, a direct primary election law, the election of Presidential electors by Congressional districts instead of by States, an income tax, and a ten per cent. tax on vacant ground.

State conventions of the People's party were held on the 31st in Illinois and Indiana. The for-

mer nominated James Hogan for governor of Illinois and the latter Leroy Templeton for governor of Indiana.

An answer to Mayor Harrison's proclamation calling upon opponents of the proposed compromise ordinance extending traction franchises in Chicago to get up a petition against the ordinance or be regarded as approving it (p. 305), was made on the 26th by the Referendum League, as the representative of those voters who last Spring sustained the public policy petition it had submitted against extending traction franchises. The document is dignified and impersonal, and makes the following points of objection to the Mayor's proposition:

1. The question could not be submitted at the approaching Fall election because the full quota of questions will be on the ballot at that time under petitions already nearly complete.
2. A petition for the Fall election could not be used at the Spring election, and would therefore be valueless for that purpose.
3. Petitions procured now would be subject to attack if verbal changes were meantime made in the proposed ordinance.
4. The time allowed would be too short to procure a petition of 100,000 signatures. Furthermore, "it is unreasonable and unfair to demand that those who approve of an existing and constitutionally expressed public policy shall get up a monster petition to sustain it every time some official assumes it ought to be changed or would like to take some action contrary to it. Yet this is the position of the Mayor on the question at issue. The reasonable and fair course would be to refuse any franchise grant unless and until the traction companies or those who favor a franchise file a petition placing the question on the ballot and show that the people are willing to reverse their former position. In other words, the expense of a petition (at least several thousand dollars) and all the labor of circulating it should be borne by the people who want to see the franchise granted, and not by those who are opposed to it and have already been put to this expense and secured the present public policy vote against it." Reference is made also to the Mayor's pledge, when a candidate for reelection, in which he made the following declaration inconsistent with his present policy:

As Mayor of this city, I do not regard the signing of pledges to separate bodies as exactly a dignified proceeding, and for that

reason must decline to affix my name to the pledge you sent me. I can say this, however, that in every speech I am making in the present campaign I am calling attention to the necessity of the referendum on all proposed franchise extension ordinances, and am giving my pledge to the people direct to withhold my approval from any ordinance which does not give to the people a right they expect and demand, viz.: A referendum vote on all franchise extension ordinances passed by the City Council.

In conclusion the League's protest is as follows: "In conclusion we submit that the Mayor's proclamation is in direct conflict with the position of more than a majority of the members of the City Council, who have in writing pledged themselves as follows: 'I hereby pledge myself to be governed in all my official actions by the will of the people, as expressed by the majority of those voting the 'Little Ballot'; therefore, I will oppose the passage of any ordinance for the settlement of the traction question unless the same shall have been submitted to the voters of Chicago and shall have been approved by a majority of those voting thereon.'"

Mayor Harrison has made no formal response to this protest, but through an interview on the 28th, in the Record-Herald, which supports him in his policy of enacting the proposed ordinance without a referendum on it, and may therefore be presumed to have reported him fairly, he said:

At the last election the "little ballot" proposition of immediate municipal control had 121,957 votes for and 50,807 against. At the same time there were four candidates, and, in general, two opposing platforms. Mr. Cruice was the acknowledged champion of the immediate municipal control idea, and the people favored him with less than 10,000 votes. Then there was a gentleman on the Socialist ticket, a dyed-in-the-wool blown-in-the-bottle advocate of immediate municipal control. He got about 10,000 votes. Graeme Stewart was a settlement man, and he received 138,000 votes. I also was running on another settlement platform, and I was given 146,000 votes. In other words, the candidates who favored a settlement of some sort or other received 284,000 votes, while the immediate control candidates received about 20,000 votes. The settlement candidates polled 284,000 votes, while the "little ballot" proposition for immediate municipal control received only 120,000 favorable votes. In selecting me for Mayor; did the voters repudiate my platform? They knew my views, expressed, as they had been, in half a dozen annual messages and in hundreds of campaign speeches. Did they elect me to carry out the promises I had made, the policy I had

said I would follow if made Mayor again? One hundred and forty-eight thousand voters elected me, presumably to carry my platform into effect. Am I to disregard their wishes and do what the 20,000 who voted on the "little ballot" proposition ask? Wouldn't that be rather much of a minority rule?

In the same strain Mayor Harrison continued:

The referendum idea has been placed before the people heretofore as an academic proposition. Now I propose to place a tangible proposition before the voters. I propose to give them a vote on a specific ordinance, and they will get it if those gentlemen with lungs will stop their shouting long enough to rustle around and get busy with petitions. They make two complaints. They say that only three questions can be placed on the next "little ballot," and that these questions are about decided on by petitions now in circulation. They say that if these questions do not go on the ballot faith will be sadly broken, and yet one of these questions is "home rule in taxation." They might as well ask the voters if they like three meals a day. They say they haven't time enough to get the requisite 100,000 signatures. Let 'em get to work and stop hollering. The trouble with 'em is they're too fond of distributing what Stanley Kunz, in immortal words, called "the bunk." I am not peevish. I am not critical nor captious, but simply as a seeker for information let me ask, "who is the Referendum League?" What membership has it? As a searcher after truth I make this request, "Gentlemen, produce. Show to a curious world the roster of your league." I have heard it said that five men constitute the league. Say it has fourteen members. Are they going to run me as they see fit? They produce no arguments. They get on the house-tops, beat the tomtoms, clash the cymbals, and make a deuce of a roar, but that is not argument.

At a meeting on the 27th of the executive committee of the Municipal Ownership convention,—a delegate body composed of representatives of the labor unions, turner societies and other organizations of Chicago,—a resolution was passed denouncing Mayor Harrison's franchise extension policy, and further declaring that—

It is the sense of this body that every individual and every organization in the city should cooperate with this convention not only to secure municipal ownership, but to emphasize the force of the popular will as expressed at the

polls, to the end that a republican form of government shall be preserved.

Judge Tuley, the distinguished chancellor of the Chicago bench, whose judicial fame is of the highest order, has declared himself on the same subject. In a lengthy and carefully thought-out interview in the Chicago Examiner of the 31st he said of the "little ballot" vote of last Spring against franchise extensions, that he had "thought that no Council would ever dare to attempt the passage of a franchise ordinance without a referendum after that vote." He added: "That a Council should contemplate doing that now is astounding." To the proposed ordinance itself Judge Tuley's specific objections were as follows:

1. The ordinance destroys hope of municipal ownership.
2. In the plan of commuting the unexpired franchises it gives the company more than it is entitled to.
3. It is indefinite as to what the city would have a contract right to take over at the end of the thirteen years.
4. It is misleading in its attempt to waive the rights of stockholders under the 99-year act, which cannot be done.
5. It would leave the city in an interminable tangle to the advantage of the traction company at the end of the thirteen years, with the inevitable result of another twenty years' extension of the franchises.
6. It gives the traction company unquestioned right of way in the streets over every other form of transportation and traffic.
7. It gives the company a valuable concession in the right to sublet the use of its trolley poles.
8. It gives the company the right to a five-cent fare for twenty years without power to regulate fares on the part of the city.
9. It gives the company the right to a "package and parcel" freight business in addition to the passenger business.
10. It practically suggests a parcel room in cars that the company might also collect for some parcels the people now carry free. This is possible, notwithstanding the provision allowing ordinary handbags and parcels in the hands of passengers free.
11. It sets a fictitious and outrageous value on stub ends of franchises to the disadvantage of the public.
12. It practically puts the appraisal of the property, in case the city undertakes to buy, in the hands of Federal judges to the exclusion of State judges.

13. It does not provide for lower fares or a means of ever lowering them.

14. It turns the compensation into the city treasury to be used to the advantage of the general taxpayer, instead of the users of the street cars.

15. It does not create a sinking fund to enable the city to buy the lines at the end of the franchise period.

16. It would leave the city worse off at the end of the franchise period than now, and with not a dollar on hand to pay for the lines.

17. It contracts away a. the city's general powers and binds the city down with all the detail of a cutthroat building contract.

18. It reduces in some cases, instead of increasing, the transfer of passengers.

19. It takes away from the people the opportunity to acquire the street car lines—an opportunity that will not return.

These are some of the things in the ordinance, briefly stated, to which I object as a citizen who feels a deep interest in the concerns of my people. I see that this is the time for the people of Chicago to get municipal ownership of the street car lines, and I cannot remain silent in the face of this undertaking to prevent that accomplishment. The people can get municipal ownership now if they prevent the passage of this ordinance. They can prevent its passage by bringing the great weight of public opinion to bear against it. If they fail to do that, municipal ownership will have gone beyond their reach.

NEWS NOTES.

—The American Microscopical society closed its session at Buffalo on the 25th.

—The telegraph cable from Seattle, Wash., to Sitka, Alaska, laid under the act of Congress of 1903, and 970 miles in length, was completed on the 28th.

—Edmund J. James, president of the Northwestern University (Methodist) at Evanston, Ill., has accepted the presidency of the University of Illinois (a State institution) at Champaign.

—Murad V. of Turkey, who was dethroned in 1876 on allegations of insanity and thereupon succeeded by his brother, the present Sultan, Abul Hamid II, died in prison at Constantinople on the 30th at the age of 64.

—At the Democratic convention for the Territory of New Mexico, at Las Vegas on the 26th, Geo. P. Money was nominated for Territorial delegate to Congress by 117 votes over ex-Congressman Jerry Simpson, who received 36.

—The Rt. Hon. and Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, D. D., K. C. V. O., lord archbishop of Canterbury and primate of all England, arrived at New York on the 27th on the steamship Celtic, ac-

companied by his wife and the vicar of Windsor.

—The city of Binang, in the province of Laguna, Luzon, was almost totally destroyed by fire on the 27th. One hundred persons, including many women and children, perished in the flames, and it is estimated that fully 5,000 of a total population of 7,500 were rendered homeless.

—The National Association of Retail Druggists was adjudged on the 31st at Chicago by Judge E. F. Dunne to be guilty of contempt of court in having blacklisted a dealer in whose behalf an injunction had been granted. Judge Dunne imposed upon the association a fine of \$2,500.

Professor Uphues' statue of Frederick the Great, to be presented to the United States by Emperor William (vol. v., pp. 97, 156) was packed on the 26th at Berlin and shipped to Hamburg. It will be forwarded to America by one of the Hamburg-American line steamers, consigned to Ambassador Von Sternburg.

—The Japanese government has issued a proclamation regarding the development of gold fields recently discovered in the province of Iwate. Foreigners estimate that these fields will yield gold to the value of \$500,000,000, and they are now preparing to start mining operations. It is estimated that the annual yield of the mines will be \$15,000,000.

—At a session of the United Garment Workers of America on the 25th at Buffalo, Henry C. White, formerly general secretary, and well known nationally in connection with labor union affairs, was expelled without a dissenting vote. He was charged with writing articles in favor of the "open shop" and of deserting the strikers in New York. Mr. White admitted resigning as general secretary rather than participate in the strike, which he regarded as unwise, but denied that he favors the "open shop," his position being that the "closed shop" should be established and maintained by the influence and power of the unions themselves and not by forcing employers to agree to it.

PRESS OPINIONS.

THE CHICAGO TRACTION QUESTION.

(Hearst's) Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Aug. 31.—No other man in Chicago occupies such an enviable position of universal respect and confidence as Judge Tuley. His long career on the bench has been singularly fruitful in honor. He has a national reputation for the accuracy of his decisions, and for his clear and impartial mind. Here in Chicago, too, we know him as a sincere patriot, singly desirous of the good of the community, and raising his voice in public only for some cause of public welfare. When such a man warns us that very grave danger is contained in the scheme that the Chicago City Railroad and its agents are trying to put through the Council it behooves us to give the matter the most careful attention. . . . The whole issue is whether the Council is to pass a fraudulent act that gives away the city's streets forever, whether we are to tolerate this monstrous swindle and infamous device,

whether we are to have municipal ownership or private pillage, and whether the people or the corporations are to rule. This is the issue, and we say again that no city in this country has faced a graver one. Judge Tuley evidently thinks it is of the utmost importance, and we commend to the most careful reading his momentous utterance upon it.

A MALIGNANT POWER.

(Hearst's) Chicago Examiner (Dem.), Aug. 21.—We have not always been apt to commend the official acts and the policy of Mayor Harrison, but we have, in common with the great majority of the people of Chicago, esteemed him a man of his word. Heretofore, we believe without exception, he has resolutely stuck to whatever promise he has made, whether to individuals or to the public. We believe he has taken a pride in his unblemished record in this respect, and it has been a justifiable pride. . . . How strong, then, and how sinister must be the influence that now induces such a man to violate all the precedents of his life and public service and for the first time in his experience violate a pledge! What is this malignant power that can do all these amazing things? That can make a former mayor betray their constituencies, committeemen become the tools and agents of a grasping and tyrannical trust, public-spirited citizens like John Maynard Harlan turn their backs on the Mueher bill that they labored so hard to secure, politicians risk their political future, newspaper editors desert the cause of the people, public officers become willing to surrender the city's rights to private greed, law-abiding persons become willing to see anarchy substituted for the basic principle of government on which this country has stood for more than a century, and Carter H. Harrison violate a pledge that he had given to the voters of Chicago? What is it? Here is something to make us all stop and think: What is it that is powerful enough in Chicago to do all these wonders? What is it that is stronger than the will of the people expressed at the polls? What is it that is stronger than government, stronger than principle, and stronger than right?

THE TARIFF IN POLITICS.

New York Times (Ind.), Aug. 27.—The Democrats may as well drop the tariff issue if they cannot discuss it like men with robust conviction. They will win no votes by paltering with the subject. This is a year for plain speech. The voters of this country are without exception adults. The tariff discussion thus far heard in the campaign seems to have been addressed to a nursery audience. . . . There is no virtue in proclamations of policy invariably accompanied by the neutralizing declaration that you don't mean a word you say. With the perfect frankness of a friend we must say that that was what was the matter with the tariff paragraphs of Judge Parker's speech of acceptance. There was no pledge, no promise, no affirmative declaration of the Democratic opposition to the extortions, the private favors and public outrages of the Dingley tariff.

New York Evening Post (Ind.), Aug. 26.—If the Democrats would appeal to the enthusiasm of the American people, they must fight as they pray. . . . Having, in their exalted moments, declared that protection, as a principle, is robbery and works incalculable harm to the people, they shiver at the possible effect of their pronouncement at the polls. . . . In a word, they shuffle on the tariff. . . . Such "Good Lord, good Devil" talk will not help the Democratic party in the least. If protection, as Democratic platforms have so repeatedly affirmed, is in its very nature evil, it is a thing to be got rid of as promptly as possible. If the party orators should frankly say that, no one would misunderstand them. . . . The Democrats, if they are to make a consistent and effective fight, cannot rid themselves any too soon of the idea that there is anything for them in this cry for tariff reform with "incidental protection." They need to eliminate all thought of incidental protection, which is a necessary evil, and not a thing to be gloried over by the Democrats in this campaign. The fight is on the principle, not on petty details regarding its application. The people are not going to display any enthusiasm over a party which finches on the eve of battle. No apologies for the Democratic tariff policy are needed.

NEGRO EDUCATION.

New York Age (Negro), Aug. 23.—Gorged with the delicacies of noble but ancient and remote literatures, the cultivated Afro-American displays, we sometimes think, a fatuous lack of appreciation for the actual relations of things in the objective world. Duly cognizant of his relations to his fellows, he sometimes is feebly responsive to the enlightened social conscience that exacts usury upon his talents. Moreover, you will find him failing in appreciation for the practical ethics of the workaday world, and on occasion disposed too lightly to flout a contract. Not infrequently you will see him led by his sentiments when he should be directed by his reason. He is more apt to write a "Souls of Black Folk" than to live an "Up from Slavery." These defects, in no sense racial, but intensely human, are fundamentally moral. They call, we think, for thorough-going revision of the course of study in our Afro-American colleges and universities. . . . With infinite pains, with pathetic zeal, they are still making all their students impressionable Greeks and Romans, when in the main they should be making their students reflective men and women, clearly understanding the envolving social conditions, wish heartily to serve their fellows in reasonable ways. Our colleges and universities are still stimulating and refining the imagination; when, concomitantly and with equal devotion, they should be developing, through the discipline afforded by such studies as history, political economy and descriptive sociology, the social sympathies and the powers of sustained reasoning.

PARTIES AND DEMOCRACY.

The Detroit Informer (Negro), Aug. 27.—It was because the Democratic party of anti-bellum days had drifted away from the ideal democracy of Jefferson that caused its decline and weakened its power prior to the Civil War. It was because of the retrogression and degeneracy of the Democratic party from Jeffersonian principles that made possible the organization of the Republican party to carry out the idea that "all men are created equal." It was because the Democratic party finally came to espouse the undemocratic cause of slavery that caused its downfall and utter defeat. That the Republican party has already abandoned the policy of its founders and repudiated the Jeffersonian doctrine it was organized to carry into effect only proves that history repeats itself. Parker and Davis both declare themselves believers in that Democracy known as the Jeffersonian, and, therefore, fully justify the National Negro Democratic league in offering their congratulations and support.

HONEST THINKING.

The (Indianapolis) Freeman (Negro), Aug. 27.—Don't be afraid of an honest thought if it happens to run counter to your former beliefs. Your own salvation, the safety of your country and the progress of the world depend on the loyalty of the individual to his honest thoughts, and he is both a coward and traitor who fears to follow them.

GOVERNMENT IN INDIA.

(London) India, Aug. 12.—The old conqueror claimed to rule because the sword had decided that he was the stronger. The modern conqueror alleges the inferiority of his subjects in intellect and character. The wisest of British rulers of India have tried to lay aside the conqueror altogether, and to establish their Empire on the rock of justice and good faith. Lord Curzon proposes to establish the Empire on racial domination. Is it any wonder that his unpopularity among the Indians has been exceeded by none of his predecessors?

SHIP SUBSIDIES.

Columbus (O.) Press-Post (Dem.), Aug. 29.—Did it ever occur to you that a ship subsidy would not be needed, if the price of steel in this country were not so high? If steel sells \$10 a ton cheaper across the water, a man would be a fool to build on this side. Ships are not like railroad tracks. They can be moved about.

All great and noble institutions of the world have come from popular efforts.—Bancroft.

MISCELLANY

LABOR DAY SONG.

For The Public.

Air: American Hymn, "Speed Our Republic."

Flag of our Union, so proudly unfurled,
 Float Labor's greeting to all the wide
 world;
 From every nation the busy ones come,
 Thrilling the air with the trumpet and
 drum,
 Raising Toll's standard aloft in the sky;
 Men, brave and loyal, by thousands are
 found
 Marching in triumph on Freedom's fair
 ground,
 Leaders of Labor whom gold cannot buy.
 Hush for a moment the hum of the mill,
 Let the strong hammer be idle and still;
 Stop the great reaper, on meadow and
 plain
 While the air trembles with music's wild
 strain;
 Let every list'ner the clear call obey;
 This is the time when with one heart and
 voice
 Men of all races clasp hands and rejoice—
 Builders of nations, not dreamers are they.

World-honored craftsmen, your weapons
 of pow'r
 Never gleamed brighter than in this great
 hour;
 Never before was the burden you bear
 Freightened as now with such deep, solemn
 care!
 Weavers of life's wondrous fabric are you;
 Clearly have nations their duty discerned,
 Lessons are taught that can ne'er be un-
 learned—
 Justice comes holding a guerdon for you.

Justice eternal! thy searchlight so strong,
 Quenchless and deathless must find every
 wrong;
 Sweep from our country the crimes we ab-
 hor;
 Cleanse from our banner the black stain
 of war;
 Take slavery's fetter from childhood's
 frail hand;
 Shatter in fragments the throne of mis-
 rule;
 Send us true pilots in pulpit and school;
 Give to the toilers a free, happy land.

MARY M'NABR JOHNSTON.

WHAT IS AN AGITATOR?

Who are the "labor agitators" in Colorado? What is a labor agitator? Some members of labor unions are labor agitators. In 1894, when the panic had possession of the country, there was a political meeting at an Illinois county seat. The meeting was held out of doors. One of the speakers said, when he had concluded a short speech, that he would be glad to answer questions on the issues of the campaign. Immediately a tall, well-dressed man said he had a question, and asked this:

"You are one of these labor agitators, ain't you?"

"Possibly I am," replied the speaker; "but what is a labor agitator?"

"A labor agitator is a man who goes about making laboring people discontented," answered the well-dressed man.

"Does he have to go about? Can't he stay in one place and make them discontented?" asked the speaker.

"Of course he can; but some of them go about making all the trouble they can."

"Yes; that's true. But aren't you Mr. —, manager and part owner of the plow factory here?"

"Yes, I am. What of it?"

"Didn't you cut wages last year?"

"Yes, I did. But I had to cut wages to keep the factory going."
 "I don't deny that; but I want to ask you if the employes in your factory were pleased at the cut. Did the wage reduction make them contented?"

"No; I can't say it did."

"It made them discontented, didn't it?"

"Of course it did."

"Then if a labor agitator is a man who makes laboring people discontented, it seems to me that you are a labor agitator."—The Press, of Helena, Mont.

LET US ALONE.

Elizabeth G. Jordan, in Harper's Bazar, tells a very amusing story of poor Hannah Rissler, who was taken for a drive by an enterprising reporter, "to get a breath of fresh air and have a good time." "I want to get her out of that tenement room for the first time in 29 years, and to show her the world. I want her to see the park and the sky, and the river and the boats on it, and the elevated trains, and the tall new buildings; and I want to write a story telling what she thinks of New York after her Rip Van Winkle sleep."

Here is what the enterprising lady reporter wrote in advance, as what ought to have occurred:

"Hannah looked out over the expanse of water, and tears filled her dim old eyes; eyes which for 30 years had gazed upon nothing but the grimy walls of the opposite tenement and a tiny patch of blue sky which the great building could not quite shut off. 'When I was a girl,' she said, softly, 'my husband and I used to sit on the river bank and see the boats go by. That was long ago—but this makes it seem yesterday.' Her lips quivered a little."

But here is what actually happened:

"Where are we going?" she whimpered. "We have went so far. Are

we in another city? I don't feel well. I think I catch cold. I got some good medicine in my house wot the Salvation girls give me. It always makes me well. It cures everything wot I got. Take me back."

Here is the finale, as the enterprising lady reporter had imagined it:

"Good-by," she said. "Thank you and God bless you. You have shown me to-day a glimpse of what I hope awaits me after I take my next—and last—long drive!"

But this is what happened:

"A long gasp of delight fell on Miss Underwood's ear. It came from the lips of Hannah Rissler. Her face was transfigured. The listless, sick little old woman had become an ecstatic creature, hysterical with joy. 'Ach Gott!' she shrieked, 'Ach Gott!—there's my little home. I'm back again. I'm back again!' She closed her eyes and struggled for breath: 'Ach Gott!' she gasped, 'Gott sei dank!'"

The story illustrates the fact that people generally want not what is good for them, not what they ought to have—but simply to be let alone. That is the answer of the remonstrant to the effort of the reformer.—The Woman's Journal.

IMPERIALISM AND ITS FRUITS.

We need not so much an open door to trade as barriers to imperialism.

Venice flourished and prospered and her navy commanded the seas near about, bringing her trade that created her commercial aristocracy and converted her from a republic into an oligarchy of wealth. When lust for gain and vain ambition sent her fleets against Constantinople, the mighty power of Venice began to wane.

Rome opened the door of every adjacent land to trade and penetrated and subjugated far-off Egypt; her commercialism bred luxury and sensuousness and her imperial army that had extended her sway over sea and country, fell powerless before the savage Goth and Hun.

Carthage, once mistress of the seas, extended her markets by force of arms, and Carthage is of value only as a milestone marking the path of imperialistic wrecks.

Within our own time the fleets of Spain have swept the seas, but the armada perished, and with it the mighty power and prestige of the Spanish throne.

Great Britain, mighty mistress of the seas, on whose possessions the sun never sets, is struggling under the weight of crushing debt that makes necessary a revolution in her fiscal pol-

icy, and which, constantly sapping her energy, must leave her weak and her possessors prey to the new disciple of force rising on the horizon, which in turn will crumble into ashes.

All along the path of history are strewn the wrecks of nations which subordinated right to might.

Only powers based in righteousness can endure. The lithe limbs falter, the strong body bends, the vigorous mind weakens when man ignores moral law and is sensual. Sensuality is to the body what imperialism is to the nation. Each saps physical greatness and moral power.

Trade gained at the expense of morality will finally be paid for in the flesh and blood of citizens. It has always been so, it will always be so, because human agency cannot change universal law.

The finite mind has its limitations, a fact which explains in part differences between individuals. Thus the employer who arrogantly refused to increase the wages of his employes ten per cent. a day, gives away millions for the establishment of libraries, whereas his employes had wanted more food for their children. Typically illustrative of this perversion of mind is the case of the Russian noblewoman who, watching the tragic action on the stage of a theater, wept copiously over the grief depicted there while her coachman, seated without on the box, was freezing to death.

We in the United States would repel as horrible the suggestion that we make war on Canada for the control of her markets. Yet we tolerate a war against the Filipinos, 10,000 miles away, waged for no other purpose than to open the door of trade for us, not to the Philippines alone, but to the east. We barter flesh and blood for trade.

And whose flesh and blood? Not the sons of the men who will reap direct gain from control of the markets of the Philippines and the east. Not the sons of tobacco and sugar trust directors, but the sons of the poor whom we pay so much per month to shoot and be shot at.

An army of mercenaries is a complement of imperialism. But these mercenaries are not of the families of the well-to-do, because they do not need the money. If we must barter flesh and blood for trade, then let sordid commercialists send their sons, let them, as Mr. Bryan said, "put their boys on the auction block and sell their blood for gold."

Imperialism and related commercialism make war a business. They invariably produce calloused patriotism,

defeat justice, supplant idealism with materialism and make mockery of virtue.

Imperialism digs nations' graves. But nations see in the fresh heaped earth the material fruits of the material policy; they do not look beyond it at the other fruit, created in the same action—the narrow house.—An Editorial in the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald.

THE LAND POLICY OF GERMAN CITIES.

An editorial in the New York Evening Post of Aug. 23.

At the recent conference on housing reforms held in the model village of Bourneville, near Birmingham, the delegates, representing many towns, trades unions and housing associations, were most interested by reports of the astonishing progress made by German municipalities. It was generally agreed that in the fight for public health and welfare the German cities had far surpassed the English. As a result many of the proposals of the conference which are to be laid for immediate action before municipalities throughout Great Britain are based upon German experience and experiments.

Mr. T. C. Horsfall, one of the delegates to the conference, has just published in a monograph entitled "The Examples of Germany" some of the achievements which aroused such interest at Bourneville. Credit for them must by no means be given wholly to burgomasters and town councilors. Behind these officials there has been strong government pressure. After long study, German scientists, engineers, and sanitarians have succeeded in interesting the national legislature as well as the governing bodies of the various states in a thorough policy of municipal land purchase, street planning, site control, building laws, and taxation of vacant lands on the outskirts of towns. The general building law of the kingdom of Saxony of 1900 is, for instance, a striking example of state interest in these questions, as well as an illustration of the thoroughness with which the subject is being approached. When the Saxon ministry became convinced of the need of new legislation, it submitted its first draft to various public bodies, such as the Fire Insurance Chamber and the National Medical College, the Union of Saxon Engineers and Architects, as well as to a number of state and municipal superintendents of building and to the chief authorities of the governmental divisions of the kingdom. At the request of the Saxon parliament it was also laid before a large committee of doctors, architects, offi-

cials and agriculturists, which discussed the proposals for three days, and made many acceptable changes. After another revision by a smaller committee, the bill was laid before the parliament and unanimously passed after careful discussion in many sittings.

While this is in many respects a model measure, under which the Saxon cities should develop harmoniously and scientifically, it has some startling features when viewed from this side of the Atlantic. For instance, section 59 declares that if plots of land are too small to serve as sites for buildings, and the owners do not dispose of them voluntarily, they must be sold to the community. In other sections there are grants to the municipalities of sweeping powers to redistribute lands, even against the will of the owners, should such lands hinder the carrying out of the city's building plan by reason of their form or size or position. Such unusual powers, which are wholly aside from the public right of condemnation, are in line with the most striking feature of this whole German movement—the purchase by cities and communities of large areas of land upon which to erect dwellings for the poorer classes. No less than 1,100 communities, large and small, have now such assured incomes from rents of municipal lands and buildings as to be able to do without local taxation.

So bold and generous is the scale on which these operations are undertaken that Berlin has included land 20 miles from the center of the city in its new plans for the regulation of building operations. Many smaller towns have discounted the future and blocked the path of the conscienceless speculator by prescribing the nature and extent of streets and buildings on outside areas six times the size of the towns themselves. The city of Ulm, in Bavaria, with a population of 45,000, has not hesitated to acquire 4,054 acres near the town boundaries. Cologne owns 1,450 acres, and the corporation controls institutions which own 8,430 acres more. Posen has ten square yards per head of population; Barmen, 10.76; Dresden, 14.23; Krefeld, 14.95; Essen, 17.70. Altona, Charlottenburg, Dueseldorf, Karlsruhe, Chemnitz, Cassel, have from 23.94 to 59.80. Nine cities, Stuttgart, Halle, Duisburg, Berlin, Kiel, Leipsic, Munich, Hanover, Cologne, have from 59.80 to 119.60 square yards. Berlin has 84.91. Five cities, Frankfurt, Mannheim, Breslau, Magdeburg, Dortmund, have from 119.60 to 239.20 square yards; and four towns, Aachen, Danzig, Stettin and Strassburg, have more than 239.20 square yards. Strassburg, which

has 364.78 square yards to each inhabitant, has proportionately more land than any other municipality.

Frankfurt-on-the-Main has just taken a step which has already been essayed by some of the principal German cities, and which may frankly be termed socialistic. It is the taxation of unemployed lands—"a rate on unearned increment of value"—much as was urged by the late Henry George. The town councils are permitted by law, and strongly encouraged by high imperial officials, to tax sites which have not yet been built upon, for the amount for which they could be sold. This policy has been adopted in Crefeld, Breslau, Aachen, Duesseidorf, Elberfeld, Charlottenburg, Kiel and Wiesbaden—among other towns. Mr. Horsfall calculates the following results from the introduction of the system in Halle: One owner of building land worth \$276,750, who now pays a tax of \$8.50, will have to pay \$685 a year. Another speculator who owns land worth \$361,500, and now pays only \$4.25 a year, will be taxed \$895. When this plan was introduced in Breslau in 1900 speculators paid into the city treasury in increased yearly taxes the sum of \$76,250. The following are the rates for increase of value upon which the Frankfurt-on-the-Main town council has decided: No tax is charged on an increase of less than 30 per cent.; five per cent. on an increase of from 30 to 49 per cent.; ten per cent. on an increase of from 50 to 74 per cent.; and 20 per cent. on an increase of 74 per cent. or more. Such effective rating of "unearned increment" has hitherto been unknown, says the *Soziale Praxis*, a well-known German publication.

The object of the tax is a double one—not only to depress the price of lands and prevent speculation, but directly to stimulate the building of houses. That Berlin is about to follow the example of Frankfurt seems to be evidence that this policy has demonstrated its value in the German empire. Whether it can ever be adjusted to meet American conditions is an entirely different question. But as the record stands it affords proof of the correctness of an English writer's statement that the German cities have advanced farther in the direction of what is known as municipal socialism. He adds that this is not the result of political propaganda, but of gradual development from their own experience, under the most expert guidance.

Tommy—Don't you want some of these cakes, Tottie?

Tottie—What's the matter wiv 'em?
—Chicago Examiner.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

A HOUSE OF LORDS JUDGMENT AFFECTING \$20,000,000.

From the news columns of the Manchester Guardian of Aug. 2, 1904.

In the House of Lords yesterday judgment was given in the Scottish ecclesiastical appeal, deciding the ownership of property valued at some four millions sterling. The action stood as that of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland and others vs. Lord Overtoun and others. The case arose out of the union between the Free Church of Scotland and the United Presbyterian Church, which was effected in Edinburgh in October, 1900. In the Free Church the union was approved by a majority of 643 against 27 in the General Assembly. A small number of ministers—about 24 out of about 1,100 belonging to the Free Church at the time of the union, mostly residents of the Highlands—disapproved of the union, and refused to enter the United Free Church of Scotland. These were represented by the pursuers and appellants in the action, and they claimed that they and those who adhere to them, alone represent the Free Church of Scotland and are alone entitled to the whole funds and property of the Free Church, which are held by its general trustees. The successors of these trustees now hold the funds and property on behalf of the United Free Church. An alternative claim of the appellants was to share these funds and property along with the United Free Church. The Second Division dismissed the action and gave judgment for the respondents, confirming the decision of the Lord Ordinary to the same effect. Hence this appeal to the House of Lords.

The appellants complained that the Free Church in uniting departed from the principle of a State establishment and embraced voluntarism, and qualified or abolished the Westminster Confession of 1643 as its creed. On the other hand the respondents maintained that these two principles were not fundamental principles in the constitution of the Free Church as it existed from 1843 to 1900, and that the General Assembly possessed full legislative power to effect the union.

THE INCONGRUITIES OF THE SITUATION.

From the editorial columns of the Manchester Guardian of Aug. 9.

The actual facts of the situation today, as described by the Edinburgh correspondent of the Times, are such as to threaten the religious life of Scotland with a temporary paralysis which, if prolonged, might end in ap-

athy. The ministers of 28 congregations who, in opposition to the wishes of the remaining 1,000 congregations, are now in possession of the temporalities of the Church, amounting to some five millions of realty and personalty, have by their victory incurred a burden of responsibility which it is beyond their power to bear. They have churches and they cannot fill them; they have chairs and they cannot appoint to them; they have pulpits and they have not the men to occupy them. One may go further and add that, while they have wealth to be devoted to causes which they cannot maintain, they have also causes to maintain for which they have not the wealth. For the home mission halls which they now possess have, under the terms of the trusts, to be carried on, but the endowments afforded by these particular trusts are not sufficient for the purpose unless supplemented by such voluntary munificence as the dispossessed majority alone can provide. They have too much for one purpose and too little for another, for they cannot divert the funds of one trust to the purposes of another.

Under these circumstances, it is to the interest as well as to the reputation of the "Highland Host" to agree with their adversary quickly before endless litigation arises over the application of local and particular trusts. Nay, taking higher ground, they owe it to that peace which the world cannot give to mete out mercy and equity to the unsuccessful respondents.

THE FREE KIRKERS AND THE WEE KIRKERS.

From the editorial columns of *The New Age*, of London, for Aug. 11, over the signature of A. E. Fletcher.

Sunday last was a memorable day for Scotland. Eleven hundred ministers of the United Free church read to crowded congregations a manifesto of the nature of a death warrant. According to the decision of the highest tribunal in the land, these 1,100 clerics have no right to the pulpits they occupy, and in a few weeks' time if the law takes its course they will be liable to ejection from their churches and manse. No event since the famous Disruption of 1843 has created a greater sensation north of the Tweed than the ruling of the House of Lords in the appeal case against Lord Overtoun and other trustees of the funds of the Free Church. When that church federated with the United Presbyterians four years ago, and the two bodies became one under the title of the United Free Church of Scotland, it was thought that a great advance had been made toward Christian unity. There were, however, 27 of the Free Church ministers—old stagers

hailing for the most part from obscure Highland settlements—who protested against the amalgamation on the ground that it was an acceptance of the voluntary principle and a violation of the constitution of the church as adopted at the Disruption. The dissentients were treated with scant courtesy. An attempt was made to thrust them out of the synagogue, and their offers of compromise were rejected. But they were sturdy Scots, and not to be put down. They claimed that they were the faithful among the faithless, and that the property of the Free Church belonged to them. The Scottish courts decided against them, and they resolved to appeal to the House of Lords. When, in view of the enormous cost of that appeal, they suggested that whichever side won the expense of the trial should be paid out of the church funds, the suggestion was scouted with a bad grace. The United Free Kirkers thought the Wee Kirkers, as they dubbed the dissentients, would never be able to raise the money to carry on the appeal, but they were mistaken.

The document read from the United Free Church pulpits on Sunday was drawn up in the spirit of humility, and contrasted remarkably with the hoity-toity tone assumed by the defendants in their negotiations with the appellants before the trial. "Once again," says the manifesto, "the church is apparently to endure the loss of possessions for obedience to what we regard as the will of Christ, and for practically asserting in that line the inalienable liberties of the church. The ground of the judgment is that the Free Church has no right to take the steps which her convictions demanded; no liberty to distinguish what is essential and non-essential in the Westminster confession; and no power, therefore, to enter into a union with a sister church, though that church was one with her in all essential points of doctrine, discipline and government." The judgment is certainly an astonishing one, and confirms us in the belief that Mr. Bumble was right in his opinion about the law. We suppose if there had been only one appellant, instead of over a score, the lords would have decided that he was the rightful custodian of the Free Church property, which is valued at over £10,000,000. The costs of the trial, we are told, will be not less than £40,000. The defendants have been ordered to pay these costs, and we should say they are now sorry that they did not listen to the proposal of the appellants that the costs should be paid out of the Church property. John Stuart Mill said that the English law put a premium on injustice. That it

should cost £40,000 to settle a religious dispute proves, we think, that Mill was right. The judgment was not a unanimous one. Two of the seven law lords did not agree with their colleagues. We hope, however, it will rouse Scotsmen to agitate for home rule and for the disestablishment of the House of Lords. It must appear to them ridiculous that an English court should be allowed to upset a judgment of the Scottish courts, and still more ridiculous that a great organization like the Free Church of Scotland should not have the power to revise its constitution, and to modify its creed in accordance with the fresh light which is being constantly thrown by the higher criticism on the Scriptures which the churches still acknowledge as the rule of faith and practice. The Free Church was founded by Dr. Chalmers, a man of liberal ideas, who, had he lived, we feel sure would have approved of the union of the Free Church with the United Presbyterian. There is one thing in favor of the defendants; they are in possession of the churches and the manse, the training colleges and the bulk of the Free Church property. The 24 successive appellants will have their work cut out if they decide to carry out the lords' judgment to its logical conclusion. Some compromise is surely possible. The lords may be technically right, but they have struck a heavy blow at spiritual freedom, and in favor of an antiquated orthodoxy. Yet there have been times when our law lords have done better than this. It was said of Lord Chancellor Westbury that by his judgment in the Wilson case he abolished Hell with costs, and thereby deprived members of the Church of England of their last hope of eternal damnation. Our present Lord Chancellor, however, and the majority of his colleagues seem to be desirous that Scotsmen should retain that hope. The appellants against the United Free Church are faithful preachers of the Gospel according to Calvin, who discovered that usurers had a chance of Heaven, and that there were babies in Hell a foot long. They have been rewarded for their orthodoxy, but we do not believe that they will be able to fill the 1,100 pulpits which the House of Lords has handed over to them with men of their own way of thinking.

The question of the connection between church and state is raised afresh by this judgment. The Free Church, that is to say, the Church of the Disruption, did not object to state endowment; what they protested against was the interference of the State in spiritual matters. By amalgamating with a Nonconformist body like the

United Presbyterians they undoubtedly abandoned their State Church position. It would be a good thing if all State churches were disestablished. Clericalism under State patronage is an enemy to progress, and we rejoice that in France the quarrel between the Vatican and the Government seems likely to lead to a permanent rupture. By insisting upon adherence to the Concordat the French Government are well within their rights. The Concordat was the work of Napoleon I., who drew it up in such a way that there could be no doubt that he meant France and not the Pope to be supreme. France therefore will not accept bishops of whom she does not approve, or allow bishops of whom she does approve to be removed without her consent. It is curious that Scotland and France, old allies, should both now be agitated by something of the nature of a religious revolution. The loss of the Free Church property may be a spiritual gain for the United Free Church of Scotland, and the severance of the Church and State in France will help the cause of civil and religious freedom all the world over.

EUROPE'S MUNICIPAL STREET CARS, AND THE ECONOMIC LESSONS THEY PRESENT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

By Judson Grenell. (Copyright, 1904, by Judson Grenell.)

Glasgow is an excellent place from which to study the street car problem. It is probable that the statistics furnished by Glasgow officials have been more quoted than from any other municipality, but, after all, figures are not everything, and, as has been before remarked, while figures do not lie, liars sometimes figure. So I shall not weary the reader with statistics. Suffice it to say that the reports are all in favor of municipal ownership from the financial standpoint. But there are other things to consider as well as money, and it is necessary to view the problem from all sides if one desires to come to a correct conclusion.

After talking with city officials and intelligent citizens in Glasgow; in Liverpool, Manchester, Oldham, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, Bradford, Salford and London, England; in Berne and Lausanne, Switzerland; in Freiburg, Germany, and in various other localities; after viewing the magnificent plants some of these cities have installed and noting how the public is being accommodated; and, keeping in mind also the financial side, I can truthfully say that the street car problem has been solved in Europe over-

whelmingly in favor of municipal ownership.

UNIVERSAL APPROVAL.

I have failed to find in a single city where municipal has followed private ownership, even a respectable minority of citizens favoring the private monopoly of city tramways. Municipal ownership is as yet comparatively young, while the private company with its long monopoly had every advantage that experience could give; but only occasionally was the private monopoly content with normal profits. Possessing a "good thing," they worked it for every penny it was worth, until finally city after city tired of the exactions imposed and either bought or fired them out, and these municipalities have since reaped the reward of their righteous indignation.

During the past five years hundreds of thousands of dollars have been turned into the treasuries of municipal corporations by the cities' tramway officials; cars run oftener and more rapidly; seats are provided at all hours for 95 per cent. of the passengers; and employes are much more solicitous to give satisfaction than they ever were when in the employ of a private street car company. While occasionally a particular line of a system fails to meet expenses, the public is recompensed in other ways and the apparent loss is usually an actual gain.

SHORT HAULS THE RULE.

Glasgow has been held up as a model for cities contemplating owning their own street car systems. It is, in fact, well worth studying, and a superintendent would be wise indeed could he not add to his general knowledge of street car matters by an investigation here. Still, in my opinion, both Liverpool and Manchester are not one whit behind Glasgow in their conduct of their municipal tramways. There is in every instance a wise supervision that looks after the accommodation of the public while not neglecting economy. The men are not overpaid, the supplies are purchased in a competitive market, and the cars are neither extravagantly nor parsimoniously furnished.

It must be kept in mind, however, that probably in no city in Europe are the conditions just the same as those of American commercial and industrial centers. Go back far enough, and it will be seen that most continental municipalities were walled towns, for protection against foreign foes. In consequence they are compactly built, and even in such a great city as Paris, with its 2,500,000 inhabit-

ants—the area of which is about the same as Detroit, Mich., with 300,000 population—the suburbs are quickly reached, making long hauls the exception.

Most English cities were never walled enclosures, but the land laws have had the effect of insuring compactness, so that Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, etc., all with populations running into hundreds of thousands, comprise areas of from 10,000 to 15,000 acres only. Paris covers less than 25,000 acres. Of necessity, then, the hauls are short, the great bulk of the street car riding public paying the minimum fare demanded for the shortest ride.

THE "ZONE" SYSTEM.

In no English city owning its own street cars and tracks did I find one fare charged different length hauls. The "zone" system prevails, passengers paying according to distance traveled. It has been said that the American public will never consent to be "bothered" with this way of collecting fares; that the average American citizen prefers the one-price way; and that the system would financially ruin any American road adopting it. These are not valid objections against the "zone" system that are not more than offset by the simple fact that under it each passenger pays for just what he gets, and that he of the short haul is not mulcted for the benefit of suburban passengers. In short, the "zone" system is the most equitable possible way of charging for street car rides, and the system is as easily laid out and managed as is the system of a merchant who, selling cotton cloth by the yard, charges in proportion to the number of yards ordered. Land speculators dealing in suburban real estate are the chief opponents of the "zone" system. It most certainly would not favor their interests.

Let me explain the "zone" system. After the unit of a haul is decided on—and this unit varies in different cities—a center is established, and the distance between the center and the beginning of another division is a zone, and is the basis of all subsequent charges. In Glasgow this basis is, in the rough, about a mile, for which ride the charge is a cent. In Manchester the basis is two cents for two miles. When two zones are entered the cost is doubled.

When paying a fare the passenger either informs the conductor where his ride is to terminate, or hands over the exact fare he desires to pay. In either case he is given a check containing the names of the streets or stations terminating the various zones, and this check

is punched opposite the terminus of the zone or zones paid for.

As a rule the backs of these checks are used for advertising purposes, quite an income occurring from this source. These checks are at once receipts for fares paid as well as bars to dishonesty on the part of conductors and passengers. "Inspectors" board cars at regular intervals and call for these checks, in the meanwhile noting the number of passengers the memorandum kept by the conductor calls for. I do not remember seeing passenger indicators in any street cars abroad, the number of checks taking their place.

CLOSE VIEW OF MANCHESTER STREET CARS.

Last year was the second the street tramways of Manchester had been under municipal control. The system is not yet perfected, as the experimental stage is incomplete. Yet the management turned \$250,000 into the city treasury, besides cutting the fares, reducing the hours of labor of employes from 70 to 54 hours a week, increasing their pay, putting on more cars with more rapid speed, and in other ways improving the service.

Letters of introduction from Mayor Maybury, of Detroit, Mich., and Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, O., provided me interviews with city officials everywhere, and the information thus obtained as well as the confidence with which those in charge of municipal tramways talked, backed up as were their words with official figures, makes it impossible for me to see how anyone with any general knowledge of the situation can argue for a moment in favor of private and against public ownership of street car service.

"No one in this city at least," the superintendent of the Manchester city tramways told me, "even dreams of returning to the private ownership of our tramways, except he has a nightmare."

In no big town in England has this addition to the duties of a municipality been a failure. It was often necessary to buy out private companies, paying a good round sum for unexpired franchises, and then throw the outfit on the scrap heap and build anew from the bottom. Yet this was cheaper for the public than permitting private ownership to continue.

Here the penny fare is the unit. That small sum carries a passenger about two miles. Over 50 per cent. of our fares, in round numbers, pay this sum; 25 per cent. pay a penny and a half; 15 per cent., possibly, pay tuppence. The remainder pay thrippence, any increase over the largest amount carrying them out of our and into other municipalities' territories. In the cross-town routes there are half penny zones, but these cut but a small figure in the system, such routes being only feeders to the main lines.

Some routes are run at a financial loss,

but there is compensation in other directions, one being the prevention of congested traffic elsewhere.

You can say for me to the American public that our experience here proves that city tramways must be under municipal control if the best and cheapest service is desired. Only through gross mismanagement can there be financial loss.

Manchester, as also, do other up-to-date towns, uses two sizes of street cars. These seat from 38 to 75 passengers. Four passengers only are allowed to stand at one time in the small cars, and six in the large ones, during rush hours. This privilege is seldom needed, and never abused, as the cars are sufficiently numerous to take care of all ordinary crowds.

CONDUCTORS HAVE APPRENTICES.

On the big cars, besides motormen and conductors, there are employed "trolley boys." The duty of the trolley boy is to watch the trolley rope and to stop the car when a passenger wishes to alight while the conductor is collecting fares. The boy starts in at \$1.75 a week, and is raised 50 cents each year for five years, when he emerges a full-fledged conductor, commanding journeyman's wages—say eight dollars to ten dollars a week. This latter sum is tip-top pay in England for a skilled mechanic.

I noticed in Bradford, on the municipal tramway there, what looked like the persistence of customs more applicable to private ownership. For one thing, the motorman, in giving warning at street crossings, was compelled to pull a string attached to the clapper of a big bell hanging overhead. Each conductor carried a "safe" into which the passenger dropped his fare, so that the conductor handled only such money—and that his own—as was necessary to change larger for smaller denominations.

PARIS TRAMWAYS.

Paris presents a sharp contrast to England's municipal street car service. Here the companies are monarchs of all they survey, notwithstanding the spread of socialistic ideas in the French republic. Where old franchises are running, the fare is six cents for first-class, and three cents for second-class passengers. New franchises call for four and two-cent fares, respectively. On the double-deck cars the inside passengers pay the first-class price, the outsiders the lower charge. These prices take one anywhere inside the city limits, be the distance long or short.

An advantage offered in the higher fare is the privilege of demanding a transfer to any other line crossing the one on which the first-class rate has

been paid. Another advantage is the shelter provided in stormy weather. Where a car is not a double-decker, it is divided into two compartments, the first-class passengers having the privilege of sitting on upholstered seats and with curtains at the windows.

The intervals between cars are long, so that in the rush hours and on holidays one must practically engage a seat ahead by going to a "station" and getting a card on which is printed a number. When a car finally appears, the conductor calls out the numbers in rotation, and not until your number is reached are you allowed to get on the car, and not even then, if all the seats are occupied. I have waited for several cars—on one occasion over an hour. You see, this is "private enterprise," where the stockholders are making several hundred per cent. on the actual outlay.

IN SWITZERLAND AND GERMANY.

I found Swiss and German cities owning their own tramways. They are generally run on the profit system, rather than exclusively for the public good, and in consequence the service is not what it should be. In none were the accommodations provided equal to those of Glasgow, Liverpool and Manchester. Freiburg, Baden, has an excellent municipal tramway service, run on the one-price principle for either long or short hauls, a fee equal to two cents, if I remember aright, being the charge for either long or short distances inside the city limits.

In Lausanne, Switzerland, where the street car service is privately owned, the employes work long hours, and conductors and motormen wear for a uniform blue cotton blouses, receiving about six dollars a week. Here I paid four cents for comparatively short rides, and one cent for rides covering a very few blocks.

One defect in continental street railway systems was that they often ended abruptly and seemed to run to nowhere in particular. There is no particular effort made to reach the outskirts of the municipalities. This is in marked contrast to many of the street car systems in America.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL ENTERPRISE.

London tramway service is being gradually municipalized and changed from horse to electric power. Few of the lines are completed, and the service lacks as yet much that is desirable—speed among other things. The power is applied from conduits between the tracks, and in this respect they resemble cable cars. But the motion is smooth and continuous. Anyone who has rid-

den in the jerky cable cars such as disgrace Chicago, for example, cannot fail to note the difference. By the way, I found Edinborough, Scotland, still clinging to cable cars and private companies. The contrast between Glasgow and Edinborough is marked. The one thing in favor of conduits is the doing away with unsightly overhead wires. This is one of the reasons given why the London county council adopted them. Still, if the London county council is so aesthetically inclined, one wonders why the members allow the cars to be used as traveling advertising bill boards. The way these cars are disfigured with signs is a public disgrace. The staring letters telling of the virtues of patent medicines, infants' foods, pickles, whisky, etc., dwarf everything else in sight, and the stranger has difficulty in discovering the inconspicuous lettering indicating the routes.

Neither in Glasgow nor Manchester are these disfiguring advertisements allowed on the cars, though this involves a loss, I was told, of over \$100,000 a year. Yet there is compensation in keeping nightmares off the public streets.

CONCLUSIONS.

Summing it all up, my conclusions regarding the regulation of street railways are:

1. The municipal service of the tramways of Europe is much improved over that given by private ownership.
2. The charges for fares are based more nearly on the services rendered, and these charges are lower under municipal than under private control.
3. Employes work shorter hours and receive better pay.
4. There are few or no conflicts with other municipal functions also occupying the streets in common.
5. Notwithstanding the low fares, large sums are being turned into the public treasuries.
6. Municipal tramways, with low fares, have had a marked effect in increasing land values.
7. There is no good reason why, either under the one price or the "zone" system, municipal street car services cannot be made to return handsome profits.

Detectives have discovered that when Chicago people are baptized their sins are washed away into the drainage canal.

That the saturnalia of iniquity which is making St. Louis infamous is directly due to this source of infection, is the unhesitating opinion of the best authorities in psychobacteriology.

The federal courts will be asked for an injunction.—Puck.

BENGOUGH REPLIES.

THINGS AND THE MAN.

As coming from the recognized but unofficial poet laureate of the empire, Rudyard Kipling's new poem, "Things and the Man," signaizing the renewal of Mr. Chamberlain's fiscal reform campaign, is being read with wide interest.

"And Joseph dreamed a dream, and he told it his brethren: and they hated him yet the more."—Genesis 37:5.

Oh, ye who hold the written clew
To all save all unwritten things,
And half a league behind pursue
The accomplished fact with flouts and flings,

Look, to your knee your baby brings
The oldest tale since earth began,
The answer to your worryings—
Once on a time there was a man.

He single-handed met and threw
Magicians, armies, ogres, kings;
He, lonely mid his doubting crew,
In all the loneliness of wings;
He fed the flame, he filled the springs,
He locked the ranks, he launched the van
Straight at the grinning teeth of things.
Once on a time there was a man.

The peace of shocked foundations flew
Before his ribald questionings,
He broke the oracles in two
And bared the paltry wires and strings;
He headed desert wanderings;
He led his soul, his cause, his clan,
A little from the ruck of things.
Once on a time there was a man.

Thrones, powers, dominions block the view
With episodes and underlings;
The meek historian deems them true,
Nor heeds the song that Clio sings,
The simple central truth that stings
The mob to boo, the priest to ban,
Things never yet created things.
Once on a time there was a man.

A bolt is fallen from the blue,
A wakened realm full circle swings
Where Dothan's dreamer dreams anew
Of vast and forborne harvestings;
And unto him an empire clings
That grips the purpose of his pian.
My lords, what think ye of these things?
Once in our time is there a man?

—Rudyard Kipling.

THINGS AND THE OTHER MAN.

For The Public.

Respectfully dedicated to Rudyard Kipling.

Oh, you who hold the laureate's brief
For Austin who so seldom sings,
And give your active mind relief
So frequently in flouts and flings,
Look, to our hand the paper brings
Your latest screedlet, while we scan,
With its refrain of jinglings:
"Once on a time there was a man."

From Genesis you get your clew,
And tell of one who conquered kings,
And who "amid his doubting crew"
Felt "all the loneliness of wings;"
He "fed the flame," he "filled the springs,"
He "locked the ranks," he "launched the van;"—

Joseph it was who did these things—
"Once on a time there was a man."

Then you go on—we catch your view,
Though some have puzzled questionings—

Our period has its Joseph, too,
And 'tis for him your paean rings—
Joe Chamberlain, whose wanderings
Have been from Beersheba to Dan;
And so you own his leading-strings—
"Once on a time there was a man."

Oh, Rudyard, we're amazed at you,
Who 're not among the "underlings,"
Being in the crowd that Joe can do
With his exploded arguings,
His sophistries and wriggings,
And his preposterous "Fiscal Plan;"
You swallow all these boshy things?
Well, well! you easy little man!

"Once on a time" affairs were blue,
And Britain swarmed with starvelings,
'Twas when the corn-laws put the screw
On all the wealth which commerce
brings;

But Cobden rose and downed the rings,
And now this Britain leads the van!
Of Dick—not Joe—old John Bull sings—
"Once on a time there was A MAN!"

J. W. BENGOUGH.

Toronto, Ont.

"Ye really do think drink is a
necissry evil?" said Mr. Hinnessy.

"Well," said Mr. Dooley, "if it's an
evil to a man, it's not necissry, an' if it's
necissry it's not an evil."—F. P. Dunne.

As we understand the current inter-
pretation of international law, the seizure
of a vessel on the high seas is a
mistake or an act of piracy, according to
the size of the navy of the victimized nation.—Washington Post.

Figures seem to say that we are
paying out more for soldiers than several
of the great military powers of
Europe are paying out.

Assuredly there is something wrong
when it costs kings less to trample
on liberties than it costs a republic to
extend these.

The present bull tendency in the
price of liberty may be due merely to
the shorts scrambling for cover, and
again it may—

But sufficient unto the day is the
evil thereof.—Life.

Advertisement.—Positively the Great
American Novel.

Printed in three—count 'em—three
colors.

The blood passages in red, the love
in green, and the talk in black.

Mix them to suit yourself.

\$1.50. At all booksellers. \$1.50—
Puck.

BOOKS

SACRIFICIAL AND SPIRITUAL RELIGION.

Within a century no more important
work on religion has been published
than Auguste Sabatier's "Religions of
Authority" (translation issued by Me-

Clure, Phillips and Co., New York, \$2.50).
In this book the learned author draws
the contrast between sacrificial religion
and spiritual religion, arguing that the
religion of Jesus was essentially of the
character of the latter. He holds that a
religion of authority, whether based on
an infallible hierarchy or an infallible
book, is contrary to the ideas of Jesus,
who was more or less hostile to all forms
of sacerdotalism, as well as to intel-
lectual dogmas.

"Upon no point," he says, "has the
thought of Jesus been more flagrantly
traversed by those who call themselves
his heirs. Nothing was farther from his
mind than to constitute a new sacerdotal
order. He will have no master among
his own, who are all brethren. He prom-
ises to all equally the gift of the Holy
Spirit. The dogma of apostolical suc-
cession did not make the bishops; the
bishops made the dogma.

Sabatier contends that the claims of
the religions of authority can not bear
the tests of historical investigation, and
that the sooner the world grows out of
them the better. The passing of such
conceptions of religion will open the
way, he believes, for a true spiritual
religion, which was the religion that Jesus
taught. There will then arise a truer
faith in God and a far more acceptable
method of worship.

"The religion of the spirit," he says,
"is compounded of faith and love. To
faith all things are possible; to love all
things are easy. To develop and build
up these two necessary qualities should
be the task of theology."

J. H. DILLARD.

LAND VALUES IN CITIES.

When Richard M. Hurd, now the
president of "The Lawyers' Mortgage
Insurance Co., of New York, took charge
in 1895 of the mortgage department of
the United States Mortgage and Trust
Co., he found no books, either in Eng-
land or the United States, to aid him
in passing judgment scientifically on
land values in cities. He was conse-
quently forced to develop the science
at first hand. One of the results of the
work thus thrust upon him, out of the
necessities of his business as the re-
sponsible agent of a real estate loan
company, is a book of the highest im-
portance, not only to investors in real
estate, but also to economic students.
Among these it is especially valuable
to such as are active in propagating
the land value doctrines of Henry
George.

Mr. Hurd did not write his
book (Principles of City Land Values,
by Richard M. Hurd, New York: The
Record and Guide) for the purpose of
serving George's following. He prob-
ably had no thought of George, his fol-
lowers or his doctrines; but was aim-
ing only at evolving the science of land
values for business purposes. But
the very fact that the book was writ-
ten with a view solely to enabling

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. Familiarity 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, 1641 Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Post office address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

HENRY B. TAWRESEY,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
213 South Sixth Street,
PHILADELPHIA.

CONTRACTORS.

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

"Our Foreign Trade Balance continues to enrich our nation," says Senator Fairbanks, in his speech of acceptance. Pamphlet on international trade proving this to be a fallacy, mailed postpaid, 30 cents. A. C. AUSTIN, Salt Lake City, Utah.

LAND MONOPOLY MAKES THE DIFFERENCE.

"The child of an Astor comes into the world as naked as the waif of Five Points. Nature does not starve one and gorge the other. Human law does that."
—Herbert S. Egelow.

investors in real estate to make or to save money, adds to its value for the purposes of single tax agitation. It is not too much to say that it is among the best single tax books since those of George, which it most opportunely supplements.

Heretofore single tax writers and speakers have been obliged to make their own observations of facts; but now, thanks to Mr. Hurd's excellent book, they may have the benefit of a mine of illustrative facts, vouched for by one of the most prominent real estate experts of the world, and gathered solely for the purpose of enlightening business men with reference to real estate investments.

Mr. Hurd deserves to be especially congratulated upon his intelligent fidelity to economic principle. His book is no mere rule of thumb manual. It is in every sense a scientific production—deductive but not dogmatic, inductive but not heterogeneous. The thoughtful reader cannot but feel a peculiar sense of gratification as he notes the care with which the author has considered his subject in its apparent variations and shades of significance; and always, as far as we have observed, without a flaw. The book is a much needed model of the scientific method in economics.

Besides its value as a business monograph and an economic thesis, this book is interesting and instructive also in its exposition of the natural laws of urban growth, a phase of the sub-

ject which the author illustrates with numerous maps of cities both in this country and abroad.

PERIODICALS.

The story of Thomas Nast's cartooning of the Tammany ring is continued in Pearson's for September. This magazine will begin in an early issue another series of articles by Henry George.

Thomas W. Lawson is beginning to keep his word in his series of articles on "Frenzied Finance," in Everybody's. His first article, July, was a thrilling promise of exposure. His second, August, was picturequely but only generally descriptive. In the September article, however, he gets down to particulars, and a plain exposure of Wall street larceny results. The curious thing about it is that with all its sinuosity of detail and magnificence of climax, this is nothing but vulgar larceny of the kind that gets less magnificent thieves into jail. Readers of Everybody's who are interested in Lawson's articles should not miss the correspondence between him and the publishers which appears on pages 431-33 of the magazine for September.

Campaign Subscriptions

THE PUBLIC will be sent during the campaign to persons not now on its subscription list, for

TWENTY CENTS

This will include the issue of November 19, 1904. Address: BOX 687, CHICAGO.

PUBLICATIONS

OF L. S. DICKEY & CO.
1601 Unity Building, CHICAGO.

ETHICS OF DEMOCRACY.—By Louis F. Post. 400 pages, silk cloth, deckle edges, gilt top. Price, \$2.00 net. By mail, \$2.12.

BISOCIALISM.—The Reign of the Man at the Margin. By Oliver R. Trowbridge. 400 pages, in cloth. Price, \$1.50 net. By mail \$1.60.

COMPLETE WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE, LIBRARY EDITION.—Just issued in ten volumes, with Life of Henry George, by Henry George, Jr. Uncut edges, green buckram. Price, \$17.50 per set.

THE PROPHET OF SAN FRANCISCO.—A Monograph, by Louis F. Post, 80 pages. Per copy, 20c postpaid.

FREE AMERICA.—By Bolton Hall. In paper; 220 pages, 25 cents.

All of above sent to any address in the United States, for \$1 on monthly installments of 25c. Deliveries in Canada and Mexico will be made without additional charge other than for customs duties, and to other foreign countries without additional charge other than for customs duties and expressage.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.,
1601 Unity Bldg., Chicago.