

The Public

First Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 27, 1898.

Number 21.

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 column of last page.

Whoever thoughtfully reads the interview with Mark A. Hanna, published in our news columns this week, and remembers that Hanna stands in the world's estimation as the keeper of the presidential conscience, will no longer wonder that to foreigners the perfect symbol of the United States is the hog.

Congressman Maguire's nomination for governor of California, gives assurance of a live campaign in that monopoly ridden state. Whether the people or the railroads own California, would be an open question were it not so plain that the state is owned by the railroads. But the people have a chance now to assert their independence of this monopoly by voting for Maguire. If they do that, he will do the rest.

There are signs that the monopolies of California intend to make their campaign against Maguire on his taxation views. Maguire believes in exempting from taxation everything that men produce, and raising all public revenues by taxing men in proportion to the value of the land they own—the land irrespective of its improvements. In their innocence, the monopoly organs propose to appeal to the farmers, arguing that this kind of taxation would cast all taxes upon them. We should suppose that nothing could be more acceptable to Maguire. If a man of his ability can't make the farmers of California understand that issue between now and November we miss our guess. The farmers are not such fools as the monopoly organs take them to be.

With a little reflection it is clear that the kind of taxation that Maguire advocates would relieve instead of burdening the farmers. Of course, we mean the farmers who own and work their farms, not the ranchers who monopolize thousands of acres; the farmers who farm farms, not the farmers who farm farmers.

Under Maguire's idea of taxation, farmers would pay no taxes on their buildings and other improvements; they would pay none on their produce and other personal property; they would pay none in the price of their store goods, whereby they are now taxed amazingly; and they would pay none on their land, unless it had a value as bare land. Even then they would pay upon it not by the acre, but according to its value. For illustration: Let a California farmer imagine that all his improvements were swept away by some great catastrophe; what would his land be worth? Whatever it would be, that would be the basis of his tax. Now let him imagine that the improvements of a great ranch were swept away; what would be the value of that land? Whatever it would be, that would be the basis of the rancher's tax, and he would have to pay it just the same whether he used all the land or merely kept other people from using most of it. Again, let the farmer imagine that the buildings on a city lot were swept away; what would the lot be worth? Whatever it would be, that would be the basis of the owner's tax. Once more, let him remember that all the vast landed holdings of railroad magnates in California, holdings of great value, which are kept out of use in order to strengthen railroad monopoly, would be taxed the same as if they were in use. When the California farmer considers these things, he will not be long in deciding that Congress-

man Maguire's idea of taxation is his idea, too. We suspect that it will be a dangerous proceeding for the California monopolists to raise the single tax issue against Maguire.

James H. Barry is the democratic candidate for congress in Maguire's district. Like Maguire he is a democrat through and through, a free trader and a single tax man. Also like Maguire he is uncompromisingly opposed to the railroad monopolies and absolutely fearless. Barry is the editor and owner of the San Francisco Star, the bravest and most influential weekly paper on the Pacific coast, as the railroad ring has more than once been made to feel.

The sheriff of Christian county, Ill., seems to think it his duty not only to threaten to shoot white miners who try to reach the imported negroes at Pana to explain the trick that has been played upon them by the operators, but also to threaten to shoot the negroes if they attempt to leave the operators' employment. It is the business of the sheriff to preserve order, but it is not his business to act as a private detective for coal operators, which is a distinction that the sheriff of Christian county ought to know, and one which, if he doesn't know it, he ought to be made to learn.

We are neither a populist nor the organ of a populist, but that is no reason why we should either deny or hide the virtues of populists when they appear. And populist virtues have appeared, in the state of Washington, in italics. The facts are presented in an eight-page broadside by the Seattle Daily Times. From this publication it appears that prior to 1896 the republicans were in power in Washington, but that at the election of that year they were superseded

for the first time in the history of the state, the populists taking their place in all departments of the state government except the supreme court. Then comes the comparison. The republicans during their administrations had increased the state debt in eight years at the rate of \$800 a day, and in the latter two years at the rate of \$2,200 a day; the populists have been reducing the debt since they came into power at the rate of \$1,000 a day. The difference between \$2,200 increase, and \$1,000 decrease, every 24 hours, is worth considering. When the populists came in, state warrants were and long had been below par; they are now at a premium. Under republican rule, the school system was so badly managed that the schools languished and teachers had to shave their salaries in order to live; the schools are now flourishing and teachers are paid promptly in cash. In the insurance department, receipts have been increased from \$15,000 in 18 months under the old regime, to \$82,000 in the same period under the new; while expenses, which under the old regime were \$26,000 in 18 months, have been under the new only \$16,000 in the same period. This showing is even improved upon in the land department. Against average biennial appropriations of \$87,000 made by the republicans for that department, the populist biennial appropriation is only \$39,000; yet the administration of the department has been radically improved. From the leasing of public lands alone the populists have raised the income from \$27,000 for the two years ending in 1894, and \$20,000 for the two years ending in 1896, both under republican administrations, to \$53,000 for only 20 months ending July 1, 1898. The general appropriations show similar improvements in administration. The appropriations of the republican legislature in 1893 amounted to \$3,087,209.75, and those of the republican legislature in 1895 to \$3,140,228.72; on the other hand the appropriations of the populist legislature in 1897 were only \$1,793,476.40.

If these are indications of what the plutocrats mean by the "blight of populism," let the blight proceed and spread. What the people of Washington think of the matter is to be made known at the general election next November.

A more important matter still is to be passed upon by the people of Washington at their next election. It is a non-partisan amendment to the state constitution, providing for home rule, or local option, in taxation. The proposed amendment requires the legislature to "provide by law a uniform and equal rate of taxation on all property in the state, according to its value in money," with the right reserved, however—and this is the essence of the amendment—to "each municipal corporation in the state to fix and determine by majority vote of the qualified electors voting thereon, the class or classes of property upon which taxes for municipal purposes shall be levied, which tax shall be uniform as to person and class." It will be observed that under this amendment any city, town or county could raise its local taxes from any kind of property its voters might prefer. The amendment appeals to the sense of justice of everybody who is at all democratic. People for whom taxes are levied and who have to pay them, ought in simple fairness to be allowed to decide as to the way in which they should be levied, whether in accordance with their own ideas of justice or a legislative lobby's ideas of injustice. It appeals with a special force to advocates of the initiative and referendum, for in degree this would be a submission of the leverage of the taxing power to the people to be affected; it is not the amount so much as the incidence of taxation that menaces popular rights. And with all the rest, the amendment appeals peculiarly to single tax men. Under it they could submit their proposition to the voters of every county, and when a majority of the people of a county favored it, that county would become as to local taxation a single tax coun-

ty. To bring the merits of this amendment before the people of Washington, funds are needed for speakers and literature. It is believed that \$500 would carry the amendment, and persons favoring the agitation may send contributions to R. T. Noyes, box 321, Seattle, Wash.

The Washington taxation amendment to which we have just called attention, was unanimously recommended in the lower house by the revenue and taxation committee, composed of republicans, democrats, populists and silver republicans, and was passed in that house with only three dissenting votes—a republican and two populists. In the senate, the committee on constitutional revision, also composed of all the political elements of the state, unanimously recommended its passage. It passed the senate with only four votes in the negative—one silver republican, one populist and two republicans. The amendment, therefore, is clearly non-partisan. This is one thing of which the people of the state need to be advised. Another is the merits of the measure itself. For the latter purpose, manuscripts from all writers in favor of the amendment are invited for publication. They may be sent to Harry B. Drees, Box 321, Seattle, Wash.

"Statistics," said a republican state senator on a certain occasion, "are like sausages; their value depends upon who makes them." Put to this test the statistics of prosperity which Congressman Taylor, of Ohio, puts out through the medium of the American Protective Tariff League, are simply worthless. That league is notorious for its cooked statistics. If it fell in the way of the American Protective Tariff League to wish to prove that it would be feasible to build a railroad to Neptune, or run a stage line to the moon, it would not be without plausible statistics in support of the proposition. Whenever this league requires statistics for any purpose whatever, it has only to command that there be statistics, and forthwith, be-

hold! the statistics, strictly according to order in quality, quantity and kind, are on hand. Presumably, therefore, and apparently, the statistics which the league credits in its August leaflet to Congressman Tayer, whereby a stunning period of prosperity is figured out for last March, are of the cooked variety.

Professedly they compare the number of hands employed and wages paid in 2,229 establishments in March, 1895, with the number employed and wages paid in March, 1898, in the same establishments. These establishments seem to be kept in stock by the league for the purpose of furnishing statistics on call. But whether that reasonable inference be true or not, one might wish, in view of the general complaint of lack of employment, low wages, and the like, that the league had named some of the establishments, as evidence of good faith. Was the Cleveland wire nail factory included, we wonder, where the workmen are struggling against a 50 per cent. reduction? There is not a word nor a figure, from beginning to end in the leaflet in question, which might not have been supplied by any penny-a-liner accustomed to writing speeches for congressmen, without a single authentic fact, but simply out of his own inner consciousness.

But even if the Protective tariff league were credited with having in this instance put forth true statistics, they prove nothing worth while. Here is the whole sum and substance of them: In March, 1895, 2,229 establishments employed 204,580 hands, and paid them \$7,079,323.34 in wages; in March, 1898, the same 2,229 establishments employed 269,329 hands, and paid them \$10,198,136.94. When stated in this way, in figures high up in the millions, or as a gain in percentages—thus: "gain of 31.65 per cent. in hands employed; gain of 44.05 per cent. in wages paid"—these statistics look formidable. But consider them in detail and see

how petty they are. Considered in detail, they show—supposing for argument's sake that they are true—that for the month of March, 1895, the hands received \$34.60 each, and that for the month of March, 1898, they received \$37.86—an increase of \$3.26 for the month, or 12½ cents for each man per working day. Twelve and a half cents!—almost enough to buy Congressman Tayer an extra cigar per diem. Is this the prosperity the Protective tariff league has to offer workingmen, an increase of 12½ cents a day? Is this prosperity for labor, \$9.46 a week?

We have long believed that the excitement of the man hunt would account for many acts of brigandage and also for much of the boldness and skill of detectives, to say nothing of the bravery of soldiers in the field. Men find enjoyment in hunting game, and their enjoyment increases with the size of the game and the danger of the hunt. To hunt tigers they cross continents. But what animal hunt can equal in excitement a first-class man hunt? The two are incomparable. Highwaymen hold up a train of cars. Is it for the "plunder" they get? Yes, much as the tiger's skin is the incentive to a tiger hunt. But men hunt tigers not for their skins but for the excitement of the hunt. The skins are only trophies. May it not be so with highwaymen. What could thrill one's blood more than with a single companion and two pistols to "hold up" a whole train load of passengers and make them turn over their valuables, in the face of the danger of being assailed at any moment by some passenger bolder than the rest or an unexpected sheriff noted for his skill as a marksman, and wafted out of the world on the wings of a pistol bullet? And the crack shot of a sheriff, how could he find greater enjoyment than in chasing the highwayman and bringing him down. For keen sport, we suspect that no hunt equals the man hunt. This is the opinion also of James Felt, of Litchfield, Ill. He keeps bloodhounds for

running down escaping criminals, and this is the way he describes the man hunt:

In chasing a man wanted for a serious offense like Mattias, we let the dogs loose and follow them on horseback. The fugitive must then take chances with the dogs' jaws if they catch him. A man hunt with a well trained pack and a big reward in view is about as exciting a pastime as the keenest sportsman would care for. It is "go" from "the jump," the hounds baying joyfully when on the trail and whining piteously as they circle around trying to find where the fugitive has doubled on his tracks or waded in a pond or stream. Carried away by the excitement of following the distant hounds when they are on a straight trail the rider leaps fences and logs and dashes through briar patches and thickets regardless of danger or wounds. The dogs never give up until called off the trail. A true bloodhound is tireless and is most eager when most baffled by the fugitive's arts.

Who would waste his time hunting the buffalo, the boar, the tiger, or the lion, when sport like that is to be had in any civilized community where a crime has been committed? Certainly not Mr. Felt.

Maj. Frederick A. Smith, of Gen. Shafter's staff, doesn't help matters much for his chief by his explanation of the criminal lack of medical supplies at Santiago. He explains in an interview that "not a man in our outfit, from the commanding general down, believed we were going up against such a fight as we struck; a heavy skirmish was about all we contemplated, and then came the fights of which the world knows." It was the commanding general's business to expect hard fighting and to be prepared for it. If he was not prepared for it, his fatuity is no excuse.

One of the justest yet kindest men we know, thoughtfully criticizes our warview of two weeks ago, for subordinating the sweeping success of the American arms to considerations of military mismanagement, and for neglecting to credit the skill of our navy with "the virtual wiping out of the Spanish navy, the nest egg of our huge success." He wants to know what black demon possessed us with such a flood of gall.

If any demon did possess us it was probably the same demon who, in less disagreeable but more dangerous form, possesses so many to make the sweeping success of the war a shield of defense against irrefutable charges of gross mismanagement. In the intoxication of victory the American people are too prone to ignore mismanagement and malfeasance. Yet if these were not condemned with emphasis, tinctured even with gall, the United States would be in danger of succumbing to our unwholesome tendency to worship mere success. An apt comparison will not be out of place. During the Crimean war, the English papers devoted themselves to fault-finding, while the French papers flattered. As an immediate result, the French army was supposed everywhere, even in England, to be about perfect, and in contrast in every way with the English army; but the ultimate effect upon the English army was in the highest degree healthful, while that of the flattering policy upon the French army was disgraceful collapse sixteen years later.

In the article which our friend criticizes, we had no intention of minimizing the sweeping character of our victory. Nor was there any purpose in it to detract from the glory of the navy. With the exception of the manifest favoritism regarding Sampson, our naval record in the war was without serious blemish. It was more than that; it was brilliant. Though the discovery of the utter weakness, incapacity, rottenness, of the enemy naturally dims this brilliancy, nevertheless it is evident from the way in which Dewey, Schley, Sampson, and their subordinates conducted their maneuvers, that the navy would have won laurels against a competent foe. But notwithstanding the efficiency of the navy, "the egg of our huge success," as our friend truly describes the destruction of the Spanish fleets, would have been added by the war department had we not been favored with extraordinary good luck. From the unwarrantable supersedure of the

commanding general, with a subordinate in favor with the head of the department, to the final upsetting of pretty battle plans by the unconsidered lay of the land, the army campaign in Cuba was a succession of blunders. They were blunders, too, which would have culminated in driving our troops in shame from the island, but for the still greater blunders of the enemy, supplemented by the alertness and effectiveness of Sampson's squadron.

Congressman Dingley, of tariff fame, puts on a sanctimonious face and joins the land grabbing crew. Our disclaimer as to grabbing territory was honestly meant, he says, but recent events as to Cuba "appear to indicate that the island is unequal to self-government." What are those events? What single indication have we that Cuba is not equal to self-government? Not one. Even if she were in fact unequal to self-government, that would be none of our business. We have no commission to set up governments for people that we choose to regard as incapable of self-government. Mexico governs herself. The Central American states govern themselves. The nations of South America govern themselves. Their governments are not up to our ideas, but what of that? Would Mr. Dingley have us send gunboats and troopships down there to set them up in the government business according to our standards? He certainly would not say so. Why, then, this hypocrisy about Cuba. It could govern itself as well as any of our continental neighbors to the south, and better than they have done at some points in their history. The true inwardness of all the talk about Cuban inability with reference to self-government, Dingley's included, is that we want to annex Cuba and are in search of some hypocritical excuse for throwing our pledge against annexation to the winds.

The native political societies of Hawaii, which protest with great dignity and earnestness against annexa-

tion without reference to the will of the people of the Hawaiian islands, basing their protest expressly upon that part of the declaration of independence which proclaims that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," are guilty of a strange oversight. They ought to know that the administration doesn't put much store by the declaration of independence. It was Lincoln, not McKinley, who gave the republican party its reputation for respecting that document, and Lincoln is out of date.

The address of her private secretary to the natives of the Hawaiian islands, in which the deposed queen relinquishes her hopes, is pathetic; not on account of her personal disappointment, but because she so evidently voices the sorrow of the people. She reminds them that they have been swamped in their own hospitality and generosity. Those whom they welcomed to the islands from the great republic, have accepted their welcome only to betray them; and the great republic itself has seized their islands because it happens to need them or to think it does. While the address contains not the slightest expression of ill-feeling toward this country, but merely alludes, and that but briefly, to familiar facts, it cannot be read by any sensitive American without bringing to his cheeks a tingle of shame. The conviction must press itself upon him that in some way his country has acted an indefensible part. All the more must he have this feeling when he reads the mournful congratulation with which the queen closes her address. Though she says that annexation will at any rate give the natives a chance at the ballot box to direct the country which was once their own, he cannot but shrink as he realizes that this is just what it will not do. For he must suspect, if she does not, that under American domination the native Hawaiians are to be disfranchised.

For attempting to kill an insurgent at Manila and succeeding in

wounding him in the leg, a Spaniard has been arrested by the United States authorities and put into jail; for attempting to steal, five insurgents were promptly shot by the same authorities. Thus do we impress the untutored Filipino mind with the fundamental principle of American plutocracy, that property is more sacred than human life.

Vaccination was a live question in the British parliament at the session just closed. A sentiment so strong against compulsory vaccination had grown up in England, that the house of commons in passing a remedial measure provided for the total exemption from compulsory vaccination of all persons who object on grounds of conscience, together with the children of such. This clause the house of lords stubbornly opposed, but was at length forced to adopt it to prevent the defeat of the entire measure, which in other respects was intended to protect the purity of vaccine matter. Commenting upon the measure, the New York Evening Post wondered at the English prejudice against vaccination, which drew out a letter from Montague R. Levenson, M. D. Dr. Levenson, who has the degrees also of M. A. and Ph. D. from the University of Gottingen, is now a practicing physician at Fort Hamilton, N. Y. He was well known as a publicist in California two decades ago, and has devoted great study to the subject of vaccination. He is certainly qualified to contribute to the enlightenment of the public with reference to the question. But the Evening Post, which opens its columns freely to letters of which it approves, and to others when it sees an opportunity to pitch into the writers, returns Dr. Levenson's without publication. As the action of the British parliament in virtually abolishing compulsory vaccination, especially as the action is based upon the report of an expert commission, shows that the vaccination question is not one-sided, we gladly give Dr. Levenson an opportunity to outline the other side. Fol-

lowing is his rejected letter to the Evening Post:

In your issue of the 6th inst. is an article on vaccination, in which it is said: "The prejudice against vaccination in England is incomprehensible." It is by no means so in England. There they have had a royal commission of inquiry, and the evidence was overwhelming to prove: (1) That vaccination affords not the least protection against smallpox; (2) that smallpox is generally a very mild disease; and (3) that cowpox is often a very dangerous one. Already several of our unfortunate volunteers have fallen victims to this "grotesque superstition," and every pathologist who has studied the pathology of vaccination, with whom I have an opportunity of conversing upon the subject, agrees with me in the opinion that the tremendous sickness which has befallen the army in Cuba is mainly due to the fact of their vitality having been so lowered by having an animal poison (cowpox) injected into their blood that they were unable to resist the noxious influence of their surroundings. It was the inoculation of smallpox, under the quackery of those days, which, at critical moments, disabled the army of Washington; it is an even worse inoculation which, under the quackery of the present day, is now disabling our army in the flower of their youth, the flower of the manhood of America. When will common sense be suffered to prevail over official ignorance and "vested interests," and this murderous superstition be abandoned?

The Chicago school census reveals a suggestive contrast. Of the inhabited blocks of the western metropolis, it brings into shape for comparison the most thickly with the most sparsely settled. The block bounded by Blackhawk, Division, Holt and Dickson streets, is inhabited by 2,312 Poles, 347 Germans, 22 Irish, 23 Norwegians, 6 Russians, 10 Swedes, and 7 Americans,—a total of 2,727. In contrast with this crowded block, is one bounded by Indiana and Michigan avenues, 37th street and 37 place. It is fully occupied, yet is inhabited by only 9 people. He that hath brains to think and a conscience to feel, here may he find work for both.

One Senor Santos, described as a well-known writer of Madrid and a specialist on American subjects, is reported as saying that the United

States means to rob not only Spain but all other European countries of their American colonies, and that having accomplished this it will turn upon Mexico, which country it regards as a rampart separating it from the rest of Latin America, which it also wants to appropriate. Senor Santos evidently obtains his ideas of what the United States intends, from the editorial columns of our expansionist newspapers.

It was not a representative of the Cleveland wire nail workers, who are striking against a reduction of wages, but the president of the bankers' convention at Denver, that said: "We have seen the fog of depression lift, the sunshine of prosperity come."

This same banker, on the same occasion, assured his hearers that the period of hard times ended suddenly at the beginning of 1898. If that be true, what are we to think of the organs and touters who assured the public pretty nearly all through the year 1897 that we were then in the midst of good times? And what has Secretary Gage to say about it, after having predicted that now, the war being over, we might expect at last to get our share of prosperity?

Gen. Fitzhugh Lee has done much to win the confidence and gratitude of the American people, but is President McKinley's way of expressing their sentiment for them just what they like? In recognition of Gen. Lee's services, the president has appointed his son to a lieutenantancy in the army over the heads of others who have done no less to deserve it. This method is not a recognition of Gen. Lee's services, it is nothing but favoritism. But President McKinley seems sadly at a loss to distinguish between the public rewards that recognize public service, and mere public gifts to personal favorites.

The report that John R. McLean is slated for a place in McKinley's cabinet, is altogether too good to be credible. McLean belongs with the

Mark Hanna outfit. With his millions, his ambitions, and his incapacity, he would make a suitable successor to Alger. But McKinley will never take McLean into his official family at Washington. McLean is too useful to Hanna in the democratic sheepfold.

NATURAL TAXATION.

Taxation has been so long and so universally applied without reference to fundamental principles of justice and high expediency, has been so generally imposed by arbitrary codes, that a pernicious idea has taken root, not only in the common but also in the expert mind, that there is no science of taxation, no system of natural laws to which taxation may be scientifically adjusted. This idea is ably controverted by Thomas G. Shearman. A leading member of the New York bar, a legal author of national reputation, an expert in statistics, a profound student of taxation whose opinions everywhere command respect, and withal a writer of exceptional perspicuity and force, Mr. Shearman's discussion of the subject cannot fail to interest and instruct. It is to be found in a work of his which first appeared three years ago, and is now reissued in a revised and enlarged edition under the imprint of Doubleday and McClure, the title being "Natural Taxation—an Inquiry Into the Practicability, Justice and Effects of a Scientific and Natural Method of Taxation."

I.

Mr. Shearman argues that unless there be a science of taxation, there is no science of government, for government implies taxation. Taxes are the indispensable condition of government; upon them it lives, and without them it would die. Just as certainly, therefore, as the existence of the body implies a science of food, the existence of human society implies a science of taxation. Taxes are the food of the body politic.

He entertains no doubt that "every branch of human life, just as truly as vegetable life, is governed by natural laws of unerring accuracy and invariable operation." If it were not so, if in human affairs there really were no natural standards of right and wrong,

then Mr. Shearman believes that neither college professors nor book writers should presume to say anything about taxation; he would refer the whole subject "to Senator Quay, with power."

But we may be sure, he declares, that there is a science of taxation, which we can learn if we only listen to the voice of nature. Nature teaches this subject as she teaches everything else—"by the stern pressure of necessity driving us forward, while every path except the right one is hedged up with difficulties and penalties." Unscientific taxation is as certain, he proceeds, "to produce bad government and bad social conditions, as is bad food to produce indigestion and decay in the human body." If, therefore, we find taxation bearing most heavily upon those least able to pay, upon those who derive least benefits from government; if we find it taking "from the poverty of the poor to add to the wealth of the rich;" if we find it easily evaded by fraud or falsehood, and therefore paid only by the honest and truthful; if it can be collected only by oppressive and degrading methods; if it unnecessarily hinders the increase of wealth and comfort among the people as a whole; if it corrupts the morals of the people or necessarily brings into existence a class which finds its profit in promoting wastefulness and extravagance in public affairs; if it forces the real taxpayer to make two payments where the government receives but one—if these are the results of taxation, the taxation that produces them is unscientific, unnatural. They are the penalties with which nature wards us off from wrong methods of taxation, while driving us on to further investigation and experiment until we shall find the right one.

Starting from that premise, Mr. Shearman enters upon an extended and extremely interesting and practical inquiry into the working and effects of the methods of taxation commonly in use.

II.

Indirect taxation first claims his attention. This system, the one most in use in all civilized countries to-day, is shown to possess about all the faults that he has enumerated as tests of bad taxation. Mr. Shearman calls it

"crooked taxation," not only because it is indirect, but also because its peculiar tendency is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, to burden those least able to bear it, to remove legitimate checks upon the extravagance of government, to foster a class whose incomes depend upon legalized robbery, to perpetuate tax burdens lest vested rights suffer by their removal, and to promote public corruption by making business profits depend directly upon legislation. These assertions are established by a great wealth of statistical citation clearly explained.

One of the most striking features of this part of Mr. Shearman's inquiry is his demonstration that indirect taxation makes the rich richer and the poor poorer. We have space only to state the result of the demonstration. The laboring classes of the United States who in 1880, under the prevailing system of indirect taxation, accumulated only 19 per cent. of the total wealth-product of the year, could have accumulated with no more self-denial as much as 43 per cent. in the absence of taxation; whereas the rich, who accumulated 64 per cent. with taxation, could have accumulated only 39 per cent. without it.

III.

Concluding from his inquiry thus far, that nature testifies in unmistakable terms against the naturalness of indirect taxation, Mr. Shearman next considers the question of direct taxation. And since the only variations of that method now in use to any important extent are the income tax, the succession tax, and the general property tax, he confines his attention to these.

With the same precision and force that characterize his treatment of indirect taxation, he argues against all three. The income tax he finds to be unfair and in many respects impracticable, one of his objections to it being that it falls as heavily upon incomes earned by hard personal labor as upon those derived from accumulated wealth. The succession tax, though measurably successful as a supplemental tax, could not be made the sole source of public incomes, and is essentially unfair. It is to the general property tax, however, that Mr.

Shearman here devotes most attention. This is the tax which is so widely approved because it aims to subject all classes of property to equal taxation; but Mr. Shearman shows that however good its aim, like the Irishman's friend who said he always aimed to tell the truth, it is a very bad shot. Instead of bearing equally upon all classes of property, the general income tax is most unequal in operation, and like indirect taxation, rests with heaviest weight upon those least able to bear it.

In support of his position regarding the general property tax, Mr. Shearman makes liberal demands upon the testimony of experience. This is directed especially to considerations respecting so much of the general property tax as falls upon chattels—personal property taxation. The experience of the Roman empire and of the Netherlands in the past, and that of New York, Ohio, Maryland, West Virginia, Vermont, Connecticut, California and Massachusetts in modern times, is spread before the reader, to show that neither dread of physical torture, nor respect for the pains and penalties of perjury, is sufficient to enforce personal property taxation with the slightest approximation to uniformity.

The chief sufferers from the lack of uniformity are farmers. Their personal property cannot be secreted nor lied about, while that of the rich in cities can be and is both secreted and lied about, with the result of throwing back upon farming communities a burden of taxation which they have endeavored to put upon the cities. In demonstration of this, Mr. Shearman draws extensively upon the tax statistics of Ohio, where an attempt to enforce the general property tax with severity against the intangible personalty of cities operates much more severely against the tangible personalty of country districts.

Most writers who attack the personal property tax, stop there. They see no objection to the taxation of landed improvements. But Mr. Shearman proves that most of the reasons for the exemption of chattels, apply with equal force to improvements upon land, which he aptly describes as "really nothing but chattels attached to land." All taxes

upon improvements, he argues, are indirect; they distribute themselves among tenants. These taxes are prejudicial to the public good because they discourage improving; they cannot be assessed with a reasonable approximation to equality, and in consequence the dwellings of the rich are assessed less in proportion to their value than those of the poorer class; and, as in the case of personal property, the residents of cities are taxed less fully and accurately upon improvements than are villagers and farmers.

IV.

Concluding from his inquiry that "every form of indirect taxation is unjust to the poor, and that every form of so-called direct taxation thus far examined is unjust to the honest," which, in accordance with his hypothesis, condemns them all as unnatural and therefore unscientific, Mr. Shearman sets about discovering the natural system. It proves to be a method of direct taxation which he had not yet examined.

"If we can find in actual use," he begins, "in every civilized country, a species of taxation which automatically collects from every citizen an amount almost exactly proportioned to the fair and full market value of the benefits which he derives from the government under which he lives and the society which surrounds him, may we not safely infer that this is natural taxation?" The question does not appear to admit of a negative answer. Such taxation would certainly be just, and if just it must be natural. But it is generally understood that although there are numerous systems of this character in theory, no such system is anywhere in actual operation. That, however, is a mistake. Mr. Shearman explains that it not only is in operation, but that it is a familiar operative system all over the world. Upon this point let us quote him fully. He says:

Such an automatic, irresistible, and universal system does exist. All over the world, men pay to a superior authority a tribute, proportioned with wonderful exactness to these social advantages. Each man is compelled to do this by the fact that other men surround him, eager to pay tribute in his place if he will not. The just amount of this tribute is determined by the

competition of all his neighbors, who calculate to a dollar just how much the privilege is worth to them, and who will gladly take his place and pay in his stead. Every man must, therefore, pay as much as some other man will give for his place; and no man can be made to pay any more.

The allusion here is obviously to ground rent. But as Mr. Shearman explains, we call it ground rent only when it is paid to individuals; when paid to the state, it is called a tax. Yet in the one case as in the other, a tax it is and nothing else. Where there is no government, there is no ground rent. As government becomes more complex with the growing demands of society, ground rents increase. Ground rent, therefore, "is the tribute which natural laws levy upon every occupant of land, as the market price of all the social as well as natural advantages appertaining to that land, including necessarily his just share of the cost of government." Thus Mr. Shearman argues. Proceeding, he insists that ground rent is just, as being the exact equivalent of the advantages which the government gives by securing men in the possession of land commanding those advantages. "Here, then," he concludes, "is a tax, just, equal, full, fair, paid for full value received, returning full value for the payment, meeting all the requirements of that ideal tax which professors and practical men alike have declared to be an impossibility. It is not merely a tax which justice allows; it is one which justice demands. It is not merely one which ought to be collected; it is one which infallibly will be and is collected. It is not merely one which the state ought to see collected; it is one which, in the long run, the state cannot prevent being collected."

As may now be inferred, Mr. Shearman regards landowners as natural tax gatherers, who are not as yet required by the state to render an account of their trust. He would cause them to do so by concentrating all taxation upon land, valued as if it were bare of improvements, and irrespective of whether improved or not. In other words, the natural system of taxation which Mr. Shearman advocates is the single tax with which Henry George's name and fame are associated. Mr. Shearman, how-

ever, would limit the amount of taxation to the necessities of government economically administered.

V.

To the practical operation of the single tax and the sufficiency of the fund it would raise, Mr. Shearman devotes the better part of two chapters, marshaling statistics and facts, as is his wont, and demolishing the trumpety statistics that have been cited in opposition, in a way that should delight those to whom his views appeal, as it will very likely confound such as oppose them. His conclusion is that the system of public revenues he advocates as just and natural, is—since the power to collect ground rent is a delegated power of taxation—simply a proposition to “tax the proceeds of taxation, and nothing else.”

We have not the space to follow him through his very practical exposition of the incidence and justice of the single tax and the social and industrial reform it would effect, nor to review his pointed replies to objections that have been made. It will be enough to say that in all these respects his work exemplifies his well-known qualities. Facts are abundantly used with painstaking accuracy and directness of statement, and the argument rests naturally and solidly upon them. Presenting Henry George's single tax idea from the practical in contradistinction to the theoretical point of view, Mr. Shearman's book is a valuable supplement to Mr. George's. Not that Mr. Shearman is unphilosophical. On the contrary his is the only really philosophical discussion extant of taxation in itself. But it is designed to interest and influence the so-called practical classes, the hard-headed, unsentimental men of affairs, rather than abstract students.

NEWS

War news has lost its interest. Fighting in the field is over, and fighting about terms of settlement has not yet begun. Both Spain and the United States have appointed their military commissions for the surrender of Cuba and Puerto Rico; but neither has yet named its peace commissioners who are to be charged with framing a treaty. It is understood, however, that the commissioners to

represent the United States are to be Secretary of State William R. Day, Senator Cushman K. Davis, Senator William P. Frye, Supreme Court Justice E. D. White, and ex-Secretary of the Navy Benjamin F. Tracy. The Spanish queen regent has convened the cortes for September 5th to confirm the protocol and authorize the treaty of peace.

Pending the adjustment of questions in the United States growing out of the war, a voluntary conference of representative citizens assembled at Saratoga on the 19th, to discuss the future foreign policy of this country. The conference was opened by Henry Wade Rogers, of the Northwestern University, Chicago, chairman of the committee of arrangements, who spoke in opposition to colonial expansion. Carl Schurz was the principal speaker on the same side, while Judge Grosscup, of Chicago, led the expansionist elements. Samuel Gompers, president of the American federation of labor, spoke at length against the expansion policy, as calculated to injure the labor interests of the United States. A series of resolutions reported by Chancellor McCracken, of the New York University, chairman of a mixed committee of 21 on resolutions, was adopted unanimously. After commending the policy of the administration in first trying to avoid war and then prosecuting it vigorously, the resolutions declared in favor of allowing the people of the islands surrendered by Spain to govern themselves as soon as they can be trusted to do so, they to continue meantime under the protection of the United States, and the question of ultimate annexation to be left in abeyance, subject to the mutual desires of the people of this country and of the respective islands. The conference adjourned on the 20th subject to the call of Chairman Rogers.

On the question of territorial expansion a notion of the views of the administration may be derived from an interview given out by Senator Hanna, and reported in the Chicago Tribune of the 25th. Mr. Hanna says:

We will control Cuba. It makes little difference now whether the insurgents can maintain a stable government. In less than 20 years the United States will practically own the island. It will now require 50,000 men to hold Cuba, but we will get good returns for

our investment. We have spent \$300,000,000, and we spent it well. We have done ourselves a good turn while enhancing the cause of humanity. It is evident we have a good hold on these islands, and I am glad of it. The importance of such possessions from a commercial point of view cannot be overestimated, and we are there to stay. Whether Cuba is ceded to us or not makes little difference. We will control Cuba, and we will control part of the Philippine islands, and we are now on the eve of a new era of prosperity. We began the war on humanitarian grounds, but we end it by becoming the possessors of great territory, important not only on account of commercial, but also strategic possibilities.

The cable censorship of West Indian dispatches has been raised, and the cable between Hong Kong and Manila has been restored, while the interdiction of mails between the United States and Spain has been removed. Communication, therefore, between Spain and her former colonies and the rest of the world, will soon be as complete as ever.

From Santiago, daily reports of the sickness and deaths of American soldiers are still forwarded by cable. On the 23d the total number sick was 900, as against 1,516 reported last week; the total of fever cases was 631, as against 1,139 last week; and the total deaths for the week was 47, as against 94 last week.

The bad management as to medical supplies and hospital accommodations, which made such a scandal in connection with the Santiago campaign and the invalid troop ships, seems to have perpetuated itself at Camp Wikoff, the detention camp on Montauk Point, and to have spread to most if not all the other home camps. So loud and persistent have been the complaints from Camp Wikoff that Secretary Alger visited that camp on the 24th to make a personal inspection. The official report of Brig. Gen. Terry, of New York, as to the condition of New York troops in the various camps, reveals such a serious condition that the adjutant general of the state refuses to make it public.

The controversy over the responsibility for lack of medical supplies, and the consequent unnecessary suffering of the wounded before Santiago, continues. Dr. Senn places the

responsibility explicitly upon Gen. Shafter and his chief quartermaster. Col. Charles R. Greenleaf, chief surgeon of the army in the field, holds Gen. Shafter responsible also for the ravages of disease. He says that it was due to a want of cooperation on the part of Gen. Shafter, whereby the medical officers were made powerless to carry out their instructions.

Responsibility of another kind is placed upon Gen. Shafter by the Cuban Gen. Castillo, who, in reporting to the Cuban Junta at New York, blames him for having brought about the misunderstanding with the Cubans. Gen. Castillo, who accompanied Gen. Shafter to Cuba, says that personally he always received courteous treatment from Shafter, but the latter estranged Garcia and his men by breaking his promises and acting discourteously. Before the American forces landed, says Gen. Castillo, Shafter volunteered a promise to Garcia that upon the surrender of Santiago it would be turned over to him. Shafter also told Castillo, as late as the day before the surrender, that the Spanish prisoners would be marched outside the city and the Cubans be allowed to enter. These promises were broken. But even then, says Castillo, all friction might have been saved had Shafter been less brusque. He describes the friction as not only unfortunate but unnecessary.

With reference to the feeling engendered in the American army against the Cubans, Gen. Castillo makes this explanation in his report to the Junta. He says that as Gen. Garcia had no pack animals he detailed 250 men to carry provisions from Siboney to the front, eight miles away, for the subsistence of his force of 5,000 troops. There was consequently a continuous stream of Cubans walking through the American lines loaded with supplies, and the American soldiers suffering from want of food and ignorant of the errands of these Cuban burden bearers, naturally suspected them of selfishness and gluttony. The charge of inefficiency and cowardice made against the Cubans in connection with the charges of gluttony, are also answered by Gen. Castillo. He says he holds letters from Generals Lawton and Ludlow, who alone are able to judge, because their forces only were near the Cubans, that the Cubans worked hard and fought well.

At Manila, anticipated difficulties between the Philippine insurgents and the United States authorities, appear to have been avoided by tactful management. According to the Hong Kong correspondent of the London Daily Mail, Gen. Merritt and President Aguinaldo have agreed that the latter shall govern outside the city of Manila. For this reason, apparently, the city water supply of the city, which Aguinaldo controls and which it was feared he might cut off, is uninterrupted. The Mail's advices have been corroborated and supplemented by communications directly from Aguinaldo, who expresses his satisfaction with American occupation, and announces that he is disbanding his army.

American politics is taking on definite shape in California, where a fighting campaign is about to open. James G. Maguire, for three successive terms a democratic member of Congress, who was nominated for governor recently by both wings of the populists, and later by the silver republicans, was, on the 18th, nominated by his own party. Congressman Maguire, therefore, goes before the people of California with the united nomination of all parties in opposition to the regular republican organization. The republican convention met within a week after Maguire's nomination, and on the 23d nominated Henry F. Gage, of Los Angeles. The campaign will turn chiefly upon questions of railroad monopoly, though, as Maguire is a pronounced follower of Henry George, of international fame as such, his adversaries are likely to make an anti-single tax campaign.

Other political conventions of the week were that of the prohibitionists of Michigan, that of the republicans of Missouri and of South Dakota, and that of the democrats of Ohio, none of them of general importance.

For several days rumors have been current of the organization of a gigantic steel trust; and it is now stated with an appearance of authority that the organization has been effected. The companies comprised in the new trust are the Minnesota Iron Co., the Illinois Steel Co., the Southwestern Connellsville Coke Co., the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern railroad, the Lorain Steel Co., and the Johnson Steel Co. Six other companies may come

into the trust. The capital represented by the companies already included, exceeds \$75,000,000, and it is supposed that the capitalization of the trust will not be less than \$200,000,000.

Serious labor troubles are brewing at Pana, Ill., a coal mining town in the southeastern corner of Christian county at the junction of the C., C., C. & St. L., and the Illinois Central railroads, about 200 miles southwest of Chicago. A strike for some time in progress at that place, has been so far successful that the operators have sent into Alabama and engaged 1,000 negroes to come north and work in the Pana mines. They were expected to leave Birmingham, Ala., on the 22d and to arrive at Pana on the 24th. This expectation was the cause of much excitement at Pana, and indignation meetings were advocated. As an indication of the sympathy of the town with the miners, the sheriff's summons to 100 citizens to appear at the city hall on the morning of the 22d to act as deputies in protecting the imported negroes, was responded to by only 10 persons. On the 23d the sheriff summoned as deputies members or employes of nearly every business house in the town. He had received a consignment of Springfield rifles with which to arm the deputies. The first consignment of negroes arrived on the 24th. When they learned the situation they complained that they had been deceived by the operators, and most of them refused to go to work. Deputies stationed at the grounds are charged with threatening to shoot negroes who attempt to leave.

International difficulties between Canada and the United States are now in process of definite and formal adjustment. The joint high commission of the United States and Great Britain to adjust all differences between the Dominion and this country met in the city of Quebec on the 23d. The first session was held in the parliament building of the province of Quebec. Nothing was done except to exchange credentials, choose a chairman and three secretaries, and indulge in an interchange of courtesies. The chairman chosen was Lord Herschell, the British commissioner, and the secretaries were Chandler P. Anderson, of the American state department, for the United States, W. C. Cartwright, of the British foreign office, for Great Britain, and Henri

Bourassa, a member of the Canadian parliament, for the Dominion. The commission adjourned till the 25th.

The Canadian commission whose first meeting is described above, is composed of six members from the United States, four from Canada, one from Great Britain, and one from Newfoundland. The American commissioners are Chas. W. Fairbanks, George Gray, John W. Foster, John A. Kasson, Nelson Dingley and T. Jefferson Coolidge. The subjects which the commission is to consider and adjust are numerous. They relate to sealing in Behring sea and the North Pacific, and to the Atlantic fisheries; to the Alaska boundary line, and other indefinite boundaries; to the transit of merchandise between different points in either country across the boundary line of the other, and to alien labor laws, mining rights and customs duties; also to the old international agreement respecting war vessels on the great lakes, to the transportation by one of the countries of its prisoners through the territory of the other, to use of the currency of each country within the borders of the other, and to reciprocity in wreckage and salvage rights. In addition to these subjects the commission will consider any others that may be brought before it by private interests or otherwise. The conclusions of the commission will be submitted in the form of a treaty for the approval of the treaty making authorities respectively of Great Britain and the United States.

Hawaii came formally within the jurisdiction of the United States on the 12th. The American flag was on that day raised in the place of the Hawaiian flag, which for 85 years had represented the sovereignty of the islands. Soon after the American flag had been raised, the American minister Sewall, read a proclamation by President McKinley, directing that the civil, judicial and military powers of the government continue to be exercised by the officials of the Hawaiian republic, who would be required to take an oath of allegiance to the United States, and that the existing legislation and customs regulations remain in force until otherwise determined by Congress. The ceremonies closed with a ball at the executive building at which 2,000 guests were present.

The day before the ceremonies of Hawaiian annexation, the private secretary of Queen Liliuokalani gave out a proclamation recognizing that the end of her kingdom had come. "After battling nineteen months," the statement read, "for beloved Hawaii and her people, among the statesmen and politicians of America, we return home defeated to a broken hearted people." Then explaining that the queen's cause was almost won, when the Spanish war enabled the advocates of annexation to force the Hawaiian islands upon the United States as a war measure, the statement goes on:

We realize that all is lost. The boundless hospitality of the Hawaiian people has been the sin for which they now must give up name, race, flag, tradition; everything. No one but a Hawaiian can ever know the grief, the anguish, that to-day fills the Hawaiian heart to overflowing. We have loved and trusted the stranger who came to our shores not at all intensely, but too well.

Crop expectations in the United States are reported by the department of agriculture, in the August circular, as on the whole better than in previous years. The condition of corn is below the August average for the past 10 years; that of wheat is above the average; oats, rye and cotton are above; barley, buckwheat, and potatoes are below. The European wheat crop is reported as better than that of last year, though it will be short in Russia where important wheat growing districts have suffered. The world's wheat crop is expected to be unusually large, but as the stock now on hand is lower than for many years past, no "sudden return to the low prices of a few years ago" is looked for.

Apropos of the report of a short wheat crop in Russia, the St. Petersburg correspondent of the London Times forwards a pitiful story. In seven districts of the Province of Kazan, he says, and largely in the Provinces of Samara, Saratov, Simbirsk, Viotaka, and Perm,—all in the middle east of Russia,—the crops are almost worthless. So bad is the condition that not only the tillers of the soil, but even the great owners of the soil themselves, are asking the government for relief. The probabilities of a famine are very grave. In some of these famine stricken districts the peasants have gone so far as to pillage

the communal granaries rather than starve.

In South African politics the Cape Colony elections for members of assembly have been preceded by a fierce campaign, which has in reality, so it is claimed, been a political duel between Cecil Rhodes, of Cape Colony, and President Kruger, of the Transvaal, though nominally a contest for and against the Afrikander Bund. Rhodes was active in the campaign, and in his speeches he identified the Bund with Krugerism. Should the Bund triumph, he said, Krugerism would be dominant. The two parties to the contest are known respectively as Bundmen and Progressives. Reports of the voting, which takes place in different places on different days, leave the final result still unknown. Bundmen have been elected in some districts, defeating prominent Progressives, while from other districts it is reported that Progressives have won. At Capetown, the lowest of the four Progressives elected had over 1,200 votes more than the highest Bundman candidate. Cecil Rhodes and another Progressive were elected by overwhelming majorities, in Little Namaqualand, a maritime district in the northwest of the colony.

NEWS NOTES.

—Joseph H. Choate was on the 19th elected president of the American Bar association.

—The American Bankers' association began its 24th annual session on the 23d at Denver.

—The national biennial encampment of the Knights of Pythias began at Indianapolis on the 23d.

—The Spanish steamer Alicante arrived at Corunna, Spain, on the 24th, with the first load of Spanish soldiers from Cuba.

—Admiral Schley is suffering from nervous exhaustion, the effects of his long nervous strain and exposure to a tropical sun in the Caribbean.

—In a smash-up of the New Bedford express on the New Haven and Hartford railroad, near Boston, on the 21st, four passengers were killed and 21 injured.

—A plebiscite is seriously proposed in Jamaica for the purpose of petitioning the British parliament to allow the island to seek annexation to the United States.

—On the 18th the volcano Vesuvius was reported as in a state of active eruption, streams of lava flowing down the mountain side at the rate of 400 yards an hour.

—Eight workmen were killed and several more injured on the 22d by the caving in of the wall of the Carnegie tunnel near Pittsburgh on the Pan-handle railway.

The Santa Fe railroad has completed arrangements for running a line of steamers between San Diego, Cal., and China and Japan. The first vessel is to sail about October 1.

—Com. Philip has protested against his promotion by "points" as an injustice to his comrades. He cannot refuse the promotion, as that would be held to amount to resignation.

—The indictment against the wife of Gov. Atkinson, of West Virginia, which charged her with being accessory to forgery, has been dismissed on the ground of the acquittal of her principal.

—Gen. Morales, the leader of the recent Guatemalan revolution, was captured in a starving condition in a cave where he had taken refuge, and on his way to San Sebastian under military arrest he died.

—It is reported through the London Mail that the Russian government is offering to peasants who have completed their terms of military service, tempting inducements to emigrate to China and form colonies.

—Dr. E. B. Andrews, late president of Brown university, has begun his career as superintendent of the public schools of Chicago. One of the innovations he proposes is the teaching of Spanish as well as French and German.

—The secretary of war has ordered the commanding officer at Santiago to refuse to allow the claim of the Catholic bishops to the annual payment of about \$18,000, which the Spanish government has been accustomed to allow.

—The navy department has decided to place the dynamite cruiser, Vesuvius, out of commission. She is regarded as a failure. A naval officer says she was never known to hit but one thing that she aimed at, and that was the Island of Cuba.

—Charles L. Brush, in a paper read before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, on the 23d, claims to have discovered a new gas, the chief characteristic of which is great heat conductivity and low pressure.

—Sampson's squadron passed in review up the Hudson river at New York on the 20th, before an immense gathering of people. Prior to the review Mayor Van Wyck made an address of welcome which was responded to by Admiral Sampson.

—The steamer Heligoland, one of the searchers for Prof. Andree, of the Andree balloon expedition to the north pole, has returned after a fruitless search. It reached to within 600 miles

of the pole, and discovered an island which has been named the August Scherl.

—Sir Herbert Naylor-Leyland, the liberal candidate for the seat in parliament made vacant by the appointment of George N. Curzon to the viceroyalty of India, was elected on the 24th by 272 majority over his tory adversary. Mr. Curzon had been elected as a tory by a majority of 764, and Naylor-Leyland's election was regarded as impossible.

—Certain sensational stories that were published not long ago regarding the sudden and mysterious departure for Copenhagen of the princess of Wales, are now explained by the report that her mother, Queen Louise of Denmark, had fallen into a state of senile dotage. Queen Louise's condition since the princess of Wales was sent for has become worse.

MISCELLANY

HAZELTON.

Oh, we're the sheriff and his men—

The brave men,
The grave men—

Oh, we're the sheriff and his men,
Who never flinch or quail.

We shoot the "Sheeny" and the "Hun"—
The knave Hun,
The slave Hun—

We shoot the "Sheeny" and the "Hun"
If we catch them turning tail.

We first make sure they buy no arms,
Nor hire arms,
Nor fire arms.

We first make sure they buy no arms,
Then let the volley fly.

Their backs we riddle with our shots;
We're crack shots
At back shots;

Their backs we riddle with our shots,
And we shoot them where they lie.

And should you ask for further proof—
Profound proof
And sound proof—

And should you wish for further proof
Of our courageous stand,

Pray, ask the jurors and the judge—
The bold judge,
The gold judge—

Pray, ask the jurors and the judge
And the journals of the land.

—Ernest H. Crosby, in *The Coming Nation*.

UNFREE FREEMEN.

Extracts from a sermon delivered by the Rev. R. M. Webster, at Pasadena, Cal., June 5, 1898.

What of the southern slaves? Not long ago I found one of them in Los Angeles. He read me a letter from his son in Alabama, showing how he was actually worse off than his father had been in slavery. He had rented a piece of land. The owner made him sign a contract to get all his goods at a certain place, and to pay for them in the cotton and the corn when he had raised it. He bought as little as pos-

sible, but when settlement came and the rent share was paid, it took every ear and pound to pay for the scanty living he had already had. And for fear he might be hiding something, the man from the store came with his team and got the last ear, and left him with nothing, and he must now be the wood sawyer and general roustabout for the owner, in order to keep from starving till the next season. It was less trouble for the owner of the land and the owner of the store to get all the products of this negro's labor for poor board and scanty clothes by this process than it would have been by means of chattel slavery. . .

And the Cubans—we are fighting for the Cubans; and so far as this is our spirit it is humane and honorable, even though it be a mistake. . . . But when we have driven off Spain will the Cubans be free? . . . Will the Cubans own Cuba, and know how in a fraternal way to help each other to peace and plenty? Will not the rich planters own Cuba? Will not a syndicate of capitalists manage the people? Will not that "iron law of wages," under the competition of laborers for a job, reduce their living to the scantiest? Will a plantation hut and slaves' fare be the home and living of freemen? War cannot make men free! It may destroy one set of oppressors, but unless the people are intelligent enough to love justice, and work together for the common good, they will even out of their own number develop another set of oppressors.

"YOU CANNOT CHANGE HUMAN NATURE."

Out in the great interstellar spaces, before time was, the young cosmic Forces laughed over a new plaything—laughed, then stormed, then wept.

For this plaything was so perverse. And yet it was only a shadow—a prophetic shadow. But it was an ugly little monstrosity. With awkward, claw-like limbs, it struck, and scratched, and pinched. With a mouth that it dragged near the ground, it grinned, and gibbered, and grimaced, and howled. What it could snatch it secreted. And at last, springing up, with its fangs it tore the tender throat of the wide-eyed youngest force—Equilibrium. This it was that brought those first tears to all the worlds.

Then cried out the older Centrifugal Force: "The monster must be destroyed; he is Human Nature; and it is written in all the stars that Human Nature may not be changed."

Just then came passing, radiant and fragrant, the mighty Nurse, and they

called to her: "Natura, thou darling, come hither and judge for us upon this evil thing!"

"It is Human Nature; it cannot be changed," repeated Equilibrium.

The great Natura took up the distorted manikin in her strong, comely hands, and it became dumb and still.

"You are right," she said; "it may not be changed. But, my children, did you find it like this? It is inside out and upside down!"

With that she gently shook the hideous shadow, and tossed it caressingly in her great arms. And lo, it forsook its horror, and became fair and wonderful—so lovely that they knew not what they looked upon.

And Natura set it upon its feet. "Go thy way. Fight thy battles bravely. Tell thy message truly. Thou canst not be changed; the writing bears true witness. But thou canst live thy true life right side up—thy life of lives."

And the dear Nurse shook the star dust from her robe and passed on down the path which led to the youngest world.—Alice Thacher Post, in *The New Earth*.

FAMINE IN CHINA.

No friend of China can view without sadness the present condition of her unfortunate people. The creator has blessed them with a salubrious climate and a fertile soil, yet millions of the people die every year for lack of food. It cannot be said that the people are at fault—they are sober, industrious, and thrifty, and have all the qualities that are needed in the production and accumulation of wealth. In every part of the world save China they do accumulate and grow prosperous. Nor must the suffering be charged to overpopulation. There is no such density as is found in England, Belgium or India. The distress this year is widespread and appalling. In nearly every part of the empire murmurs of discontent are heard. The Yangtze valley is full of starving refugees from less fortunate districts. Typhus fever rages among them. They have pawned everything but their rags for food, and the price of rice is double what it was four or five years ago. It is already higher than during the troublous times which ushered in the Taiping rebellion. The effects of this rise in the price of food-stuffs are seen here. Painters, carpenters, tailors and barbers have successively struck for higher wages, and, however unjustifiable the resort to violence on the part of some to bring their masters to terms, we cannot but sympathize with the toilers whose

wages are kept at such a mark that any increase in the price of food means less food and food of a poorer quality to eat. All around us we hear of rice riots, with assaults upon local officials and destruction of property.

Hunger has ever been a fruitful source of revolution. There is a limit to human endurance, and even such conservative writings as the Chinese classics justify the overthrow of a government that leaves the people to die in the ditches, and deny that it is rigid to slay an oppressive ruler. The people of China are patient in the extreme. They are not turbulent, but law-abiding, and with a reasonably just government they cannot be driven to disloyalty. It is ominous, therefore, that at this time the murmurings should be so loud.—*Shanghai Celestial Empire*.

TRUE RELIGION.

The prophets of every age are they who restore religion to humanity, who tear away the veils that confine religion in the temples of formalism. The world's greatest danger is that religion should become so specialized that the oppressors of widows and orphans shall find no discords in the anthems of the sanctuary. When men begin to complain that religion is not minding her own business, that is the sure sign that religion is becoming vital. Liturgies and hymns are no signs of religion. Though a man indorse all the creeds of Christendom, still that would not make him religious.

Religion has vastly more to do with the question of wages than with the question of the Trinity. The question of capital punishment and the treatment of criminals is a more religious question, by far, than the question of eternal punishment and the condition of the damned. The liquor problem is a more religious question, by far, than the theological significance of the sacramental wine. There is more religion in the Declaration of Independence than there is in all the creeds. The doctrine of the sovereignty of God is not a religious question. But if the church does not preach the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people and guard popular liberties against the encroachments of subsidized politics, her name will become the synonym for treason and her doors the gates of hell! To-day, when money is more sacred than men, it is more important that the church should vindicate the sacredness of humanity against the degradation of poverty than that she should settle the question of the sec-

ond person of the Trinity. The spirit of justice is abroad in the land. The prophets are beginning to tell of better days. Tongues of fire are flaming forth from the reform press, preaching the Gospel of a new crusade. The toilers on whose shoulders have been laid burdens grievous to be borne, are beginning to have faith that they may cease competing with each other for the opportunity to labor, in that fast approaching day when opportunities shall be as limitless as God's bounty. Religion in its purity is to be found where men in self-forgetfulness are laboring for their fellows.—Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati.

A VICTORY FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGISTS.

Advocates of woman suffrage will doubtless be greatly encouraged by the official opinion of the full bench of the supreme court of Idaho, that the experiment with such suffrage in that state is a decided success, that it is more popular among the people than when first adopted, and that none of the evils predicted of it by its opponents have come to pass. Moreover, it is the opinion of the court that if the question were resubmitted to the people of the state it would be adopted by a vote almost unanimous. In the several municipal elections which have been held since suffrage was granted to women, they have taken an active part, and polled a large vote, many women who had opposed the granting of suffrage to their sex being active participants in and voters at such elections. Another consideration to which the supreme court apparently attaches much importance is that if the great bulk of the woman vote is not polled at every election it will stand "like a reserve in an army, ready to be marshaled for effective work whenever the exigencies of the case demand it," which fact is of itself regarded as a powerful factor in compelling all political parties to put none but clean and competent men before the people for their suffrage. It is also the testimony of the court that women fully realize that they can do effective work at the primaries in securing good men and women to represent them in county and state conventions, and that much good will result from their active interest in that direction. "The women of our state," says the court, "represent that which is best in morals and society, and their influence on the politics of our state will have an elevating effect."

Such testimony as this is certainly valuable, and entitled to weight. It

cannot be denied that the principle of woman suffrage is founded in justice, for if all just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed, then when women are deprived of the right to vote a great injustice is done to a large portion of the community. In this state (New York) the course of both of the great political parties toward woman suffrage has been the quintessence of meanness and perfidy, making promises to the heart only to break them to the hope. Perhaps the time will be ripe, sooner than has been generally expected, for another and this time a successful crusade on the part of the valiant advocates of "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."—The Albany Law Journal.

ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM.

A letter published in the Chicago Record of August 11:

The declaration of the mayor that he will use the influence of his administration against the pollution of the lake by sewage in the Calumet district is gratifying to those who can see the selfish interests at work to effect a profit by a direct injury to the people. According to the Record the Calumet and Chicago Canal and Dock company and S. E. Gross, both large holders of vacant land, from which they hope to reap a profit by the increase of land values, have declared clearly for pollution of the lake water. The sooner the district is drained the sooner people can be influenced to settle there, thus by their presence enhancing the value of land. Now I myself own one of the principal Ninety-fifth street corners. The law, in view of my deed of title, gives me the right to hold this corner at a ridiculously low rate of taxation until my industrious neighbors have built around it. When they have sufficiently enhanced its value I hope to sell it and thus reap the benefit of their industry. If I were to build upon it my taxes would be increased—under our tax methods the industrious home-builder is always fined—so it is cheaper for me not to improve it. If I had employed labor and tradesmen in building a house and furnishing it, thus helping others to live, my taxes would be raised. This, in the public thought, is just, because I can get an income by renting the house, while vacant lots bring in nothing. This is a fallacy we land-owners are particularly active in perpetuating, for it prevents people from seeing that we do really reap a fine income. The advantage is, we get it in a lump sum when we sell the land, and do not have the

bother of building. Now, I know, and Mr. S. E. Gross knows, and the Calumet Canal and Dock company knows, that no matter how estimable our personal characters may be, we are, economically, thieves. We take from the people a value which their presence alone creates. The law allows this, and the people make the law, so we are going to play the game as long as they allow it. But there is a traditional honor among thieves, and if my fellow-thieves will agree to stand a good stiff special assessment to send this sewage over into the canal instead of poisoning the drinking water of the people I'll pay mine without a murmur. I believe we would profit more in the end by doing this, because we could then pose among the other philanthropists and the people would be all the longer in getting onto the game.

FRANKLIN H. WENTWORTH.
Aug. 9, 1898.

HAWAII.

An extract from a private letter written by an American business man, who recently stopped at Honolulu on his way to Australia.

I see by the papers that the States have annexed Hawaii. I have for some time felt that this would ultimately be brought about, and though I am sorry because of the precedent it establishes, you fellows need not feel ashamed of your new baby.

The principal town of Hawaii is Honolulu; and if there is a prettier place on earth I would like to see a picture of it. I never could imagine a prettier place than Honolulu, with its beautiful plants and trees, and its elegant drives over roads as smooth and level as a billiard table.

It is nearly 2,100 miles southwest of San Francisco, and has a population of about 260,000. The place is practically American now. There are about 4,000 Americans on the island, and they wear the trousers. They are the whole thing—what they say goes. The place is up to date in everything except that they use horse cars, though they were contemplating electricity for cars when I was there.

You can buy an American bicycle or glass of beer there; in fact, everything is American. You would hardly know you were outside of the States if it were not for the natives who swim out to greet the ship as it approaches the harbor. They call to the passengers to throw money into the sea—these terriers can do anything in the water that a fish can; and the way they get after a ten-cent piece or a quarter is a caution. The pieces thrown into the water never get to the bottom; one of

these kids gets after it, and is out of sight for three minutes; when he comes up he shows you the coin you threw in.

Aside from this you would hardly know you were outside of the States, and it is simply a delightful place to live in. You can live on the road to Wai-Ki-Ki, surrounded by the most beautiful plants you ever saw, and open your back door on to the ocean, where you can have a salt water bath. The only objection I had to the place was that it was a little too warm for my constitution. I like it a little cooler than they have it down there.

Americans come down here all fixed up, going to be very lively—walk along the street as though they had to do everything that day. That is, when they first come; but the climate takes all the activity out of them, and pretty soon if they want to go a block they call a cab.

Every white family in town has a telephone. To be without one is to be out of the social swim. The women visit, order their supplies and make their dates all by telephone. They are too lazy to move in the daytime. They sometimes visit each other at night, but nearly always in some sort of conveyance.

There are some splendid looking women among the natives. Nearly all of them wear a great big Mother Hubbard wrapper on the street, and in consequence look about twice as tall as they really are. I saw the princess, the daughter of the late queen, out driving when I was there. She is a very pretty girl. I feel kind of sorry for her, because you know she is really out of a job and her mother is "broke." If she could get mixed up with little Alphonso they ought to fix up some sort of arrangement whereby they could go on the road together and do a song and dance act. They ought to draw good houses and make a pretty fair living.

I don't want you to understand me to say that I approve of the States annexing Hawaii. Hawaii will not only prove an expensive proposition from a military standpoint, but as above intimated, it establishes a dangerous precedent. Every stiff in the country will be talking in favor of annexing something from now on. If they could take Hawaii and let annexation go at that, I might be able to stand it; but I know the blokes over there too well. They are an aggregation of swelled "nuts." They already think they can whip anything in sight, and most of them are ready to try, just to prove it.

The situation reminds me very much

of a cartoon I saw somewhere some years ago, in which John L. Sullivan was caricatured. It seems some one had called Mr. Sullivan's attention to the fact that he was "not a gentleman." Sullivan replied: "I ain't, eh? Take that! Now am I?" The fellow was knocked down, and rather than get a good licking, he acknowledged Mr. Sullivan was a gentleman. If any nation should wink a cross eye at Uncle Sam from now on, and should intimate that he (Uncle Sam) is not a nice man, there will not be wanting those who will point to the army and say: "We ain't, eh? Be careful now; remember what we've got; we can lick you fellows in a holy minute. Remember the Maine."

M. J. FOYER.

SOME FACTS ABOUT PUERTO RICO.

The surface of the island is broken and hilly. A low mountain ridge traverses it from east to west, ranging nearer the southern than the northern coast, with spurs extending northward. Of this ridge the highest elevation is El Yunque (The Anvil), a mountain rising from the tableland of Luquillo to a height of 3,700 feet above the sea, and visible to vessels some 60 miles off the coast. The country has two marked features—the many wooded ravines descending from the mountains, through which course streams of bright water falling to the sea; and, interspersed with these ravines, extensive stretches of natural meadow land, which serve as pasture to herds of wild cattle.

The climate is a healthy one for a tropical situation. The constant running streams, with the absence of stagnant water, doubtless contribute to purify the atmosphere. The island, well aerated throughout, is appreciably cooler and more salubrious than are the larger Antilles, or than the majority of the lesser Windward islands, which have been termed the graves of foreigners. The mountain valleys, especially in the winter—from November to April—when the north winds blow steadily, enjoy a delightful climate which has been likened to a perpetual spring.

In the summer—the rainy season at the north of the island—a sea breeze blows from eight a. m. to four p. m., in the absence of which life would hardly be tolerable near the coast. The rains, which are frequent and plentiful in May and June, come down in August and September "with the fury of a deluge." The rainfall at San Juan has been estimated at about 70 cubic inches. On the southern coast,

however, there is much less rain; sometimes none at all even for ten or twelve months.

It is in August and September that the climate at the north is least healthful, especially for foreigners. Fever, dysentery and scorbutic diarrhoea are then to be guarded against, and a change to the mountains is desirable. These are also the months of the hurricanes which have in some years proved so destructive and ruinous in their effects.

Puerto Rico is eminently an agricultural island. It is favored with a soil of unusual fertility, consisting of a reddish (or whitish) earth, made up chiefly of a clay mixed with peroxide of iron or marl. The abundant supply of water keeps the soil productive; even in the southern districts, where the rain is less and the ground seems parched, water may be found by digging 1½ feet or two feet beneath the surface. The hills and valleys are luxuriant with verdure; the mountains are green to their tops and cultivable at any height. Good timber, suitable for houses or ships, is abundant—a result owing in a measure to a wise provision of the government early in the century, when it was formally ordered that "three trees should be planted for every one cut down." Among the native trees the royal palm has been perhaps the most useful, not only on account of its wood and its fruit, but also for its leaves, which furnish thatching for the cabins of the poorer classes. The mahogany tree has yielded valuable timber for export. The plantain and the banana trees have furnished food for thousands. Among the shrubs, the coffee plant, grateful to sight and smell, with its glossy leaves and jasmine-scented white blossoms, grows almost spontaneously. The tobacco plant yields a product not much inferior to that of Cuba. That useful grass, the sugar cane, is cultivated with profit, and best in the hot, arid regions of the south, where other crops requiring more moisture would not flourish. A considerable capital, English and Spanish, is invested in sugar plantations, Ponce being the center of this commerce. A cotton remarkable for its length of fiber, tenacity and whiteness is produced, and its culture might with advantage be largely extended.

The population of this densely peopled island is about 800,000. As to the character of this population, a series of fortunate circumstances, in combination with a sagacious government, has contributed to impart to it a quality superior to that of any other of

the West India islands. In the first place, this has always been a purely agricultural people. Then, at an early period, the crown lands of the island were divided up among the natives, who thus became a community of small proprietors, to which was given a new consistency and stability on their being formed into a body of disciplined militia. Further, the island has not suffered to the same extent as its neighbors from the curse of slavery. The slaves were permitted to purchase their freedom on easy terms, and they have borne but a small proportion to the mass of the inhabitants. Thus, in 1873, when slavery was finally abolished, there were but few unemancipated persons left in the province. As a result, Puerto Rico is one of the few countries of tropical America where the whites outnumber the blacks; and, it may be added, where the males outnumber the females.

Comparatively free from political disorders, the island has profited by the revolutions which have disturbed the adjacent regions, especially San Domingo and Venezuela, in the contingents of valuable settlers which she has gained as immigrants from these localities.

There has thus been insured for Puerto Rico a peasantry of free laborers—an industrious and self-sustaining population. Even the poor white Xivaro of the mountains or the interior is no burden upon the government, but, with his cow and horse, his acre of corn or sweet potatoes, his few coffee plants and plantain trees, he lives, with his family, an independent and happy existence. All the rural laboring classes, with entire simplicity of manners, unite a frank cordiality and genuine hospitality to travelers and strangers.

The only popular vice appears to be—here as in the Philippines—gambling, especially in the form of cock fighting.

In this connection it may be noted that there are no beasts of prey, no noxious birds or insects, no venomous snakes or reptiles to disturb the life of the inhabitants. There are, indeed, no indigenous reptiles, no monkeys and few birds. On the other hand, the rats are numerous and destructive, especially on the sugar plantations.—Col. W. Winthrop, in *The Outlook*.

Dr. Field, who was the examining surgeon for the naval reserves while the recruiting was being done in New Orleans, had many a good story to tell of recruits in the service. A good one he tells is of a German who was walk-

ing his post and calling the hours as required. He called: "Seven bells and all's vell." The next call, however, was a variation. It was: "Eight bells and all is not vell; I haf droppit my musket oferboard."—New Orleans Times-Democrat.

THE DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION OF THE RAILROAD PROBLEM.

In the course of the several debates on the Pacific railroads during the last five years the advocates of refunding and other methods of sacrificing the government's interests have repeatedly declared to the house that my opposition to their measures was designed and intended to bring about an experiment in the government ownership and operation of railroads. I have as frequently declared that while I believe absolutely in the government ownership of all railroad highways, including roadbeds, bridges, stations and terminals, I do not consider the operation of railroads in the transportation of freight and passengers for hire to be a proper function of government. . . .

To those who have seriously and intelligently studied the railroad question the difference between these two systems is as plain and unmistakable as the difference between night and day. The public highway system is based upon the great democratic principle that the true and only function of government is to prevent the interference of one citizen with the equal rights of another, or, as that principle has been more tersely expressed: "The only true function of government is to govern." While the system of government operation of railroads as a common carrier is based upon the socialistic idea that all industrial enterprises should be conducted by the government and that all citizens should look to the government for employment and support, the public highway theory is a development of individualism.

The public highway system is a stage or step in the establishment of free competition, while the system of government operation involves the destruction of individuality and the elimination of competition in the great industrial field of railroad transportation. It is remarkable that systems so widely different, so entirely contrary in principle, should be confused as substantially identical by gentlemen having long experience in the congress of the United States.

In view of the fact that this bugbear of government ownership and operation of railroads has been and still is the greatest obstacle in the way of the

enforcement of the claims of the government against the Pacific railroads, it can hardly be considered a digression to fully and clearly state my position on that question.

Let me first deal with the principle involved in the government ownership of public highways, including navigable streams, ship and boat canals, wagon roads and railroads. If it be undemocratic to advocate government ownership of railroad highways, it must be equally undemocratic to advocate or to tolerate government ownership of other highways. That will hardly be asserted. Who would contend that the streets and wagon roads should be given or sold to private toll gatherers, who, in consideration of their maintaining the highways, should be permitted to levy tolls on all travelers who use them? Who would give over the navigable streams of our country to the care of private companies and individuals with the right to levy tolls for their private use as a consideration for keeping them in condition? Does any man contend that the granting of franchises and rights of way, either by gift or by sale, for such purpose would be democratic?

Certainly no man who understands the democratic theory of government would make any such contention, or, if opposed to the democratic theory of government, would for a moment risk his reputation for either truthfulness or intelligence upon such a statement. The fact is that the granting of a franchise for any purpose whatever is undemocratic. The true democratic principle is that no franchise shall ever be granted for any purpose whatever, because a franchise is a privilege granted to some citizens which cannot be enjoyed by all, and in its very nature involves the creation of a monopoly, which, according to the democratic principle, it is the function of government to prevent and suppress, but never to encourage or establish.

The whole philosophy of democracy was summarized by Thomas Jefferson in his world-famous expression: "Equal rights to all, special privileges to none." The democratic principle requires that any enterprise of general utility which in its nature necessarily becomes a monopoly if left to private control, and which requires a franchise in order to enable it to be carried on privately, must, for the general good, be made a public function to the extent of eliminating the monopoly, but no further.

What is the theory of democratic government? It is, first, that all men have equal natural rights; that every

man is morally entitled at all times to the enjoyment of all his natural rights; that he is entitled to perfect freedom in the exercise of his natural rights; that he is entitled to pursue his happiness without hindrance or obstruction, provided always in the exercise of his own freedom or in the pursuance of his own happiness he does not interfere with the equal right of any other man; that some men are prone to invade the natural rights of others; that government is necessary to prevent the evil disposed from interfering with the equal rights of others; that no man has an inherent right to govern another, though all have a natural right of self-defense; that all rights of government must spring from the consent of the governed only; that that consent is always to be expressed by the majority of the persons of mature age and sound mind in every community; that the true and only function of the government so established by the majority is to prevent individuals from interfering with the natural rights of others; that the government so established has no more or better right to interfere with the natural rights of any citizen than one citizen has to interfere with the natural rights of another; that the government so established has no right to grant franchises or privileges which enable one citizen to interfere with the natural rights of another; that no government has, nor ever had, nor ever can have, any rightful power to grant or maintain or permit any franchise or privilege which constitutes or involves a monopoly.

Keeping those principles of democracy, the correctness of which no man of intelligence will dispute, clearly in mind, let us come to the consideration of the railroad problem. The monopoly system of private toll roads has universally given way to the democratic system of public wagon roads, owned variously by the national, state, county, and municipal governments, and maintained as public highways over which all citizens freely pass and compete with each other in all kinds of transportation service. The locomotive is invented, making an enormous saving of labor and time in transportation possible, but involving the necessity for special highways for operation.

A railway company is formed to establish and operate a railroad between two given points. The company announces its purpose to open a highway, to construct a roadbed, and to operate trains for the transportation of passengers and freight for hire, and so advises the public authorities. The authorities say to the company: "Go

ahead." But, says the company, we cannot secure a right of way without a franchise. The authorized representatives of the Government, under a truly democratic system, cannot grant franchises for any purpose. A franchise is a special privilege, and the democratic principle forbids the granting of special privileges for any purpose.

But the construction and operation of the railroad would manifestly be of great advantage to the whole people of the state. It cannot be constructed by private enterprise without the granting of a special privilege by the government. What then? Why, clearly the true function of the democratic government is to make such change in the construction of one or more of its public highways as will make it possible to operate this new form of conveyance for the public benefit. It is soon discovered that this new form of conveyance, with the special construction and operation of the highway required for its operation, cannot be successfully combined with the uses to which the old wagon roads of the country are put.

What, then, is the function of a democratic government? Certainly not to bar the way of progress by refusing to provide a highway for the new and improved vehicles of transportation. Certainly not to disregard the lives and interests of its people by combining railroads with wagon roads, but to open new highways so constructed as to serve the interests of the public with the greatest possible safety in the operation of the new system of transportation. When the railroad highway is constructed, what, then, is the true function of the democratic government?

It is, first, to protect the highway from interference of any kind that would either destroy or impair its usefulness. What next? Manifestly to open the highway to all citizens who desire to operate locomotives and cars over the road on terms of perfect equality and with such limitations only as are necessary to prevent transporters of freight and passengers from interfering with each other, and to prevent as far as possible the danger of collisions and other accidents. This done by the government, the commercial and industrial inclination of the people, based upon intelligent self-interest, will do all the rest. If the freights and fares usually collected for railroad transportation give greater average returns, in proportion to investment and risk, than can be had from other equally safe investments, capital will tend to supply locomotives

and cars for all kinds of railroad transportation.

As soon as the average profits of transportation have been reduced by competition to the average net earnings yielded by capital in equally safe general investments the equilibrium will be reached, capital will continue to supply locomotives and cars but will cease to be attracted to that business in superfluity. Freights and fares will be regulated by the free competition of common carriers over the railroad highways as perfectly as they are regulated by the free competition of common carriers over wagon roads.

The people will be required to pay simply for the service rendered by the carriers, including interest on the capital invested in the locomotives, cars, and other property used incidentally in the transportation service. Under such a condition of free competition there would be and could be no such thing as monopoly extortion. . . .

Ask the officers of any railroad company in the country or in the world if there would be the slightest difficulty in their permitting trains of a dozen different companies to operate regularly over any given railroad, provided locomotives and cars were built on the same plan and to the same gauge with their own locomotives and cars and with their engines and conductors running such trains under the command of the superintendents and train dispatchers of the company owning the road, and the answer will be that there would not be the slightest difficulty. In fact, it would make absolutely no difference, so far as operation is concerned, whether the trains belonged to the company owning the road or to another company or to as many companies as there were trains operating over the road.

If that plan of operation would not present the slightest difficulty under a private company owning any given railroad, why do men who pretend to knowledge in the ordinary affairs of life contend that the difficulties which the government would encounter in doing the same thing are insuperable?—Hon. Jas. G. Maguire, in the House, Feb. 4, 1898.

Spanish Statesman—Hurrah! Viva Hispania! We are saved. The American government is now threatened with enemies at home.

Another Spanish Statesman—Ah, good! Who are they—Indians or the old confederates?

Spanish Statesman—Neither. I just read that the populists—the American peasantry—recently met and publicly

denounced the United States government.—Puck.

"I can't see which one this is," said Aunt Jean when she went in the semi-darkness to kiss her two little nieces good night.

"Ruth," answered Frances, soberly. "But it sounds like Frances," said Aunt Jean.

"P'raps it 's," replied a roguish voice; "it's so dark I can't see, too."—Judge.

"Just think of Chicago being for four days without a newspaper," said Jinks.

"I don't believe it ever happened," said Blinks; "it's a canard, to make the city attractive to residents."—Bazar.

Uncle Sam—Peace? Why, certainly, senor. Only, this being—ahem!—strictly a war of humanity, you must hand over any trifles you have about you which I think I can find use for.—Life.

In my sleep I was fain of their fellowship,
fain

Of the live oak, the marsh and the main.
The little green leaves would not let me
lie down in sleep;

Upbreathed from the marshes a message
of range and of sweep,

Interwoven with waftures of wild sea-liberties,
drifting

Came through the lapped leaves, sifting,
sifting,

Came to the gates of sleep.
—Sidney Lanier.

THE PUBLIC

Is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, 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.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 522,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO FRISER, 316
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St.
West.