

conquest, we have already, in loss of life actual and prospective, abundant reason to condemn the imperialistic land-grabbing regime that has involved us in it.

Whether the courts of Ohio ever succeed or not in making out a legal case of crime against John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil company, the fact of its criminality now stands confessed. For refusing to produce the books of the company, its secretary claims the privilege which all criminals are by law allowed. He pleads that "the books disclose facts which may be used against the Standard, tending to prove it guilty of offenses made criminal by an act of the legislature of Ohio," and that "they disclose facts and circumstances which may be used against" himself "personally as an officer of the said company, tending to prove" him "guilty of offenses made criminal by the act aforesaid."

Last week we referred to the attempt of President Harper, of the Rockefeller university, of Chicago, to draw the public school system into the Standard Oil monopoly net. Here are the facts: Mayor Harrison appointed a commission to revise the public school system. That was more than a year ago. One of the appointees was President Harper, of the Rockefeller university, who became chairman of the commission. The commission recently reported a bill, now before the legislature, the manifest object of which in one respect was to place the public school teachers of Chicago under Mr. Harper's domination. We refer here to that clause of the bill which would make the eligibility of public school teachers depend upon the report of a board of examiners, the majority of whom would almost of necessity be professors or other teachers in the employment of President Harper. Two of these examiners—there would be five in all—would be the superintendent of schools and one assistant superintendent, while the other three must be college graduates or have an equivalent educational training, and have

had at least five years' successful experience in teaching since graduation. As the language of the bill is here a little obscure, we reproduce it, so that our interpretation may be tested. It requires the examiner to "possess either a bachelor's degree from a college or university, or an equivalent educational training, together with at least five years' successful experience in teaching since graduation." Had the bill imposed no other limitation, this would have confined the choice of three out of the five examiners to professors or teachers in the Rockefeller-Harper university, and to public school teachers who were college graduates. Few other persons in Chicago have had "five years' successful experience in teaching since graduation" from a college. But the bill specified one other limitation, namely, that no person should be eligible as one of these three examiners if connected with the city school system. That would rule out public school teachers, and leave the virtual selection of Chicago teachers entirely to employes in the Rockefeller-Harper university. It will be seen that the bill was neatly contrived to make the public schools of Chicago another adjunct of the Standard Oil trust. The senate committee on education has wisely decided to return this bill with an adverse report.

Altgeld opened the speech making part of his Chicago mayoralty campaign with a broadside aimed at the administration of Mayor Harrison. Apart from his discussion of the question of municipal ownership of street car lines, the ex-governor confined himself on this occasion to administrative questions of purely local interest. And if the mayor expected to gain by declaring as he did before the Altgeld meeting that he would stand upon his record, he must by this time realize the weakness of his hopes. For not since the fall of the Tweed ring has an exposure of worse city administration been laid before a community. Since Altgeld's speech, the Chicago newspapers have not shown so much anxiety as they did before, to discuss

questions of good municipal government.

It is sometimes hard to tell whether statesmen are shrewd in diverting attention from questions they do not wish to discuss, or merely obtuse. This applies as well to Canadian statesmen as to the brand which the states produce. A case in point: Recently a delegation of single tax advocates waited upon the ministers of Ontario, and urged the adoption by them of the single tax policy. After the ministers had listened attentively for an hour, Mr. Hardy, the premier, replied. The subject was interesting, he said, though the government might not possibly agree with quite all that had been urged. Specifically, he thought—and this is the remark to which we call attention—that it would be unjust to let personal property go untaxed. The man with \$500,000, for instance, seemed to him a good mark for taxation. Et cetera. Surely, Mr. Hardy knows that it is the man with \$500,000 who now goes almost untaxed. Of all ineffective ways of taxing the rich, the personal property tax is most ineffectual. Can it be possible that a man of Mr. Hardy's well-known ability is ignorant of that?

The Kansas City Journal, which was established in 1854, and is therefore old enough to know better, denies The Public's contention that excessive exports tend to impoverish a country. Somewhat amusing is the Journal's confusion. It suggests for example that if we import into our own office "more type setting and editorial expense" than the sums we receive for exported papers, we will realize the fallacy of our reasoning. Import expense! Why, instead of realizing our fallacies, we should go crazy trying to strike a balance between "expenses imported" and papers exported, just as we should if we were foolish enough to try to reason out the effect of the pressure of an irresistible force against an immovable body. Since the Journal seems not to know the fact, despite its mature