

Speaker Cannon he says: "My lectures have been profitable and my writings have paid me well; but no one attends the lectures unless he wants to do so, and no one buys what I write unless he is interested in reading it."

* *

A Traction Contrast.

The Chicago Daily News, one of the traction corporation organs of Chicago, insinuates that the traction settlement in Cleveland was less favorable to the public than the Chicago settlement. Without bothering to question its figuring from which the Daily News draws forth this insinuation, we think it worth while to direct attention to facts it had to ignore. Even if it be true that the purchase price in Cleveland is nearly \$100,000 per mile, as the News figures it, the highest price the city will have to pay on this basis if it takes over the lines will be \$110,000 per mile. In Chicago it may run up to \$125,000 or \$130,000 or even more. Meanwhile, in five months after the settlement Cleveland is getting a good and increasingly better service; whereas Chicago, seventeen months after the settlement, is getting a service which in only a few places is slightly better than before and in the others as bad as it ever was. While much has been said in traction papers about new cars, it is doubtful if the car supply is as large as before the settlement, and it is certain that the strap hanging evil is as bad as ever. Another difference between the Chicago and the Cleveland settlement is in the fare. In Cleveland the fare is three cents and in Chicago it is five. Other differences relate to the future. The Cleveland system is operated by a non-profit-making company which can retain only 6 per cent on its actual investment, the city getting surplus earnings or the passengers getting reduced fares out of any excess; whereas the Chicago system is operated by profit-making companies which, after a multiplicity of profits under other names, retain 5 per cent on their investment and in addition 45 per cent of surplus earnings—the city getting only 55 per cent and the passengers getting no reduction at all in fares. Furthermore the Cleveland company is bound to turn the system over to the city upon demand at bottom cost, plus ten per cent, and without reservation; whereas the profit-making corporations of Chicago, though bound to sell to the city under certain circumstances, is so protected by conditions and reservations that no sale can be effected if any considerable financial interest opposes it. Still other differences in detail could be pointed out, but the whole subject may be summed up in the one incontrovertible fact that

the Chicago settlement was controlled, contrived and supported by and in behalf of private financial interests; whereas the Cleveland settlement, controlled and contrived by and in behalf of public municipal interests, was opposed by the same kind of financial interests that supported the settlement in Chicago.

* *

The Foundations of Our Prosperity.

"Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity." This is the shibboleth of the "Conservation League of America," of which Mr. Roosevelt is honorary president, Mr. Bryan and Mr. Taft honorary vice-presidents, and Walter L. Fisher of Chicago the active president. Although the immediate purposes of the League relate more to the preservation of our great natural resources from destruction than to the conservation of their benefits for the whole people, the latter purpose is within the scope and even the terms of the scheme. In its statement of principles, the League distinctly declares that the natural "sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated."

*

The importance of this declaration has become quite manifest in consequence of the monopoly of irrigation benefits that has already set in through absolute ownership of arid lands which public irrigation has made valuable, and the history of our national development is full of analogous instances. Had common rights in connection with public improvements been conserved in the past, we should have a far more prosperous people now than our most enthusiastic optimists describe them to be. This basis of prosperity is not yet out of reach; but whenever it is proposed to restore to public ownership the benefits of former improvements, conservatives cry out that it is now too late. It is clearly not too late, however, to guard those of the future that will attach to the conservation of such of our public resources as the Roosevelt-Bryan-Taft-Fisher League has undertaken, and there is encouragement in its declaration against the monopoly of natural resources. What the League purposes in the way of conservation of these resources is of great importance; but any such conservation, without concurrent steps for the security to all the people of their interest in the resulting financial benefits, would only strengthen the present tendency in our country toward class stratification. This League should be encouraged in every reasonable way, so long as its efforts at securing equitable distribution of common benefits from natural resources keep pace

with its work of physical conservation of the resources themselves.

* *

Our "Revived" Prosperity.

An example of the "business rebound" of which our prosperity fakirs are boasting was afforded in Philadelphia last week. John Wanamaker advertised for 1,000 workmen to help tear away part of his old store preparatory to rebuilding, and 5,000 workless men responded. According to press dispatches of the 14th, these 5,000 "unemployed mechanics and laborers thronged around the building, hundreds of them arriving soon after midnight." This sign of the times, though not so exhilarating, is more trustworthy than the factory-opening promises of our political and business seers, and the jubilant outcries of the bunco men of Wall street.

* *

Unexpected Incendiarism.

Under the signature of "A Bystander," Goldwin Smith's other name for newspaper purposes, we find this apparently anarchistic hint in a recent issue of the Toronto Sun:

The aim of the Socialist, at least of the political and aggressive Socialist, plainly is general confiscation, as Henry George frankly avows; and against this property, there is reason to fear will have to defend itself by other arguments than those of logic.

Goldwin Smith may be freely forgiven for mistaking Henry George for a political socialist. He might be forgiven also for saying that Henry George advocated "general" confiscation, were it not that as a literary purveyor of economics, deservedly distinguished, he must be presumed to have read at least one of George's books. But how can he be forgiven as a great and influential public teacher for advising property owners to defend their disputed titles by "other arguments than those of logic"? Men have been hanged in Chicago for language hardly more incendiary than that.

* *

"Copperhead" and "Grafter."

To say of a Democratic gubernatorial candidate that his political enemies accused him of being a "copperhead" forty odd years ago, is not the most candid way of defending a Republican gubernatorial candidate whose political associates accused him of being a despicable grafter hardly more than four years ago. But that is the way in which Charles S. Deneen's supporters are trying to defend him in the contest between himself and Adlai E. Stevenson for Governor of Illinois.

Negro with a Capital "N."

We are sometimes asked why we spell Negro with a capital "N," when so few other publications do so. We do it for the same reason that we spell Smith with a capital "S." Just as "smith" was once a common descriptive term indicative of occupation and came thence to be a family name, so "negro," once a common descriptive term indicating the black color of a certain race, has come to be a race name. This is a kind of transformation through which many words have gone, from common names to proper and from proper to common ones,—as from smith to Smith or reversely from Boycott to boycott. When these transpositions of meaning take place, they ought to be indicated by the ordinary rules of capitalization, simply as matter of good literary form. We should as soon think of writing "mr. smith" as "negro." Capitalization is of course a mere conventionality, but that is not a sufficient reason for disregarding it. In some connections it has a significance of respect which may make its misuse offensive. The spelling of Negro with a little "n" may well be offensive to sensitive persons of that race, and we see no other reason for refusing to capitalize the word than a positive intention to offend or indifference to giving offense, unless it be ignorance of English usage. We are therefore glad to note that at least one periodical of the first class, the American Magazine, habitually follows our rule as to the word Negro. Has not this word become as truly a proper name as German, Jew or Quaker?

* *

The Color Tone of Righteousness.

To the intelligence and conscience of those of our good white friends who are democrats down to the color line but no further, we commend these true words from a Negro, S. Laing Williams, whose democracy, like Thomas Jefferson's, knows no race limitations: "There are some things about which there can be no compromise. A righteous man is neither white nor black. He is simply a righteous man."

* *

Municipal Telephones in Great Britain.

The "free-plate matter" which adversaries of public ownership are inveigling careless editors into publishing because it costs nothing, is in many cases costing the papers their readers' confidence. We notice as an example the publication of matter of this kind which attempts to discredit municipal ownership by reporting that British cities have abandoned municipal operation of telephones. If it were explained that they have abandoned it