

may be German woollens will drive British woollens from the market. But, if Britain prospers, the fate of these trades is a matter unworthy of thought, just as the retention of the wheat trade of 50 or 60 years ago was unworthy of thought. If there are elements that threaten Britain's trade as a whole, that is a matter for consideration. Judging from past experience, however, we are to look for those dangers in restrictions upon industry at home rather than in threats of competition from abroad.

When we think of trade restrictions, we naturally think first, and some of us think exclusively, of tariff duties. We think of "trade" as the mere exchange of goods, not realizing that wealth is in course of exchange from the very inception of production, and that production is not complete until exchange is complete and the goods are in the hands of the consumer. There are 10,000 ways in which the statute laws, or those customs which are stronger than statute laws, can restrict trade. The lowland farmer in the Shetlands, as pictured in Scott's story, "The Pirate," found that the superstitions of the only people he could hire made their labor so intermittent and uncertain that no system could be based upon it, and agriculture was impossible. There is no fact better attested by reason and the consensus of all authorities than that a rack-rent system is death to industry. A condition of war will destroy trade, if it lasts long enough. These are but examples of forms of restrictions quite apart from tariff laws,* but each effective in making trade impossible.

While the condition-and-not-a-theory people join in demanding tariff and other restrictions to confine to Britain certain forms of production, there are many sensible people who realize that the hope of Britain's trade lies in extending the freedom of that trade. The demand for less interference from the trades unions is one form of this movement. Of course, it is rank heresy in the eyes of some people to suggest that trades unions ever did or ever could do aught but good. But when we are free to say that even the churches do harm as well as good, surely the high priests of trades unionism will not deny us the right to question the perfection of some of their own acts. Every system is faulty, at least in its application. At a time when continental Europe despised trade and all it involved; when the orient exported only what Britain could not produce; when the United

States had only domestic problems to face and was determined to trade within itself, except in farm produce; when South America was merely a happy hunting ground for the agitator and intriguer—when these conditions prevailed—Britain, the only country where trade was the main object of life, could make what she pleased, choose her market and demand her own price. Under such conditions British trades unionism grew. Freed from foreign competition, the British manufacturer could make concessions to his men and still live. To-day, it is not too much to say, a British factory in almost any staple and long-practiced industry is a copartnership between employer and employed. If the conditions of the market change, the manufacture cannot be changed to meet the new conditions until the "hands" have been consulted and have given their consent. For instance, the southern states are coming forward as competitors for the sale not merely of raw cotton but of manufactured cotton goods. In those states, there are no laws—no effective laws at any rate—such as there are in Britain, restricting the employment of females or minors, or controlling the conditions under which the work shall be done. Nor are there trades unions to protect the workers against the rapacity of slave-driving employers and overseers. In any class of goods which they can make, it is clear, the southern states will be able to undersell Great Britain. In the same way, it is probable, the poorly-paid, badly-organized workmen of Pennsylvania or Alabama may be able to turn out coal or iron which shall displace that of Great Britain in some competitive markets. Further restrictions on the part of British trades unions will not better this position. The hope of Great Britain lies in more freedom. With a due elevation of her labor in skillfulness and general intelligence, Britain can leave to others the manufacture of the mere staples in iron and cotton, just as she leaves to a lower class of labor or a cheaper class of land the production of wheat—while she turns to a higher grade of industry. This will be the natural tendency, and only restriction can check that tendency. The trades unions, by rigid rules, can prevent the adaptation of industry to new conditions, but they must not be allowed to do so.

In fact, they cannot do so unaided. The upper millstone cannot crush until it approaches the lower one. Peo-

ple laugh at dictators whose sole power to punish is the expression of their displeasure.

This lower millstone of restriction, landlordism, against which grind many small upper millstones, is now coming into plain sight again. It has never been hidden from popular view in bad times. Over and over again, landlordism in Britain has absorbed the benefits of successful wars, notable inventions and the more perfect organization of labor; and over again, its "vested rights" have been set aside that the people might not be strangled in its greedy clutch.

As British trade has grown under the glorious sun of freedom, landlordism has demanded greater and greater toll from labor. Town lots, farming lands, mining areas, foreshores—all forms of land ownership—have increased in value immensely in the last 50 years. There may be cases of falling value by reason of exhaustion of minerals, the decay of towns or the removal of special privilege such as the iniquitous corn laws, but there are but trifling exceptions to the rule. Landlordism, like any other form of privilege, never yields a point willingly. Times have been good in England for some years past. They will not be always good. But the landlord will demand to be kept in the same luxury as before, regardless of how the laborer may be housed or fed. And, as in the time of Wat Tyler, and as in the time of Richard Cobden, the landlords' privileges must be restricted that the people may have freedom to work and live. The final report of the royal commission on local taxation, though most conservative in its tone, indicates that the remedy is known to many and advocated by not a few.

In every case up to the present the shackles of landlordism have only been loosened and the people have joyfully turned to their work as soon as they could move. It is to be hoped that when the struggle comes this time, the bonds will be broken and cast aside.

HOME RULE SCIENTIFIC: BOARD RULE DECADENT.

Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Secretary of the National Municipal League, is visiting the chief cities of Ohio, to see the men most prominently interested in the matter of city government. He will have personal interviews with the lawyers and experts who are to assist Gov. Nash in compiling a code bill, and he will have a session with the governor and urge the adoption in that bill of the doctrines of the National Municipal League, as set forth in the municipal programme which was adopted in 1899. The

following account of the principles advocated by the League we republish from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of July 23.

The fundamental principle of the league's creed can be expressed in two words, Home Rule. The code adopted at the 1899 convention held at Columbus lays down certain broad, general limitations, just as does the constitution of the United States. It makes no effort, as did the Pugh-Kibler code, to meet every possible emergency and lay down laws for every possible municipal contingency. It was framed to govern the cities as the states are governed. It does not recognize any distinct difference between the relations of the several states and the national government and those existing between each state and the cities therein. If the states are able to govern themselves with only the few general limitations set down by the constitution, why should not the cities be equally capable of that kind of home rule? This is the question which the national league asked, and answered by saying there is no valid reason.

The league's municipal programme, as its code is called, is based upon the principle of self-government, which lies at the very foundation of the United States government. It insists that the municipalities be given sufficient power to govern themselves. In the place of a long enumeration of delegated powers it proposes to confer upon the cities sufficient power to meet their needs. It substitutes a positive, affirmative grant of power for a negative policy of petty limitation, while at all times recognizing and preserving the rights of the state in all matters of a purely state character. It recognizes the principle that in state matters there should be centralization and uniformity, and in municipal affairs autonomy and home rule. The voter is told that he must divorce municipal affairs from state and national policies at the polls. In 1897 a committee of seven was appointed by the National Municipal league to compile a municipal programme. The chairman was Horace E. Deming, of New York, a prominent citizen and an authority on matters of municipal rule. His six colleagues were Dr. Albert Shaw, editor of the Review of Reviews; Frank J. Goodnow, of the Greater New York charter commission, both of New York; George W. Guthrie, Pittsburg, recently Democratic candidate for the lieutenant governorship and chairman of the city committee that in Febru-

ary overthrew the ring that had ruled his city; Dr. L. S. Rowe, of Philadelphia, who was appointed by the late President McKinley to codify the municipal laws of Porto Rico; Charles Richardson, Philadelphia, and Clinton R. Woodruff, a member of the Pennsylvania legislature for two terms and counsel for the municipal league for ten years and at present secretary of the National Municipal league.

It took this committee of able men two years to compile a code bill. The result of their labors was submitted to the convention of the league held at Columbus in 1899 and adopted. It is a brief and succinct document covering 34 pages.

As stated, the code starts from the hypothesis that cities should govern themselves. Perhaps the most important general restriction made is the complete divorce of the policy making and the executive parts of the government. That is, the mayor and his corps of assistants have nothing whatever to say regarding the laws made by the city council. On the other hand, the council has no powers in the putting into force of the laws passed.

Much power is given the mayor. But that executive is effectually held in check by two important and comprehensive restrictions. In the first place he is tied down to a rigid civil service system and in the second his acts can be reviewed by the governor, who, after a trial proving his misconduct, can remove the mayor from office.

By the code the elective offices are cut down. The people elect only a mayor and the members of the council. The mayor is elected for a term of two years. The councilmen are chosen for a term of six years, one-third of that body going out every two years. The lessening of the number of names on the ticket is believed to be a good thing because it will have the effect of simplifying elections and making them more truly indicative of the mind of the people. It is argued that where there are a multiplicity of names the voters are confused. They do not know for whom to vote and it is too much trouble to find out. The consequence is that they fall back on the decision of their party and vote the slate ticket blindly.

Because the elective offices are fewer the appointive power is correspondingly greater. The power is vested absolutely in the mayor with but one exception. This constitutes the great increase in power spoken of before as granted to the chief executive under

the municipal programme. The auditor alone is named by the city council. The only reason for this privilege being denied the mayor is that the auditor has the reviewing of the mayor's accounts and consequently could not be fittingly named by that official.

Although the mayor has this large appointive power he cannot by its use build up a machine such as is now the case so generally. The civil service restrictions are rigid. Men must be appointed to office on merit and merit alone. The mayor may remove from office any official when misconduct or incapability is proved. But there his power stops. He cannot fill the vacancy with any of his friends or henchmen. The man next in line, the one most capable of holding the place, must be named.

As stated before, the mayor may be removed from office by the governor on proof of malfeasance or incompetency. The governor, on the other hand, cannot use this power further to pay any political debt. The vacant mayor's chair is filled by the president of the city council until a successor is elected.

On the question of board rule, which seems to be hanging over the heads of Ohio cities, the National Municipal league comes out flatfooted. Board rule is not countenanced in any form. It is believed to be a decadent means of government. The city of New York, which is probably the most progressive and advanced municipality in respect to government, has discarded board rule. So also has Boston. Bipartisan boards have been proved inadequate. They do not accomplish what they are supposed to, that is, provide independent and unprejudiced government. A board may be made up equally of Republicans and Democrats, but the appointive power is so broad that the complexion of the board can be so changed by those in power that it is no longer bipartisan. A Democratic executive can name, for instance, two Republicans on a board of four. If these two are not amenable to "reason," they can be removed and other Republicans substituted until two are found who for the sake of the money represented by the salary attached will be amenable. No corporation carries on its affairs under the board plan. The departments are under managers whose heads can be removed if there is mismanagement or incompetency.

A stand is taken against the government of a city from the capital of the state. The state legislature, it is argued, has no more right to dictate

what a city shall do than has the United States congress the right to dictate to the several states. A broad general form of government is laid down by the national government for the states. As long as each state has a republican form and does not attempt to set up a monarchy or republic within the United States it can do about as it pleases. The divorce laws, the restrictions as to trade and business relations, the qualifications for suffrage and a multitude of other kinds of legislation differ widely in the several states, and it would be foolish to try to bring all under a uniform government.

The same is true of cities. Each municipality has its own peculiar needs. The people within its limits are best fitted to tell what these needs are and how they shall be met. It is distasteful to a city of free men to be forced to gain even its petty rights from a legislative body which is situated at a distance. What right has the rural legislator to say what and how a city shall carry on an enterprise. As foolish to ask the city man to dictate to the farmer what crops he shall plant and how he shall plant them.

It is for this that the Municipal league is mainly striving. It is taken as axiomatic that a city cannot learn to rule itself aright until it has been given a chance to do so. The young man who is dependent upon his father all his life, who relies on him to supply his needs, meet his debts and rectify his mistakes, is never able to stand alone. The same is true of a municipality. Honesty in the carrying on of public affairs, the highest efficiency in government can best be obtained when the individual cities have the power to govern themselves. Then and only then will the people take enough interest in the question of government to insist that it shall be pure and capable.

It is on this theory that the municipal programme is laid down. Take for instance the regulations in that document pertaining to the granting of franchises, a subject just now of great interest locally. The code prescribes only that no franchise shall be inalienable, that is, that no franchise shall be perpetual. A grant can be given for a period of 21 years only and by a four-fifths vote of the city council, and approved by the mayor. The recipient of the franchise must pay a percentage of the gross receipts to the city. Nothing further is stipulated. The percentage may be large or merely nominal, that rests with the honesty and business astuteness of the city

government. The city may give the bare privilege to use the public streets for transportation purposes, for instance. Or it may construct tracks and power houses and lease them to a corporation, or it may operate these equipments itself. The same is true of gas or electric lighting plants, docks and other public utilities. It is not necessary to ask the lawmakers at the state capital for the privilege of doing any of these things.

Two states by their constitutional conventions have adopted some of the salient features of this municipal programme. The first of these was Alabama, which a year ago embodied the home rule feature in its new constitution. Virginia followed, its constitutional convention having just recently disbanded after adopting the ideas of the league in respect to home rule, municipal debt and franchises.

The King to Salisbury—Why is Ireland not here on my invitation?

Salisbury—She is in prison, my liege.

The King—Is that the way to promote loyalty?

Australia and Canada—No, try a commonwealth.—The Weekly Freeman (Dublin).

John Bull—Joe, that war came high.

Joe Chamberlain—Well, you see, John, we have been paying the expenses of both sides.—Life.

"Then the police didn't raid the pool-room?"

"No. When they got there they found that somebody had neglected to give the tip and the place was running in full blast."—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE KENTONS.

As the latest and one of the cleverest books of Mr. Howells, who is certainly our foremost man of letters, this novel, "The Kentons" (Harpers), calls for a fuller notice than the mere allusion hitherto made in contrasting it with one of the popular novels of the day.

Mr. Howells's power of quiet satire may be enjoyed here at its best. One hesitates to call it satire. It has not the form and vocabulary of professed satire; and yet it is satire of the finest variety. It permits its victims to satirize themselves.

What Mr. Howells does is just to let ordinary folks lay themselves out in print. That is enough. The satire is automatic!

We have all met families that are totally immersed in themselves. The whole world revolves around their arrangements, and there is apt to be a petted one about whom revolve the family arrangements. No matter what is going on in the world, no matter what secondary interests some one of the members may have, all serious talk bends to the same little center. It is really pathetic how the judge surrenders his great work on the history of his Ohio regiment, and the whole family breaks up and leaves, Fusingum, "the best climate, on the whole, in the Union," all on account of

Ellen, who fancied herself in love with the brisk and festive Bittridge. The life in New York, whither the villain still pursues them, and on the steamer, where a substitute is found in the person of a Unitarian clergyman, who does not quite know whether he is a clergyman or not, and in Holland, where the youngest boy, Boyne, falls in love, at a distance, with the young Queen—it is all told with a subtle humor that is as full of charm as it is of truth.

J. H. DILLARD.

In memory of "Lewis G. Janes, Philosopher, Patriot and Lover of Man" (Boston: James H. West Co), an appreciative volume under that title is dedicated to the "known and unknown friends of Dr. Janes in all lands." This is not a perfunctory memorial book, but a collection of tributes from high sources to the character and value of Dr. Janes's devoted work. Among the contributors are Thomas Wentworth Higginson, John W. Chadwick, Frank B. Sanborn, Edwin D. Mead, Herbert Spencer, William Lloyd Garrison, Erving Winslow, Dr. Francis E. Abbot, and Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Dr. Janes was one of the principal religious interpreters of the Spencerian philosophy, and a man who while noted for tolerance was nevertheless strong in conviction. He "never hesitated," says Mr. Higginson, "to take an open stand without reference to popularity." As organizer and director of the Cambridge conferences, founded at Cambridge, Mass., by Mrs. Ole Bull for the comparative study of ethics, philosophy, sociology and religion, he contributed largely to the promotion of harmony of opinions apparently conflicting and of tolerance where conflicts are real. Another instance of his work in the same general field was the establishment of the "Greenacre Conference School of Comparative Religion, in Maine, which, as he writes one of his Oriental admirers, Shehad Abd-Allah Shehadi, of Syria, "to the hearts of those who realize that men can serve each other most when they understand each other best." He was a prolific writer, his principal books being "Health and a Day" and "A Study of Primitive Christianity;" and before going to Cambridge, he had been for 15 years the president of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Ethical society. One of those patriotic men among whom the principles of 1776 had not waned when the wave of imperialism lashed our national traditions, Dr. Janes became a leader in the new fight for government by consent of the governed. He died at Greenacre, September 4, 1901.

PERIODICALS.

—The North American Review for August contains a "fancy" article on "The Constitution of Carnegie", the distinctive feature of the constitution being that all the property of men who have reached the

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

**Campaign Subscriptions
to The Public**

from bona fide new subscribers will be received from the present issue to and including that of November 8, 1902, for

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

ADDRESS,

THE PUBLIC

Box 687.

CHICAGO, ILL.