

# The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1902.

Number 201.

**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.

The December report from the reconcentrado camps in South Africa shows a slight falling off in the death rate, but the rate is still high enough. According to the London Daily News of January 18—

the deaths for the month amounted to 2,380, which is equal to an annual death rate of 244 per thousand. This is the lowest death rate recorded since July; but, unfortunately, the figures do not tell us the whole truth. In the Orange River colony the death rate is as high as 343 per thousand for men, women and children, and 464 for children only.

Gov. Taft has testified that the natives of the Philippines number about 2,000,000 Moros, 1,500,000 non-Christian tribes, and 600,000 Christian Filipinos, and that it is "the Christians who have carried on the insurrection." This must be cheering news to imperialists who have pictured the Filipino patriots as savage pagans, and prejudiced public sentiment by labeling them with a miscellaneous lot of strange tribal names derived from a remote non-Christian ancestry.

In connection with the American purchase of the Danish West Indies, a new apology for conquering or buying subjects of the American empire has been unveiled. It is explained, taking the case of the Danish West Indies for illustration, that the people there will not be prejudicially affected, even if they do not want to become American citizens, because "every one of them will be allowed to say whether he wants to be an American or a Dane." That is, if he chooses not to become an American citizen he may have the inestimable alternative

of becoming a foreigner, without citizenship rights, in the country of his birth!

When the bicycle trade began to subside—it was in the year of the last presidential election—the Republican papers attributed it to the popular fears of approaching Bryanism. Bryanism didn't come, unfortunately for the best interests of the country, but the bicycle trade languished nevertheless. It is now reported to have declined so rapidly and to such a degree that whereas on the 1st of January, 1900, there were 288 factories in the United States, only 69 were left a year afterward, and only 24 on the 1st of January, 1902. Were the Republican papers talking for political effect when they said that this is what would happen in the event of Bryan's election? Or is it due to Bryan's defeat?

Maj. Lee, of the British army, and tory member of parliament, has raised a ruction in England by giving out information which brings the British war department under grave suspicion of incompetency or worse. What Maj. Lee says has reference to the British purchase in the United States of horses for army use in South Africa. He asserts that he had an opportunity through the good will of "a high official," to get the services as adviser for the purpose "of the chief horse expert of the United States army," but was ignored by the British war department. The British public is angry because this opportunity was neglected. The American public has reason to be angry for another cause. What business had any American official, high or low, to offer Great Britain the services of the "chief horse expert" of our army as adviser in the purchase of American horses as munitions of war for the subjugation of

friendly republics? Congress might find it well worth while to inquire into this matter and uncover the "high official" who was so well disposed toward the British in a war in which our country was bound by international obligations and American sentiment to be neutral.

In German university circles the United States is understood to have virtually abandoned the Monroe doctrine. Prof. Jellinek, professor of international law at Heidelberg, who is in close touch with the German government, is reported to have phrased this feeling in these terms:

The Monroe doctrine had for its converse that the Americans would not touch any territory outside the American continent. In entering upon a colonial policy in the Philippines the United States have not observed this, and therefore the Monroe doctrine is no longer tenable.

As matter of international law the Monroe doctrine never was tenable. It rests upon no moral principle, no theory of natural rights, and it has no treaty sanctions. It could at any time as well as now have been ignored by any nation, without subjecting that nation to criticism for disregarding international obligations. It was simply a policy asserted by the United States with a warning to other powers that she would maintain it against all comers by force of arms. The United States can do this as well now as ever. That she would consider herself as under an obligation of fair dealing to abandon her exclusive "sphere of influence" on this continent merely because she has herself established a "sphere of influence" at the antipodes, is quite improbable. A nation that could disregard its own fundamental concepts of government for a "sphere of influence" abroad is not likely to yield its "sphere of influence" at home in recognition of the eternal fitness of things. Nothing but unsuccess-

cessful resistance in war or peaceful negotiations with plutocratic profit for their objective, will cause the United States to abandon the Monroe doctrine.

That some such negotiations are contemplated, under cover of the child's-play ceremonial of the naming of a German royal yacht by the daughter of an American republican president, is a fair inference. Such suspicion is at any rate abroad in Germany. The present German ministry is in the hands of capitalists who organized the reaction against the young kaiser's factory legislation, during the early nineties. Many of them are heavy holders of colonial investments. Their interests and needs are of the same kind as those of the capitalists now wielding power in Washington, and it is suspected that the visit of Prince Henry to President Roosevelt will result in an "understanding between statesmen" about South American affairs. Such arrangements are believed to be probable as will enable the German capitalists to push their South American schemes without restriction, while the sacredness of the Monroe doctrine is preserved on paper for purposes of domestic politics. The German suspicions—expectations or hopes would probably be a better word—may not be without a basis in fact. When potentates play with the vanity of presidents, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they are not seeking exercise merely nor are solicitous alone for their health.

An enormous work and a valuable service have been performed by Daniel Cruice, Thomas G. McElligott and W. J. Sullivan and their associates, in Chicago, in securing a municipal petition from over 140,000 signers demanding a popular vote, under the Illinois advisory referendum, on three questions: (1) municipal ownership of street railroads; (2), municipal ownership of light and power; and (3), nominations of city officers at primary elections. This referendum law was enacted last winter. It allows an advisory vote in municipalities on any

question, upon the petition of 25 per cent. of the voters. The large percentage was inserted under plutocratic influence with the unconcealed intention of making the law practically inoperative. In this instance, the number necessary was 104,000, and but for the energy of the gentlemen named and their supporters, so huge a petition could not have been secured. Even with that the effort would probably have failed but for the timely and effective assistance of the Chicago American. All the other local dailies were either silent or obstructive. Since the filing of the petition some of them have tried to discredit it and to cause its rejection by picking out and making much of a few instances of false signatures made by practical jokers. But all opposition is likely to fall through and at next spring's municipal election the three questions outlined above will probably be voted on. A favorable vote will not be mandatory. Neither legislature nor council need pay any attention to it. But after the vote, if favorable, one of the objections to these reforms—alleged popular indifference or hostility—will have been knocked out of the fight.

Indications regarding the delegate conference of the People's party to be held at Topeka on the 21st are pointing more and more in the direction of an amalgamation in that state of the People's party with the Democratic party. As already explained in these columns (p. 660) the necessity for some such action is due to the ballot law recently enacted by the Republican legislature, which prevents fusion nominations. One of the strongest advocates of amalgamation is Annie L. Diggs, editor of the Topeka Advocate and widely known as state librarian of Kansas. She argues that—

events are now shaping (notably the conflict of the people of the northwestern states with the consolidating railway corporations) which in the near future will compel a national party to take an unequivocal position and fight the battle for the people as against the corporate powers. This position the national Republican party cannot

take, because it includes in its dominating membership men who desire the corporation side to win. The national Democratic party can, and will, unequivocally and aggressively espouse the people's side, unless its next national convention shall be recaptured by the men who dominated it before "Bryanism" came to the front. Right here is the great service which Kansas Populists might render to practical politics; they might, by uniting with Kansas Democrats, form so consequential and forceful a delegation to the national convention as to aid greatly in holding that body to the new Democracy and prevent Messrs. Hill, Cleveland et al from walking off with the situation. For should Kansas show her faith in the new Democracy, like action would follow in other states and reformers everywhere would take heart and enthrust with the effort to use the great national party machine, already constructed, for genuine reform and progressive politics.

That is good argument and good sense. It has the merit, moreover, of telling the whole story in the briefest possible compass. And this and other like arguments are having the effect of fostering the amalgamation sentiment among the rank and file of the People's party. Many of the delegates are coming up to Topeka instructed by their constituents to favor amalgamation with all the forces opposed to the Republican party in Kansas. One obstacle to this most important conclusion is the fact that prohibition is generally opposed by Kansas Democrats, whereas Kansas populists very generally favor it; but it is believed that this obstacle may be surmounted. Should the amalgamation be made, the Republicans will of course promote the organization of a bolting People's party—another "middle-of-the-road" contingent in Republican pay and service. But that need give the body of the party no serious concern. Investments of that kind by Republicans in the past, whether in Kansas or elsewhere, have not proved profitable to the investors.

"About this time look out for"—something; snow, or rain, or hail, or winds, according to the season. That was a familiar warning in the patent medicine almanacs of our youth. The

idea is now adopted by the war department with reference to the Philippine situation. "About this time look out for"—official reports of pacification, or treachery of the natives, or outrages upon American soldiers, according to the disclosures leaking through the censor's office the effect of which it is officially desirable to counteract. Some such prognostication might be made almost any time with confidence. The latest verifying instance is an account of Filipino outrages occurring in November and apparently held back till wanted. It seems that a detachment of American soldiers, who had broken into a Filipino house to search it, was precipitated into a pit bristling with pointed bamboo sticks, on one of which the native guide—as we call him, but spy as the Filipinos do and as we would if conditions were reversed—was impaled. This is a sickening thing, of course. But it must be remembered that such catastrophes can always be avoided by keeping out of other people's houses. And bad as it is, it is hardly bad enough to accomplish its evident purpose of offsetting the infamy of the concentration camps that our army has established in the Philippines in imitation of Weyler in Cuba and Kitchener in South Africa.

The efforts of the Ohio Republicans to checkmate Mayor Johnson in his crusade for equitable taxation are full of entertainment. Having a notion that the sentiment to which Johnson appeals is hostility to corporations, merely as corporations, they are "faking" tax laws aimed at all corporations. No distinction is made between those which have valuable special privileges and those that are only incorporated partnerships without special privileges. This policy may get the Republicans into deeper water than they have bargained for. A grocery store corporation, for instance—and there are enough such corporations to make the welkin ring if they wake up—is not likely to relish a corporation tax which

falls upon it with the same weight that it does upon a railroad or street car corporation with exclusive and extremely valuable highway privileges. Meanwhile the Republican leaders in the legislature are floundering about in amusing fashion in their efforts to explain the equity of their most inequitable policy. Chairman Cole, of the House committee on taxation, is an example. He justifies the tax on corporation capital stock, which is to fall upon the stock of all corporations indiscriminately, and at par value regardless of market value, on the ground that all corporations enjoy the special privilege of incorporation! It may be conceded that incorporation is a privilege, since it protects stockholders from personal liability—repeals, as to them personally the laws for the collection of debts; but as any partnership may avail itself of this privilege, one may well inquire what it is that makes the privilege special. It certainly is not valuable. No one would buy a corporate charter unless it conferred some exclusive privilege, which but few corporate charters do. Mr. Cole appears to have heard the bell ring, but he doesn't seem to know where the clapper is. He knows that it is valuable special privileges that ought to be taxed, but he does not know that privilege must be exclusive to be special and that the tax ought to be proportioned to the actual value of the privilege. This is one of the mentally-muddling effects of legislative anxiety to serve monopoly corporations at the expense of the general public.

For the present the corporation rings that now dominate the machinery of the Republican party in Ohio, have obstructed Mayor Johnson's efforts to tax all railroad values. The board of revision in each case is composed of state officers whose leading spirit is Attorney General Sheets, the man with whom Senator Hanna displaced the anti-trust Republican, Monett, at the Republican convention a year and a half ago. This board decided last fall that it could not in-

crease the tax valuations of the steam railroads, which Johnson had demanded, and the supreme court of the state, which is acquiring a reputation for friendliness to monopolies, now sustains it. Consequently these privileged corporations pay taxes on only about a fifth of the real value of their property, while farmers pay on two-thirds. The same board, with the change of only one member, not Sheets, has now also overruled the city board of Cleveland with reference to the taxation of the street cars and other local monopoly corporations. This local board, appointed by Mayor Johnson, had added millions to the tax valuation of these corporations, though still keeping within the rule of 60 per cent. of true value. It based its action upon the market value of the stock and bonds of the corporations. That action is now reversed by the state board, which holds that the local board had no authority to take the value of stocks and bonds into consideration. The result is that the street car and lighting companies pay nearly half a million less taxes than they ought to as compared with the taxes paid by other Cleveland taxpayers. Mayor Johnson declares his intention of keeping up this fight in the courts, but he can hardly have any hope of success as the taxing and judicial bodies of Ohio are now organized. He himself confesses that he has little hope short of the final appeal he will make to the people, but that he is confident of success before that tribunal; and it certainly does look as if the Republican corporation rings of Ohio had grown reckless of public sentiment and were treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath.

Even to the imperial revolutionists, who are getting used to their policy of turning our nation away from the path of its high democratic ideals, Senator Cullom's speech of last week must be startling. In this carefully prepared speech, delivered on the floor of the Senate on the 29th, he boldly announced the doctrine that the Senate and the President alone, with-

out even the consent, much less the initiation of the lower house, can enact revenue laws, provided they do so by the exercise of the treaty-making power. This declaration from the Senate has set the House to considering its endangered prerogatives. For the constitution provides that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." In defiance of this provision, Senator Cullum argues that the Senate and the President may ignore the house in reciprocity treaties and without its consent reduce by treaty any or all tariffs which the law-making power has imposed by statute.

There is no substantial foundation for Senator Cullom's claim. It derives plausibility only from the fact that the treaty-making power can make contracts with foreign nations. But contractual power and legislative power are entirely different; and the constitution vests all legislative power, not in the Senate and the President, but in Congress, which includes the lower House. "All legislative powers herein granted," says section 1 of article I, "shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." What these legislative powers are is defined in section 8 of the same article. They consist of the power of taxation, of borrowing, of regulating international and interstate commerce, etc.; and, as already stated, in respect to the first, taxation, all measures must originate in the lower house. In contrast with these legislative powers, are certain contractual powers, which, by section 2 of article II., are vested in the President and the Senate, the former being empowered, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties," which by section 2 of article VI. are declared to be "the supreme law of the land" as against all state laws and constitutions. From these provisions it is evident that the treaty-making power can only contract, it cannot legislate, without the House. That is, it can make agree-

ments with foreign powers, as to international relations, but without the House it cannot legislate upon the character or degree of taxation to which the American people must submit. Taxation is distinctly a Congressional prerogative, and in its increase or reduction only the lower house can take the initiative. And this prerogative has the highest kind of sanction in the history of the struggle for human liberty.

This matter is so simple that a controversy could hardly have arisen but for the protective policy with which the people have so long been bedeviled. There is no constitutional warrant for protection, unless it might be claimed under the clause empowering Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It has been maintained fraudulently under pretense of an exercise of the legislative power of taxation. This pious fraud has become so much a part of our system that the fiscal disguise in which protection has masqueraded so long has now dropped off, and tax measures not only actually, but also nominally, for protection are proposed. This candid departure is one of the outcomes of the growing necessity for that phase of protection known as reciprocity. Reciprocity requires an exercise of the treaty-making power. If the constitution sanctioned the protection policy otherwise than by the commercial regulation clause, (which might possibly be resorted to but which requires action by the House), the authority of the Senate and the President to make reciprocity treaties might possibly exist, for such treaties might then appear to be within the legitimate scope of international contractual relations. But as protection and reciprocity have no constitutional sanction (except possibly in the commercial clause) outside of the guise of revenue laws, it is evident that the treaty-making power cannot constitutionally make reciprocity treaties without the consent of the House. A quarrel between the two houses over this question may prove to be of great public value. In its ef-

fort to preserve one of its most cherished and certainly most important prerogatives against invasion by the Senate, the House may open the way to a complete airing of the constitutional false pretense by which our protective policy, reciprocity and all, has been given the force of law.

In St. Louis the Board of Education is trying to raise a fund for the support of "superannuated teachers." The teachers contribute one per cent. of their salaries, but this is not enough, and the president of the board has made an appeal to the public for annual contributions of \$5. All the St. Louis papers join in a chorus of approval. One of them says this is "not charity, but justice." That paper is mistaken. Justice doesn't beg; charity does. Call it by whatever name you will, it is charity just the same; except when the contributions are forced, as by a tax on salaries to create a pension fund, and then it is plunder. If school teachers are underpaid, and they certainly are, the remedy is simple. Be honest; pay them what they earn. Don't rob them while they work and turn them into mendicants when they are superannuated.

The Northwestern Christian Advocate thinks there are signs of a remarkable change touching the matter of wealth. One might suppose from this, considering that the Advocate is a religious paper and presumably devoted to righteousness, that it had observed a tendency toward the getting of wealth by earning it instead of monopolizing its natural sources and then compelling the many to earn it for the few. But no. What it has observed is that "among the rich, money is looked upon not as a means of display or as providing for the gratification of appetite, but as a trust for humanity!" What is this but an exaltation of charity as it is now understood, above the charity of new testament days, when it meant justice? The moral and social desideratum is not that the rich shall spend their money charitably, but that they shall get it justly.

**"THE ALAMEDA CITIZEN."**

Over the bay from San Francisco lies the city of Alameda. It is one of the bedrooms of the metropolis of the Pacific, where an army of San Francisco toilers of the clerk class go from their daily work for refreshment and sleep.

Many of these clerks own little homes, more or less mortgaged, which gives them an invigorating consciousness of having a stake in the country. Nor is this the only stimulating fact in their lives. As their days are spent at work in the midst of great commercial and financial affairs, laboring with their coats on and not for "wages" but for "salaries," they have a feeling, shared even by such of their class as do not own homes, either mortgaged or free, that they are strictly in the swim with the business interests of the nation in general and of the Coast in particular.

They are, therefore, not workmen, but business men. Toward workmen, even toward those whose wages are double their own salaries, they are deliciously supercilious. The workingman belongs in a lower social class, you see. And they take no interest in labor problems beyond the vital question of how to get labor cheap, whereas in business problems their interest is active and profound.

After each daily round of business duties "over in the city," the clerkly denizen of Alameda is said to retire to his more or less mortgaged domicile across the bay, there to enjoy a few hours of hard-earned surcease from respectable toil.

Entering his home, he surveys with satisfaction an interior modeled upon that of the luxurious house of the old man—the millionaire whom he assists in business—as closely as a narrow salary and a little cottage upon a contracted building plot permit. His evening dinner over, a function also remotely modeled after the corresponding function at the old man's, our Alameda friend withdraws to his study, like the old man except on club nights, and dons his smoking jacket. A tawdry and ancient thing, that smoking jacket, threadbare and frayed, perhaps, but undeniably it is a smoking jacket, what remains of it;

and a thrill of pleasure follows the thought that, broadly speaking, this is the distinguishing part of the sartorial array of the old man when he settles down to a sociable smoke with himself at home.

Thus properly garbed, the complacent Alamedan takes his meerschaum from its case with a loving caress and tenderly fills the capacious bowl with Bull Durham. Cigars would be preferred, but good cigars are dear, while poor ones are in bad form, in addition to being otherwise objectionable; and next to cigars, aye, even along with cigars, a meerschaum pipe is correct. Indeed, a meerschaum pipe may even supersede cigars, as a better-class indulgence, if it develops rich color, which the owner may laboriously conserve and progressively admire. To be sure, the pipe ought to be loaded with Turkish instead of Bull Durham, but that is a detail which in the privacy of home cuts no figure. Besides, there is in the use of the fragrant but plebeian Durham a suggestion of sturdy indifference to style, which distinguishes the denizen of Alameda from the mere dude.

With his pipe alight, the Alamedan smokes and dreams—dreams as the Turk dreamed—of a future when suppliant knees will bend before him, even as his own now bend before the old man. Maybe his wife sits by him, and they dream together, he swelling out with a delightful sense of headship within the walls of his more or less mortgaged castle, and she blooming with pathetic confidence in his latent powers of business.

That is the daily routine, with immaterial variations induced chiefly by social obligations and changes of season, of the Alameda habitant in his leisure hours. In his business hours over in San Francisco he strives to copy the manner and manners of the old man with all fidelity. And to his credit it must be said that, comical as he often appears, he is as a rule as diligent in business as the best type of "good nigger" in slavery days.

It is in political times, however, when questions affecting business are at issue, that he becomes most interesting. For then our Alameda habitant blossoms out into the Alameda

citizen—comical, diligent and dangerous.

In political issues in general his interest is only properly languid—like the old man's. Whether government be centralized or localized, he cares little, provided the government is good, because that is the way the old man looks at it. Whether the suffrage be general or limited makes no difference to him, provided it is sufficiently limited to exclude the unfit, which is also the old man's idea. Excessive taxation doesn't trouble him, if it is indirect; though he is sensitive to direct taxation, partly because the old man objects to it, and partly because it is prejudicial to real estate interests, in which he is concerned. For inherent human rights, except his own, he does not care a fig; and is rather inclined to agree with the old man, who approves the conclusion of modern college professors, that the theory of inherent human rights has been exploded. If he knew that socialists also inculcate the doctrine that there are no inherent rights, he might recoil; for the old man abhors socialism, whatever that may be, and of course he abhors it, too. Once in awhile he becomes indignant about bad government, just like the old man; but he is no more a theorist than the old man is, and if you turn the rascals out and put good officials in he is quite content. But when politics meddles with business questions, so as to excite the old man, the Alameda citizen is indeed on fire.

He is not on fire, however, with the fuel of his own independent thoughts. He never thinks independently. He does not consider it good business form for a subordinate in business to do so. The old man thinks for him at the office, and does it well; why not at the polls?

So the Alameda citizen votes the old man's ticket, and holds in supreme contempt everybody in the establishment who does not. When a subordinate is "fired" for not taking a delicate hint at election time, he gets no sympathy from the Alameda citizen. How can he expect to eat the old man's bread, even if he does give the old man his time and sweat in exchange, and then vote against the old man's interests without being "fired?"

Besides, doesn't the old man know, better than any inside subordinate or outside agitator, what is good for the whole force? Isn't he a millionaire because he knows how? Very well then. If he says protection, protection goes, just the same as when he says buy or sell, or mark up or mark down. If he says "sound money," then sound money it is and ought to be with every voter in the place. If he says "leave well enough alone," then the party in power must be kept in power. If he says "give us a change," then the party in power must be turned out.

There is your "Alameda citizen," as Arthur McEwen, a journalist distinguished on both Coasts, discovered, and with a degree of humor we should not attempt to imitate, described him. But the "Alameda citizen" works in many places besides San Francisco and lives in many places besides Alameda, though elsewhere he might be better distinguished by the name "pen-niless plute." He is ubiquitous. Wherever you find a ten-dollar clerk who glances down as from a pinnacle upon twenty dollar mechanics, the chances are more than even that you are in the presence of an "Alameda citizen." Sound him on politics and you are almost certain to get an echo of the plutocratic sentiments in the midst of which he humbly works.

The successful business man is the "Alameda citizen's" god. Success in business is his heaven; failure his hell. He knows his hell is densely populated, but there is so much room, so very much room, in his heaven. And as he is in his own estimation possessed of exceptional business qualities, he expects to climb over the heads of the seething mass of "poor devils" who are doomed not only to failure but to destitution. All unconscious that he himself is part of the seething mass, and 999 to 1 always will be, he hopes to make it a stepping stone to a comfortable seat in his roomy heaven. And the one rule upon which he relies to achieve this bare chance of success is implicit obedience, even in the matter of voting, to the commands of his god—the successful business man.

The "Alameda citizen" is as com-

ical as an organ grinder's monkey, and for similar reasons. His one virtue, taking him as a class, is diligence in business. But both his diligence and his comicality are obscured by the overshadowing fact that he is dangerous.

Any class of voters is dangerous which votes under orders. Such voters are more dangerous, far more dangerous, than voters who are bribed. And the "Alameda citizen" does vote under orders. Without thinking independently on public questions, he simply adopts the sentiments of a coterie of successful business men. The effect is to multiply the voting power of that coterie. Instead, therefore, of getting an expression of citizenship at the polls, we get, so far as the vote of the Alameda citizen is concerned, only a magnified expression of a limited business interest which is selfishly desirous of making and maintaining such maladjustments of industrial affairs as tend to enrich them at the expense of the labor of the masses.

One thing the "Alameda citizen" has to learn, if with his narrow brain and narrower selfishness he is capable of learning anything, is that the activities which he calls business are not all of business; that is, they are not all of the industrial life of which business, so-called, is but a dependent part. Another thing he needs to know is that success in business does not depend alone upon diligence, nor yet upon this and all the other industrial virtues combined. It ought to, but it does not. If inherent human rights were recognized and conserved, it would; but they are ignored, and in consequence legalized privilege in some degree and form is an absolutely necessary condition of business success.

To make business success the reward of the industrial virtues alone, legalized privileges must be abolished or undermined. But that can be done, otherwise than by revolution, only by voting to do it. When the "Alameda citizen" shall have learned this, his intelligence will be sufficiently stimulated, perhaps, to see that in voting the old man's sentiments instead of his own he is probably voting not to abolish or undermine legal-

ized privileges, but to perpetuate them. By that time he will be competent to decide for himself how best to serve with his vote the interests of the people, of whom he is one, instead of those peculiar "business" interests in which his share is seldom more and is usually less than that of the worker in shirt sleeves whom he affects to despise.

But when he does this he will no longer be an "Alameda citizen." He will then be an American citizen, devoted above all things else, as a citizen, to the perpetuation and realization of those human rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" which the American Declaration of Independence declares to be in their nature inherent and inalienable, and which no college philosophy, no pseudo science, nor any counting room code of ethics can set aside.

## NEWS

The text of the correspondence between the British and the Dutch governments relative to the possibility of terminating the war in South Africa, which was referred to last week but the nature of which had not then been divulged, was made public on the 4th. It consists of a letter from the Dutch minister in London to Lord Lansdowne, the British foreign secretary, and of Lord Lansdowne's reply.

In the Dutch minister's letter, which is dated January 25 and is phrased with extreme caution, the reasons are outlined which in the opinion of the Dutch government justify friendly overtures for peace from a neutral power. The Boers, it recites, are placed in exceptional circumstances. Being "completely shut in and separated from the rest of the world," their "representatives in Europe are deprived of all means of communicating with the general commanding their forces." In consequence, "the authorities who ought to negotiate for the Boer side are divided into two sections, which are deprived of all means of deliberating together." In addition to this obstacle to peace negotiations, which prevents each section from acting intelligently, "the delegates in Europe are bound by their letters of credence, drawn up in March, 1900, which bind them so strictly to the independence of the republics" that they could not author-

itatively negotiate for peace upon any other terms. With a view to overcoming this difficulty, the Dutch government ventures to suggest, "seeing that the Boers' delegates are in Netherland territory and accredited to that government alone," that the British government give three safe conducts "permitting the Boer delegates to proceed freely to Africa, remain there freely for the time agreed upon," say a fortnight, "and return freely to Europe," being allowed the use of a telegraph code "with the view of appointing a place where the delegates could meet the Boer leaders." The Dutch government makes no claim to any authority from the Boer delegates to offer this suggestion. Neither does it propose to do more than to bring about, if possible, an opening of negotiations between the belligerents. On the contrary, upon the return of the delegates, should safe conducts be accorded them as suggested, it would expect only to "place them in communication with the plenipotentiaries appointed for that purpose" by Great Britain, and then consider its "task at an end."

Lord Lansdowne's reply, dated January 29, infers that the Dutch suggestion "was made on the responsibility of the Netherlands government alone and without authority from the Boer delegates or leaders," and while expressing appreciation of the humane motives of the Netherlands, declares the intention of the British government to—

adhere to the position adopted and publicly announced by them some months after the commencement of hostilities by the Boers, that it is not their intention to accept the intervention of any foreign power in the South African war.

The letter proceeds, however, to say:

Should the Boer delegates themselves desire to lay a request for a safe conduct before his majesty's government there is no reason why they should not do so. But his majesty's government, obviously, are not in a position to express an opinion on any such application until they have received it and are aware of the precise nature and grounds whereon the request is made. I may therefore point out that it is not at present clear to his majesty's government that the delegates retain any influence over the representatives of the Boers in South Africa, or have any voice in their councils. They are stated by the Netherlands government to have no such letters of credence or instruction of a later date than March, 1900. His majesty's government, on the other hand, understood that all the

powers of government, including those of negotiation, were now completely vested in Mr. Steyn for the Boers of the Orange River colony and Mr. Schalk-Burger for those of the Transvaal. If this is so, it is evident that the quickest and most satisfactory means of arranging a settlement would be by direct communication between the leaders of the Boer forces in South Africa and the commander-in-chief of his majesty's forces, who has already been instructed to forward immediately any offers he may receive, for the consideration of his majesty's government. In these circumstances his majesty's government have decided that if the Boer leaders should desire to enter into negotiations for the purpose of bringing the war to an end those negotiations must take place not in Europe, but in South Africa.

The Boer delegates to the Netherlands issued a manifesto on the 5th, declaring that Lord Lansdowne's letter proves the intention of the British government to exterminate the South African republics, and put a further obstacle in the way of negotiations for peace upon the initiative of the delegates.

British reports from the field in South Africa show no diminution of Boer resistance. In a fight on the 28th at Abrahams Kraal, near Kofffontein, in the Orange Free State, a British colonel and eight of his men were killed. Other small engagements are reported, including one which is described as especially important because it resulted in the capture of De Wet's last field piece. In all these engagements the Boers were repulsed, and in some prisoners were made. Lord Kitchener's report of Boer casualties for the week ending the 3d shows that 29 Boers were killed, 6 wounded and 142 made prisoners, and that 48 surrendered.

Parliament has been dealing with the subject of the war in connection with the application of the ministry for supplemental appropriations amounting to \$25,000,000, which Mr. Brodrick, the war secretary, brought before the House of Commons on the 31st. In presenting the application he explained that this would bring the total expenses of the war up to \$305,350,000 for the financial year, making \$620,000,000 for the past two years, and that the weekly expense had now been reduced to about \$5,000,000. In this connection members of a committee of the House, appointed to inquire into war office expenditures, declared that their investigation had revealed suspicious conduct

in the purchase of horses. On one contract alone, said one of these committeemen, the profit on a horse purchase of \$555,000 was \$220,000, a percentage of profit which, if general, would show that the contractors had received \$40,000,000 on the total purchases. Notwithstanding these disclosures, a motion to reduce the supplementary appropriation was defeated by the vote of 106 to 75. This occurred on the 31st. But the scandal has grown, and on the 4th cable dispatches stated that the government organs were "almost wholly silenced or driven to join the radical press in such attacks on the betrayers of the people's interests as the stringent English libel laws made safe." Maj. Arthur Lee, who was accredited to the American army as British military attache during the Spanish-American war and is now a Conservative member of parliament, added fuel to the fire in a speech on the floor on the 4th by saying:

I, being military attache at Washington, was not informed that there was any intention of buying horses in the United States. I learned from the American newspapers that British officers had been sent to buy horses, but I was not informed who they were nor was I asked to give them such assistance as my position implied I was competent to give. At the time I had the opportunity, through the good will of a high official, of getting the services of the chief horse expert of the United States army as adviser. I cabled the suggestion to the war office, but I received no reply.

In the United States this speech is significant of something else than what makes it interesting to the British people; and on the 4th the American war department informally explained, through Adj. Gen. Corbin, that there are no facts to warrant any impression that the United States has assisted the British operations in South Africa by the shipment of horses or in any other way. Gen. Corbin said that there is no such office as "chief horse expert" in the United States military service, and suggested that Lee referred probably to one of the large army contractors who supply the United States cavalry with mounts.

Another of those coincidences which have frequently emphasized the parallel between the British war in South Africa and the American war in the Philippines has just occurred. As the center of interest regarding the former is shifted to London

that of the latter is shifted to Washington, the investigation by the Senate committee into the state of affairs in the Philippines having begun on the 31st. Gov. Taft, who is home from Manila on leave of absence, was the first witness. He is still under examination.

On the 4th Senator Hoar presented a petition to the Senate asking for a suspension of hostilities in the Philippines and an opportunity for the Filipino leaders to be heard by the American government free from the restrictions which have been placed upon them by the American authorities in the archipelago. It is signed by some of the most prominent men in the country, including Carl Schurz, George F. Edmunds, Charles Francis Adams, George S. Boutwell, W. D. Howells, Mark Twain, Bourke Cockran, Bishop Huntington, Bishop Vincent and William Lloyd Garrison. Thirty-six professors at the University of Chicago are among the signers.

The Pan-American Congress, which dissolved at the City of Mexico on the 31st, was the second of its kind. The first met at Washington in 1889. It was convened through the influence of James G. Blaine and established the Bureau of American Republics. The one now in question met at the City of Mexico on the 22d of last October. Official delegations were in attendance from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chili, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, San Domingo, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The peace treaty of The Hague was in principle unanimously recognized by the conference, and the United States and Mexico were empowered to institute negotiations for the admission of the other American powers to the benefits and responsibilities of that agreement. Besides this, the principle of arbitration as a substitute for war was generally approved, and ten delegations, which, however, are not distinguished in the dispatches, came to an agreement and signed a treaty for compulsory arbitration.

Notwithstanding the success of their litigation to compel the public utilities corporations of Chicago to pay a fair share of taxes (p. 534), the Chicago school-teachers have as yet failed to accomplish their original object of securing a public school fund sufficiently large to protect them

from perennial assaults upon their salaries by the school board. On the 29th the board reduced expenditures \$1,118,697 as compared with last year. The salaries of teachers who have served more than seven years were cut \$75 a year. High school teachers and all employes of the board receiving more than \$1,000 were cut 5 per cent. German was dropped as a regular study and reestablished as a special department. Kindergartens are to be closed next June. Drawing, singing, domestic science and other so-called "fads" were greatly reduced. The number of district superintendents receiving salaries of \$4,500 a year was reduced from 14 to 6. And the cost of fuel is to be reduced from \$250,000 to \$150,000. A large part of this reduction, if not the whole, is necessitated by the refusal of the traction corporations, notwithstanding the court decisions against them, to pay their assessed taxes. They have brought suit to restrain the collection of these taxes. The reduction of teachers' salaries was followed by an indignation meeting of teachers. It issued an address to parents and taxpayers, which concluded in these words:

The teachers have already contributed more than their share toward lightening the city's financial burden, and would not now complain did these retrenchments seem unavoidable. But, with every other department of the city drawing on the current year's tax levy for its maintenance, they resent an economy which so seriously impairs the efficiency of the school system.

The teachers have determined also to bring suit in the Federal court to restrain the collection of taxes from the citizens of Cook county on the same ground that the corporations have brought suit to escape the payment of their taxes. In explanation of this purpose their attorney, I. T. Greenacre, who has won their litigations so far, says:

We shall take their petition and copy it word for word, substituting only "citizens" for "corporations," and then await the decision of the Federal court. What can the court do? Decide one without the other? Not an iota of difference between the positions of the corporation and the citizen can be shown. The Federal court will simply have to decide whether the revenue laws of the state apply to the rich man and the poor man alike. If they do, shall they both pay their taxes or shall they not?

For the past two weeks there has been a commotion in the Methodist

church, originating in the publication of questionable theological doctrines by a university professor at Evanston, Ill., which shows indications now of being brought to a speedy conclusion. The offending professor is Charles W. Pearson, head of the department of English literature at the Methodist educational institution at Evanston known as the Northwestern University. In a published paper entitled "Open Inspiration versus a Closed Canon and Infallible Bible," an answer to the query, "On what basis can Christians unite for aggressive action?" Prof. Pearson criticised the doctrine of infallibility. He said that—

modern preaching lacks truth and power because so many churches cling to the utterly untenable tradition that the bible is an infallible book. This dogma is their besetting sin. It is the golden calf of their idolatrous worship. It is the palpable lie that gives the ring of insincerity to all their moral exhortations.

As examples of biblical errors or allegories he enumerated the story of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the fiery furnace; the feeding of Elijah by the ravens and his raising of the dead; and the miracle of the loaves and fishes. The objection made by Prof. Pearson is not as to his right to hold these views, but as to his right to publish them while retaining an official position in the Methodist church. On the 21st a committee was appointed by the executive board of the university trustees to consider the matter, and on the 3d Prof. Pearson announced his intention of moving this committee for a decision regarding his standing both in the church and in the university. An informal hearing in the nature of a heresy trial is now in progress, Prof. Pearson having declared that he intends to make no technical defenses but to sever his church and university connections voluntarily if the committee condemns his opinions.

#### NEWS NOTES.

—Leslie M. Shaw, successor as secretary of the treasury to Lyman J. Gage, entered upon his office on the 1st.

—The Standard Oil Company declared a dividend on the 4th, of 20 per cent. for the first quarter of 1902 upon its capitalization of \$100,000,000.

—The question of the power of the state board of railway-tax equalization of Ohio to increase railway taxation raised in the Supreme Court of that State by Mayor Johnson (p.

548), was decided on the 4th adverse-ly to Mr. Johnson.

—An ocean freight pool was reported on the 31st from New York, the effect of which is predicted to be a probable rise of 50 per cent. in freight rates on grain, flour and produce. All the principal transatlan-tic steamer lines are in the pool.

—The empress of China gave a formal reception to the women of the various foreign legations at Peking on the 2d. She is reported also to have issued edicts abolishing all distinction between the Manchus and the Chinese and forbidding the foot-binding of Chinese children.

—An indictment was found on the 29th by the grand jury at St. Louis against Ellis Wainwright, the mil-lionaire president of the St. Louis Brewing association and director of the Suburban railroad, for bribery in connection with municipal railway legislation.

—The monthly statement of the treasury department for January shows on hand January 31:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000 00
Available cash balance.....	174,796,646 42
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$324,796,646 42</b>
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1901.....	326,833,124 02
<b>Decrease .....</b>	<b>\$2,066,477 60</b>

—A resolution petitioning congress to take steps to authorize the elec-tion of United States Senators by direct vote of the people was de-feated in the lower House of the Ohio legislature on the 4th, the vote being 53 to 46. Of the majority all were Republicans; of the minority 8 were Republicans, all the others being Democrats.

—President Roosevelt issued an ex-ecutive order on the 31st forbidding employes in any executive department from soliciting "directly or indirect-ly, individually or through associa-tions," any increase of pay, or other-wise using influence to secure legis-lation in their own interests, on pain of dismissal. The order is intended especially to affect the associations of postal employes.

—The January treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Fed-eral government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1901, shows the following:

<b>Receipts:</b>	
Tariff .....	\$148,357,315 61
Internal revenue..	163,416,491 23
Miscellaneous .....	19,567,919 91
<b>.....</b>	<b>\$331,341,726 75</b>
<b>Expense:</b>	
Civil and misc.....	\$66,194,022 69
War .....	69,254,827 86
Navy .....	39,704,977 59
Indians .....	6,370,975 39
Pensions .....	80,027,666 89
Interest .....	19,090,704 84
<b>.....</b>	<b>\$280,643,174 26</b>
<b>Surplus .....</b>	<b>\$50,698,552 49</b>

—In the United States Supreme Court on the 3d the filled-in-land on

Lake Michigan at Chicago, the title to which has been in dispute between the state of Illinois and the Illinois Central Railroad for several years, was awarded to the latter. The land in question has an area of 53 acres, of which 9 are still submerged and 44 have been filled in. Its value is estimated at \$10,000,000.

**PRESS OPINIONS.**

**THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.**

Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review (Rep.), Feb. 2.—Guerrilla warfare may continue for several years, but the republics have become British colonies and the Union Jack will never be lowered in them. The Boers might as well understand this first as last.

Chicago Daily News (Neut.), Feb. 5.—Great Britain bases its refusal to accept mediation on the ground that the Boer leaders must themselves sue for peace. . . . But it ought not to be necessary to point out to the British ministers that too much sticking for technical points will not tend to improve their situation.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Feb. 5.—The rejection of Holland's overture does not close the door to peace negotiations. Indeed, the Salisbury ministry would probably negotiate with Kruger himself, as Lord Rosebery has advised and urged, provided Kruger can produce letters of credence and instruction from those possessing the power of government in South Africa.

Chicago Inter-Ocean (Rep.), Feb. 6.—The British government rejects this propo-sition [the Dutch suggestion] and practi-cally submits another to the effect that the Boer delegates in Europe apply to England for safe conduct to South Africa, and, after conference with the Boer lead-ers in the field, enter at once upon negotia-tions with Gen. Kitchener. The British proposition is the better of the two. It is more favorable to peace, and it avoids delay. . . . The fighting Boers are . . . the real representatives of the Boer people under the present conditions. . . . It is desirable, however, that all the Boer leaders—those in the field, those in prison, and those in Europe—should be consulted as to the terms of permanent settlement in South Africa.

**THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION.**

Pittsburg Post (Dem.), Jan. 30.—The Philippine question will not down, and the Republicans will not be permitted to carry on their imperialistic and colonial plans without full discussion in the Senate. . . . The principles of the Declaration of Inde-pendence and the constitution are not to be howled down by jingo clamor.

The Boston Beacon (Neut.), Feb. 1.—If any good reasons ever existed for the concealment of the truth regarding the Ameri-can occupation of the Philippines those reasons certainly do not apply now, and the American public should be given the full-est possible information in order that they may come to some definite opinion.

Cleveland Plain Dealer (Dem.), Jan. 31.—The public would much like to know what the real situation in the Philippines is. [But] . . . the investigation may be so conducted as to bring out part of the facts instead of the whole truth. A report based on such an investigation will leave the public mind as befogged and suspicious as it now is.

Atlanta Constitution (Dem.), Feb. 4.—The Philippine question . . . is no longer a question of possession and reten-tion, but wholly the question of adminis-tration. . . . That which is lacking and which the Democracy should endeavor to supply are an American constitution and

Democratic plan of administration for each and all of these new possessions.

Stockton (Cal.) Evening Mail (Dem.), Jan. 24.—Congress should immediately order a rigid investigation into the conduct of the war in the Philippines. It is bad enough for us to shelve American traditions about the rights of men. We cannot afford, un-der any consideration, to smother the common impulses of humanity in our deal-ings with a race which is at our mercy.

Nashville Daily News (Dem.), Feb. 2.—The champions of imperialism think that the best way to get foreign trade is to first bring down the customer with a Mauser bullet and then force our goods upon him. There was never a greater fallacy. . . . You cannot force people to buy these days at the point of a rifle, although they may be held up that way, as the Filipinos will attest.

City and State (Ind.), Jan. 30.—It is note-worthy how quickly a word spoken at "the hub" of free institutions reaches the cir-cumference of despotism and creates a scare there. Unless Gen. Wheaton has been misreported, he ought to be told that Mr. Schurman is within those parts of the United States where freedom of speech, guaranteed by the constitution, still reigns, not in those parts where, as we are in-formed, the constitution and the abrogation of slavery do not apply.

New York Nation (Ind.), Jan. 30.—It would seem as if the members of the Phil-ippine commission were wilfully ignorant of some of the most tragic pages in mod-ern history. For if they were familiar with the struggles for liberty of men under the tyranny of despots or under foreign opp-ression, they would know full well the futility of trying to overawe men's minds and spirits by threats of prison bars. The dungeons of Russia, the convict hovels of Siberia, the prison stockade on the island of Guam, all attest this truth.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Jan. 31.—People have laughed over the talk about militarism following in the wake of such a policy as that involved in the Philippine acquisition and conquest. Well, here is a militarism of the worst type. Is it some-thing to titter over? Perhaps so. But if it is, the world observes for the first time the American democracy regarding complac-ently an American general's hint of pris-on bars in connection with a perfectly sane and very conservative exercise of the con-stitutional right of free speech in the town of Otis and Sam Adams.

**THE PERMANENT CENSUS.**

Good Government (Civ. Ser. Ref.), New York, January.—It was plain that the House wanted a public service which could be praised, as Lord Melbourne praised the Order of the Garter, "because there was no d—d merit about it."

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Jan. 31.—The Senate will hardly espouse the cause of merit, but the President's duty is clear. If the bill comes to him in its present shape, the true friends of the civil service will expect a veto with a ringing message covering the spoilsmen with confusion.

Chicago Record-Herald (Rep.), Feb. 1.—The friends of the merit system in the civil service, as well as those who believe that an efficient, well-organized, perma-nent census bureau may be of value to the country, hope that the Senate will be re-sponsive enough to public sentiment to re-ject the census bill passed by the House.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Feb. 1.—Pres-umably, the Senate will pass this House bill as it stands. Senators are quite as fond of patronage as the members of the lower house. Some of the census clerks were ap-pointed on the recommendation of Sena-tors who will have to look after their friends. But President Roosevelt has a higher opinion of the civil service law and the merit system than most congressmen have.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The Worker (Soc.), New York, Feb. 2.—As a Department of Commerce is to be established for the primary purpose of getting more profitable foreign markets for American capitalists and otherwise serving their business interests, Senator Hanna and his friends insist upon bringing the Department of Labor into the new system as a subordinate bureau. This is quite in keeping with the Hanna idea of harmony, as shown by the 24-to-12 representation of capital and labor on his arbitration committee. Labor is always to be harmonized by being swallowed up.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Jan. 31.—The Interstate Commerce Commission, more closely related to commerce than any other bureau in the government, is left out. But the Department of Labor is left in. This last is against the wishes of organized labor, whose leaders protested vigorously in opposition to making this particular department, now an independent bureau, a mere adjunct to the new department. . . . What organized labor wants is a department conducted by a man chosen from and interested distinctively in the labor side of the industrial question. Agriculture has such a department. Why not labor? The secretary of agriculture is usually a practical agriculturist, and he works his department for all it is worth in the agricultural interest exclusively. . . . And this has been the pattern on which organized labor would build an executive department for its interest.

## GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION.

Cleveland Leader (Rep.), Feb. 4.—The judiciary committee of the United States Senate . . . has decided to report favorably a bill drawn by Senator Hoar to stop what is known as "government by injunction, [which] must be accepted as proof of the most positive kind that the phrase quoted covers a very serious evil. . . . The bill ought to pass and become a law. . . . Government by injunction is a real and growing menace to representative and popular institutions in the American republic.

## PREROGATIVES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Philadelphia Press (Rep.), Feb. 3.—The wise and only way for the House to protect and preserve its privileges for over a century to be the body invariably to initiate changes in the tariff or affecting the revenue is to adopt a policy with reference to those matters so broad and so statesmanlike and so backed by public sentiment that it would be impossible for the Senate to venture to raise an issue through its treaty-making power.

## ISTHMIAN CANAL.

Seattle Post-Intelligencer (Rep.), Jan. 24.—If there is a conclusion wiser than that of the commission, it should submit its proofs and its authorities. Until then it is certainly the stubborn advocates of the Nicaragua route right or wrong, who are filling the role of obstruction.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Jan. 28.—The newest plan is to let a private corporation dig it, the government advancing the capital and having nothing to say about its construction or its operation until 50 years have passed, when, if the bonds are not paid for, the government may possess the canal. This is the proposition of the Darien-Mandango Company, the surveys made by which show that the Darien is the most advantageous route. . . . It might become desirable for the United States to build the canal along that route, but there will be a serious objection to the government backing any private, profit-seeking corporation.

## CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Weekly Capital Journal (Dem.), Salem, Ore., Jan. 30.—The problem of Chinese labor is a serious matter, but a great nation should take a position that is consistent. We should not ask commercial favors of China and then discriminate against the people of that country.

Freeman's Labor Journal (Lab.), Spokane, Wash.—We want and must have a comprehensive exclusion law, but one that will be effective, and not provoke endless litigation or sacrifice one jot of principle. The best way to exclude Chinese in our subject colonies from coming here is to cease to hold them as subject colonies and give them their freedom. Then we can fairly treat the Philippines and their inhabitants as we do China or any other foreign power.

## AUSTRALASIAN TAXATION IN COLORADO.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Feb. 2.—The only organized opposition to the amendment, thus far, comes from real estate speculators in Denver. . . . With rare effrontery these men, who reap where they do not sow, demand that the people of Colorado shall not be permitted even to say whether they desire local freedom or not on the question of raising revenue. It is a nery piece of business and, of itself, is a good argument for the amendment.

Chicago Chronicle (Dem.), Feb. 3.—This, so far as it goes, is the system of taxation advocated by Henry George and his disciples, and it bears some resemblance, though not in principle, to the simple tax proposed by the Chronicle. But it differs radically from the Henry George prescription for the cure of poverty and pretty much all the evils that afflict society in that it does not propose to confiscate all the capital invested in land values by taxing away all such values.

## TAXATION IN MINNESOTA.

Duluth News Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 30.—The commission was hampered at almost every step by constitutional provisions, and in a dozen places dwells on the necessity of the adoption of amendments before a proper system of taxation can be enacted by the legislature. The commission also pleads lack of power when acknowledging the imperfection of its own work. A powerful sentiment is being formed throughout the state in favor of submitting the amendments to the people, and holding all tax legislation in suspense until the regular session in 1903. That seems to be the most practicable way out of a disagreeable and dangerous situation.

## RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.

Northwestern Christian Advocate (Meth.), Chicago, Jan. 29.—The views which Prof. Pearson has expressed concerning the bible, and especially in their implied denial of the supernatural character and power of Christ, come as a great surprise to those who know him. The surprise was the greater that he should utter revolutionary statements that would, if true, remove the very foundations of the Methodist church, while holding a position in an institution founded for the purpose of counteracting such views, and while he was a member of a church a fundamental article of whose creed is belief in miracles.

## THE SUGAR TARIFF.

Kansas City Star (Ind.), Feb. 3.—One of the indirect evils incident to the protective tariff system is made prominent by the Cuban situation. Once give an industry government aid and it insists forever after on dictating terms to the United States.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat (Rep.), Feb. 4.—We have performed far more than our duty toward Cuba. We cannot pamper it and get the return to be expected from a

spoiled child. It is not our business to provide concessions for Cuba simply because it is Cuba.

The Central Farmer (Ag.), Omaha, Neb.—It is hard for the people to arrive at the truth when experts so widely differ. The situation is anomalous, however, when we realize that ten or twelve years ago "free sugar" was good Republican doctrine, while now the Simon pure article requires a tariff on sweetness. The whole question settles down to one of which set of several corporate interests shall be able to control congress.

## OHIO POLITICS.

Buffalo Courier (Dem.), Jan. 28.—For the first time in over 30 years Cuyahoga, upon the question of tax reform, sent a solid delegation of Democrats to Columbus. Such a departure from partisan lines means something, and it may not be healthy for the Republican majority in the Legislature to ignore so emphatic a mandate from the people.

Cleveland Recorder (Dem.), Jan. 27.—"They are all afraid of Tom Johnson down there in the legislature," said a well-known Republican who has been watching the trend of things at Columbus. "It is strange how soon he gets them all on the run. They do not seem to comprehend what he is driving at and they are deathly afraid that they are going to be caught somewhere."

## WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 31.—On the whole it would seem that the interest of Massachusetts women in general, and of Boston women in particular, in voting is comparatively limited and is somewhat on the decline. Women do not care for political rights, and so long as that is the case such rights will not be thrust upon them.

## THE LABOR QUESTION.

Journal of the Knights of Labor (Lab.), Washington, D. C., January.—We have no desire to decry any movement which has for its purpose the preservation of industrial peace; but we fear that when capital and labor again lock horns on a large scale the baker's dozen of distinguished "laborers" whose names are given will be far from unanimous in supporting the contentions of the salaried representatives of organized labor.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Feb. 4.—One day Americans are told by some messenger of sad tidings that there is no longer any chance in this country for the young man. . . . Another day the gloomy news is made public that there is no longer any chance for a workman who is over 35. . . . The mechanics who are over 35 should not be disheartened and fancy that there is no relief for them except in the grave. Nor should the young men be discouraged. There is a chance for them. There is a chance also for the sons of plutocrats. There is still a chance for everybody who is deserving.

Union Boot and Shoe Worker (Lab.), Boston, January.—But, now that the real leaders of capital not only recognize but associate and confer with the leaders of labor and appear to have gained rather than lost dignity thereby, it is probable that those who couldn't do as much business in a century as Schwab and the others do in a year will get down off their stilts. . . . Praise or condemnation for this board of arbitration are both premature. The prophets for good or evil are alike unfair. No one yet knows what good or what harm it will do. There are too many of its critics who make assertions before they know. Give the "Court" a fair show; condemn or praise it after it has had a trial.

Milwaukee Sentinel (Rep.), Feb. 4.—This tendency toward the elimination of older men is not confined to skilled labor, but it reaches all commercial lines of business. The day when a man's long service to a

employer could invariably be counted as capital has gone by. . . . Only those who are young, vigorous and enthusiastic can meet the demands of employers. . . . Human labor has become like machinery. Labor is directed by the few ruling minds. . . . This giving way of the old before the young . . . will lead to the recognition of the importance of providing for the needs of the superannuated. Wage-earners will be compelled to see the necessity of providing for a rainy day. The question of annuities will be canvassed and there will be a growing tendency toward the establishment of savings institutions in connection with large corporations.

**IN CONGRESS.**

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 35 of that publication.

Washington, Jan. 27—Feb. 1, 1902.

**Senate.**

On the 27th Mr. Hoar reported favorably from the judiciary committee (p. 1003), Senate resolution No. 1, proposing an amendment to the constitution respecting successions to the presidency. The text of the resolution is printed at pages 1003 and 1004. From the committee on the Philippines, Mr. Lodge reported (p. 1004) a resolution allowing the committee to sit during the sessions, and to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, for the investigation of affairs in the Philippines. Over a question of privilege raised by Mr. Dubois (p. 1006) relative to Gen. Wheaton's comment on Mr. Schurman's speech, the Senate discussed the Philippine question, after which (p. 1010) it resumed consideration of the department of commerce measure, Senate bill No. 569, and afterward of the Philippine tariff bill, House bill No. 5333, but came to no decision upon either. The only measure of general interest introduced was a joint resolution (s. r. No. 45) proposed by Mr. Scott, the text of which is printed at page 1006, relating to the construction of the Isthmian canal by the Darlen route.

The resolution of yesterday authorizing an investigation of Philippine affairs by the Philippine committee was unanimously agreed to (p. 1065) on the 28th; and upon resuming consideration of the department of commerce bill the senate passed it, 52 to 5, after changing the name (p. 1070) of the proposed department to "The Department of Commerce and Labor." Consideration of the Philippine tariff bill was thereupon resumed (p. 1074).

After Mr. Cullom had addressed the Senate on the 29th (p. 1104) on the subject of the extent of the treaty making power of the President and the Senate as a limitation upon the law-making power of Congress, consideration of the Philippine tariff bill was resumed.

A resolution was submitted by Mr. Rawlins on the 30th (p. 1132), calling upon the secretary of war for information relative to the Philippine treason "act" of the Philippine commission, but objection being made its consideration went over for the day, and thereupon the Senate took up the resolution (s. r., No. 1) for amending the constitution regarding the presidential succession (p. 1132), proposed by Mr. Hoar, and reported favorably by the judiciary committee on the 27th, which it adopted by the requisite two-thirds vote. Thereupon (p. 1138) consideration of the Philippine tariff bill was resumed. The new bills of general interest were No. 3353, war revenue act; 3359, importation of contract labor; 3363, statehood for Oklahoma and Indian Territory (p. 1131).

On the 31st the Senate adopted, with an amendment (p. 1175), the Philippine sedition resolution of inquiry offered by Mr. Rawlins yesterday; and after further consideration of the Philippine tariff bill, it adjourned to February 3.

**House.**

No business of general interest was done on the 27th in the House, beyond the introduction of bills No. 10167 to repeal the bankruptcy law, and 10160 to establish "a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper and defective classes." (p. 1050); and adjournment was taken to the 29th.

The only business of general interest before the House on the 29th (besides the introduction of bill No. 10301, for the protection of the president—p. 1039) was the report of the census committee on its substitute (House bill 10306) for House bill 198 (see p. 563), providing in detail for the organization of a permanent census bureau. The text of the report and substitute are printed at pages 1094-95-96.

This substitute bill, printed again at page 1145, was considered in committee of the whole on the 30th, and being reported back favorably was passed viva voce (p. 1162), a call for the yeas and nays not being sustained by the demands of the necessary one-fifth.

On the 31st, apropos of the speech by Senator Cullom in the Senate on the 29th, claiming for the treaty power authority to make reciprocity treaties without the consent of the House, the House considered a resolution of inquiry on the subject, the text of which appears at page 1193, and adopted it by the vote of 154 to 71. A resolution by Mr. Richardson, asserting the prerogative of the House in the premises (p. 1196) was ruled out of order. The new measures of general interest were bill No. 10630, repeal of war revenue taxes; and House resolution No. 116, relating to infraction by the senate of prerogatives of the House (p. 1213).

No business of public interest was transacted on the 1st of February except the passage of Senate bill No. 1747 (p. 1226), to prevent the sale of fire arms, intoxicating liquors or opium to aboriginal natives of Pacific islands not under the protection of a civilized power. The vote was 187 to 21.

**MISCELLANY**

**THE AUCTION OF LABOR.**

For The Public.

Men are the stock they're selling to-day  
In the crowded market over the way.

Who buys?

Men, men, men, men!  
Flesh and blood, and sinew and bone;  
Heart and soul, in the image of God!  
Hark! how they stumble and sigh and groan  
For pity under the heavy rod.  
Come out to the fields where one has space,  
And forget the hideous marketplace.  
'Twill be more pleasant if you and I,  
As we may,  
Feast, sing and dance while others die.  
Away!

Men are selling themselves for a song.  
Where is the fool that calls it wrong!

Who buys?

Are they not free to stand  
Under the hammer in this free land?  
Free to bend to the buyer there;  
To beg for a place from a brother's hand;  
Or die, shut out from light and air,  
And every fact that makes life fair,  
For they are stubborn and will not bear  
The cuts that are striping their backs with red.

Are they wise?

Go! let the dying bury their dead.  
Who buys?

For ever since the world began  
Has man been sold by his brother man.

Who buys?

Is it not ever said  
That what has been must ever be?  
Custom upholds the hand of fate.  
If man has established his slavery,  
Should he claim his freedom, or change  
his state?  
Should the strong man cease to devour the weak,  
Or few to find though many seek?

And the goal where wages at last are paid?

Oh, it lies

In a land where they say there is no shade.  
Who buys?

GERTRUDE COLLES.

939 Eighth avenue, New York city.

**ARE WE OUR BROTHERS' KEEPER?**

Is South Africa merely a geographical expression? Is the name of Boer the name of some one who has lived in the far past ages? Is their struggle for bread something that is written only on the musty pages of history? Is it not going on under our own eyes? Are not their cries in battle ringing in our ears? Do not the claims of their women and children strike our hearts? And yet we, wrapped up in the mantle of our righteousness, stand as silent and as stony as the Sphinx of Egypt—we, who claim to have our hearts beat for liberty, refuse to listen to the cry of the greatest soldiers of liberty that ever blessed this earth?

The Boers are not orators. There is not among them a Patrick Henry to say in tones that shall ring down through the centuries: "Give me liberty or give me death!" They are not spectacular. They are cut off from the civilized world by the cordon of English soldiery. With them, it is not one man saying, "Give me liberty or give me death," but it is a whole nation that is acting the principle "Give us freedom or let us disappear from the earth!"

Oh, we are great at boasting; we are great at applauding the sentiments of freedom, when we do not have to suffer anything in order to put them into action. We are standing by, like Cain of old, when God asks us: "Where is your brother Abel?" and we are saying: "Are we our brothers' keeper?"

These people are struggling over in South Africa—and they are not struggling in vain. God cannot allow any issue from that marvelous fight other than the issue of freedom. As sure as I believe that the sun will rise to-morrow, though it may rise in the clouds and it may set in darkness, yet the next day will come, and the sun will rise again, and the third day once more, and one day he will rise in all his splendor in a sky that is clear from every fleck or stain, so these people of South Africa, who are now going through the valley of the shadow of death, who are walking through the desert, and appear to have no pillar of fire to light them, cannot fight in vain. Their day will come, their sun will rise, and it will be the shame of America and the shame of us all that when the ambassador of the South African republic sets up his office in Washington,

his sign will hang above his door, and the motto there will be an everlasting reproach to us, for it will be: "Soli fecimus"—we did it alone!—The Rev. Peter C. Yorke, in San Francisco, January 24.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### "LET THE LEGISLATURE PROBE."

"The statement that the Republican leaders will scrutinize every bill presented by the Cuyahoga county delegation, and seek information up here concerning their merits pleases rather than disturbs me," was the statement of Mayor Johnson yesterday, when asked what he thought of the decision of a majority to discount the actions of minority members in their own countries.

"If the delegation presents the bills which I as mayor shall ask them to do in behalf of this county and city, I want the searchlight to be placed upon them and to have them investigated. There will be no bills presented which do not have behind them the city's good, and which are calculated to build up Cleveland.

"The Cuyahoga county delegation was elected upon a platform which means Greater Cleveland. It was sent to Columbus to correct evils and to make Cleveland great in every possible way. The members are also probably the only ones who are pledged to correct fundamental evils which exist all over the state. Lying behind the platform of principles on which they were elected was the much broader idea of equality of rights, and I believe that they will introduce and vote only for such bills which tend to work out this great idea.

"In local matters I believe it quite the thing that the members should inform themselves of conditions before passing the measure asked for. I hope, however, that the Republican leaders will not stop at Cuyahoga, but will give all parts of the state the benefit of that eagle scrutiny which is said to be promised to us.

"As far as our bills go, we will not only assist them in investigating, but will not block, or attempt to, any efforts they may make to get information. Of course, we want them to be honest in their search, and trust that they will not consider the word of disgruntled committeemen as representing the sentiments of the county. If they will go to representative men, not to disappointed politicians who were repudiated by the people at the polls, we will not object. We might if the leaders followed a policy of ap-

pealing to the small political fish in whom the people of the county have shown their lack of confidence, and I believe that the people would also object to the men whom they have selected to represent them being set aside for the managers of their opponents.

"Let the legislature probe, but let it go to the broad minded and responsible men of the community for its information."—Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 27.

#### HOW TO GET GRADE CROSSINGS ABOLISHED.

Hereafter railroads desiring concessions from the city must give an equivalent in grade crossing improvements, according to the announcement made by Mayor Johnson in the meeting of the board of control Monday.

An ordinance was submitted to the board giving the Erie railroad authority to lay a new switch track at Cuyahoga street.

Inquiry developed the fact that the Erie road had refused to agree to the plans for the abolition of the Union street grade crossing.

"Why. I thought that was the one that was all agreed to," ejaculated Mayor Johnson.

Engineer Carter said that the Pennsylvania company had agreed to the plan for the abolition of the crossing, but that the Erie was holding the project up.

Councilman Springborn appeared to object to the approval of the ordinance. He said that the railroad had neglected to put in crosswalks and a light at Sawtell avenue and Etna street as a previous ordinance provided. Until the company kept their agreement he would oppose any concessions to them, he said.

"Somebody ought to be delegated to look up the whole situation in regard to this railroad," remarked the mayor. "We ought to block them in everything else if they won't give us that overhead bridge at Union street. We will never get the grade crossings abolished except by holding up concessions the railroads want.

"I wouldn't give them an inch to accommodate them until we get their consent to that overhead bridge."

The board of control voted unanimously against the approval of the ordinance.—Plain Dealer of January 28.

The modern millionaire is getting to count philanthropy among the necessities of life.—Puck.

#### THE MISTAKES OF PHARAOH.

"Well," said Mrs. Dillingham, "I have been thinking of that you sent me," she went on, "about Moses and Pharaoh. Do you think it was quite reverent—the way you spoke of sacred things?"

"Which is sacred, the Egyptians or the early Hebrews?"

"You know very well. It was quoting the Bible in politics."

"And if I did, where can one get better lessons? But I mainly referred to certain events recorded in the Bible, which I take it happened just the same whether they are in the Bible or not."

"Oh, I knew you would have an answer. But to compare the Jews with the Filipinos—"

"Which I did not unless the situations compare themselves—"

"They are not at all alike. Think of all the Jews have given us, the majestic prophecies of Isaiah, the psalms of David, and of Mendelssohn and Heine and Zangwill and Emma Lazarus. It is a marvelous race and you say they were not fit for self-government."

"Pardon me, that is what Pharaoh said. And he was mistaken. There never was a people not fit for self-government unless they were first enslaved. So far as slavery or conquest is successful, so far are men unfitted to govern themselves. The Jews in Pharaoh's time were as near it as anybody. So will the Filipino be by the time we are done subjugating him.

"From Pharaoh's standpoint he was right. A man usually is from his own standpoint. But that is no reason we should adopt his views. We have the benefit of his experience for one thing."

"All the same," she continued, "it makes me feel uncomfortable. I don't like your comparing Moses with Aguinaldo."

"But I didn't. I don't believe the Filipino Moses has come yet."

Still it bothered her. "The Jews were God's chosen people."

"And Pharaoh would have kept them in slavery, would have crushed out the last spark of their national genius. What would the world have lost if he had succeeded? It shows how little Pharaoh knew about it.

"And yet they were an unpromising lot. From the time Abraham told that story about his wife, from the trickery of Jacob, from Joseph's his-

toric corner in Egyptian corn, down to Aaron's turning tail and worshipping the golden calf the moment Moses' back was turned, there was a yellow streak in them. Out of such material God chose to create the most wonderful of the races. How was Pharaoh to know it? And how are we to measure the capabilities of the Filipinos?

"It is extremely unlikely any such part is reserved for them in the world's history as fell to the Jews. It is impossible that they should furnish the central figure in the world's redemption as the Jews did. But we have no more right to assume that they were worthless than Pharaoh had to take it for granted that he knew it all about the Jews. No more right and far less reason.

"Pharaoh had his God also, as authentic in his mind as Jehovah was to the Jews, and his god sanctioned the slavery of the Jews, told him it was manifest destiny and probably, through some priest of Isis, dropped a hint of benevolent assimilation into the bargain.

"His chosen people—well, the Filipinos are at least the children of the Father of all. I haven't heard of His disowning them. He has given them, not the genius of the Jews, but a genius of their own. Every race has if it is allowed to work out its own expression of race consciousness. Every race has something to give the world. We can make them manikin copies of the Yankees, if we succeed in the conquest, can prevent them from fulfilling the purpose that God meant for them just as Pharaoh could have stifled the race consciousness of the Jews if God had not taken it out of his hands.

"Of course, I don't know what form it would take. Nobody could ever have guessed it of the Jews. All we know about the Filipinos is that they have a superb talent for lying and an excellent taste in music with natural grace in dancing and natural art in oratory. I fancy Pharaoh might have given the Jews about such a character, by the way, but he never guessed their real national gift. It wasn't his business to know it, and it isn't our business to guess what the Lord intends to make of the Filipino.

"Pharaoh's business was to let the Jews go their way. He refused to do it, and they went away with results that were bad for Pharaoh. I guess

the Lord can get what He wants done now just as well as in the days when the Red sea swallowed up Pharaoh and all his host. I know it. We know it a great deal better than Pharaoh. Because we have not only the Bible record, but the lesson from history that whoever puts himself in opposition to the methods by which the human race is to be developed by God's plan inevitably suffers for it. We don't know what God's plans for the Filipinos are, but if we know anything about history we ought to know we are guilty of a species of blasphemy when we try to tell God we know more about it than He does and when we try to make the Filipinos in our image."

"No, no," she cried. "You are wrong. I know you are wrong. You are comparing our president with Pharaoh. You can't be right."

"If I do it may be unjust to Pharaoh. He was born to be an oriental despot and never had a chance to be anything else. Our president inherits the doctrines of Adams and Patrick Henry and sits in the seat of Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. Pharaoh never heard that the just powers of government rest on the consent of the governed and it wouldn't have made any sense to him if he had. He never read the declaration of independence and couldn't conceive of such a proposition as that all men have the right to their lives, their liberties and the pursuit of their own happiness. Pharaoh's heart was hardened before the first interview of Aaron and Moses."

"You don't understand," she persisted, "Pharaoh was a heathen and we are Christians."

"Well," I admitted, "I guess I don't."—John Stone Pardee, in the Red Wing (Minn.) Argus.

#### THE POSSIBILITIES OF TRANSPORTATION.

Portions of an article on "Albert L. Johnson, the Man," written by Henry George, Jr., for The Single Tax Review of Jan. 15. (Published at 62 and 64 Trinity place, New York city. Single copies, 25 cents.)

It was on the 17th of June, a glorious summer afternoon, and just a few days before he unexpectedly passed, that I had my last chat with Albert L. Johnson, a man in many ways as remarkable as his more widely known brother, Tom L. Johnson. . . .

"The doctors say that I must keep quiet for a few weeks," he remarked; and then he continued in a meditative

way: "That's a hard thing for a man like me to do. I never before in my life have been so long quiet. I have been thinking of all I shall do when I get out again. I'll do things that no man ever ventured to do. I'll make money for myself, but at the same time I'll do things for the human race. I'll make it easier for human beings to come together.

"What makes man the first of animals is brains. What animates those brains is bringing one man within easy touch of another. Mental power then multiplies. We know what a toll gate is; it is a barrier to free intercourse. Ease of communication is freedom, and freedom is the reverse of slavery. Ease of communication is one of the chief secrets of civilization.

"If I can break down impediments existing between one human being and another, and bring them into close touch I shall, in effect, multiply active mental power—increase that thing that invents and constructs machinery, that makes books, that contrives microscopes, that does all the wonderful things that belong to our era and to the eras that have gone before ours. Isn't that something to work for?" . . .

"I'm not proud. I know what I came from—poverty. My father lost all he had in the civil war trying to keep chains on the black man. He did not think black slavery was wrong. He thought a 'nigger' was different from a human being. He fought, and his side lost. I was born in Helena, Ark.; a hotbed of 'niggers, mules and cotton.' The war broke out at that time, and my mother carried my brothers—Tom and Will—and me around after the southern army as well as she could. When the war was over my father had nothing left of his planter's estate. He had to begin over again. He got into the street railroad business in Louisville, and that is where Tom and I began our railroad careers.

"After awhile we went to Indianapolis. It was Tom's scheme, and my father and I went with him. He had obtained some money for an invention. He borrowed some more. We got hold of a dead road, and we put life into it. All of us worked, and worked hard. I was a conductor on one of those Illinois street cars. I pulled a bell strap and worked a bell punch 18 hours a day for \$1.85, the prevailing wages then. I rose to the place of foreman, afterwards to that of superintendent, and in later years I became president of systems that

made that Illinois street line in Indianapolis seem insignificant. I saw what the other side—the seamy side—of life was. It would push your heart back to know what it is to work so long for such small pay, and realize that tens of thousands of families have to be sustained on such wages.

“Perhaps it was because we knew all this, because we ourselves had been through it, that my brother Tom and I have always since been friendly to organization among workmen, and particularly railroad men. We never had a strike, not even in Cleveland in 1892, when Mark Hanna’s lines were tied up. And we may justly claim that we did much to raise street railroad wages. We raised them little by little, until from \$1.85 for 18 hours, such as I had received in Indianapolis, we paid in Cleveland \$2.10 for ten hours, and we never anywhere paid less where conditions were the same.

“Of course, business is one thing and generosity is another. I don’t pretend to say that these high wages were paid for mere kindness. We knew that good pay and shortened hours would get the pick of the men and their best efforts. That’s just what we needed. Our policy was to cut fares to a minimum. Of course, to reduce fares is to increase traffic, and to increase traffic necessitates improved management, so that we had to have the most skillful and most careful men. In handling increased traffic we had to take precautions against accidents. We found it cheaper to pay high wages to efficient men who would have few accidents, than low wages to men who would pile up damage suits.

“But all this is an old story. What I want to do now is to get at the new things. I want to reduce fares over a great area. While we were increasing the men’s wages, my brother and I cut street railroad fares in Cleveland from 25 cents to five cents, and gave free transfers; and in Brooklyn we connected the Bowery with the ocean beach for five cents. We did that and made fortunes for ourselves, while we gave cheap transportation to the public. We found that the traffic rose as the fare fell—that the new business more than offset the cut in charges. Of course we knew that there must be a limit to the minimum charges—that we must reach a point where the increase in traffic would not counterbalance the reduction in fares. But we have not as yet found that point, and I do not believe any man to-day can say where it is.

“My brother, experimentally, reduced fares to three cents for a few days in Detroit while he was president of the system there, and then returned to the five-cent fare. He found that the receipts during that three cent period were exactly equal to the receipts of a like five-cent period preceding, and that when fares were increased again to five cents the business correspondingly fell away so that the income remained stationary.

“This confirmed our speculations. The reduced fare was a two-thirds saving to the public, without hurting the company, and it is certain that if the three-cent fare could have been continued the business would have grown and made a good profit for the company. But my brother did not own control, and the other owners were afraid to continue the experiment. In fact, they had not given their consent to it in the first instance. My brother acted without consulting them. It proved that his belief about low fares was right.”

From this Detroit experiment Albert Johnson’s discourse turned to his project to connect New York and Philadelphia with an electric system which should make time equal to the steam express trains, but at a very much lower fare. The Westinghouse and the General Electric companies had each offered to guarantee an equipment that would run cars 60 miles an hour. As a matter of fact experiments have since been made on a military electric road in Germany, and a sustained speed of close to 100 miles an hour has been attained. Mr. Johnson’s idea was to build a road as straight as possible between the two cities, with no grade crossings, and to make no stops or slow-ups, having special cars or trains run to or from intermediate points, and switch to or from the main line. He had commenced the formation of this line by the purchase and extension of an electric road between Trenton and Princeton, N. J. He had also purchased a bridge over the Delaware river, and another part of the Johnson system is now in operation between Trenton and Yardley, and other points on the Pennsylvania side of the Delaware. He intended to buy or to construct other roads and thus make a through line between New York and Philadelphia, cars to be running between the great cities within a year.

“The rate of fare between New York and Philadelphia is now \$2.50,” Mr. Johnson said, continuing his fa-

vorite line of thought. “I propose to put my fare at 50 cents to start with, although I make it this high only because others raise an outcry and say I’ll ruin myself. But the truth is that I have made careful calculations upon what my electric system in the Lehigh valley, Pennsylvania, is doing, and I say candidly that I’d be ashamed to tell the public how much money I could make at 25 cents a passenger from New York to Philadelphia, and that there is a big fortune at a five-cent fare.

“That sounds like a dream, I know. But I am no dreamer. I am a practical railroad man who has created new railroad business by reducing fares. I have my own and my brother’s business experience in a number of the large cities of the country, and knowledge gained through my Lehigh Valley system, connecting a large number of towns and villages, to guide me both in the construction and in the operation of electric railroads. I have also had Westinghouse electrical experts make special calculations for me, and I am prepared to prove that no more electricity is required to send a car that makes no stops or slow-ups at a high rate of speed from New York to Philadelphia than it does to carry a car from end to end of a system in New York or Brooklyn, where there are frequent stops at street corners. From seven to twelve times more electricity is required to start a car than is needed to keep it going after it has once been in full motion, so that a car traveling the long distance, but making no stops, would use no more power than one traveling the short distance with frequent stops. The wages charge would be the same in both cases. Damage charges are very heavy in a large city. The Brooklyn Rapid Transit company had \$1,000,000 against it in damage suits last year. A million dollars would raise or depress every crossroad along the line of a New York-Philadelphia railroad, so that there need not be a single grade crossing, and the most fruitful source of accidents would thus be cut off. Then, the expense of building a street railroad is very great, as compared with that of a railroad through an open country. In this way I reach the conclusions that railroad fares between New York and Philadelphia should be no greater than those of railroads in the cities!”

This will indicate the daring genius of Albert L. Johnson. “Progress is doing new things,” he said once in my hearing to some of his lieutenants, who hesitated to carry out an experi-

ment his fertile mind had suggested. Because others were reluctant to leave the beaten path, he was in most new matters, his own lieutenant, and no president of a railroad ever knew more about every detail of construction and operation. He knew, because he himself had served in every capacity.

The New York-Philadelphia project grew out of the years of experience, first in Cleveland, where his brother and he had started with a little line on the West side, their service being provided by "four second-hand cars, and 19 mules." Against the masterly opposition of Mark Hanna, the famous king of Cleveland, they pushed into the heart of the city, and then into the East side. Leaving Cleveland, Albert Johnson took hold of undeveloped railroads and franchise rights in Brooklyn, N. Y. Out of these he and his brother Tom built the Nassau system, famous in the street railroad world for its long haul, low fare, and enormous traffic. Losing control of the management through the sale of the stock of one of their partners, they disposed of their Nassau interests. Tom L. Johnson was free at last to do what he had long desired to do—to devote himself to the single tax cause. Albert Johnson turned to the development of a Lehigh Valley system in Pennsylvania, in which he had previously embarked with the view, some time, of making it a large enterprise.

He had started an opposition in Allentown, and with low fares, improved equipment, and better management, had compelled the General Electric company, which owned the original line, to sell out to him. Mr. Robert E. Wright, who managed the fight for the other company, was taken into the Johnson company. He became Mr. Johnson's chief adviser, and on the latter's death was elected to succeed Mr. Johnson in the presidency of the company.

Beginning with the Allentown road, lines in neighboring towns were absorbed or constructed and connecting links built, so that at the time of his death the Lehigh Valley Traction company ran through and connected more than 60 towns and villages, and supplied electric light to a score. His plan was to connect all these communities with Philadelphia. The fare on the steam trains from Allentown to Philadelphia is \$1.80. He proposed to make as good time, but to charge at start only 50 cents, and less, subsequently.

From this Lehigh-Valley Philadelphia plan developed the Philadelphia-New York idea. And Mr. Johnson had

the confident expectation not only of carrying passengers at revolutionary fares, but also of carrying freight, too, and at rates that would astonish the world. The steam roads charge a dollar or more for transporting a ton of coal from the anthracite regions to tide water. He saw "millions of profit" at 25 cents a ton.

"Most railroad men may call me crazy for proposing to do such things," he said in conversation, "but that is because they themselves, or their stockholders, have not the courage to try it, or else they do not know how. But I can tell you that where I lead, other men will follow. They will get courage, and will see how simple it all is—provided, of course, the right kind of management is supplied. And then it will not be long before the whole country will be covered by a network of these electric railroads, each running its single cars, or its trains, as necessity may demand.

"My belief is that, with the kind of development which I know is possible, there would be large profit to an electric railroad carrying passengers from New York to Cleveland for 40 cents, and from New York to Chicago for \$1.50.

"I'm no dreamer. I am a practical railroad builder and operator. I have made a fortune by putting fares down and improving equipment and management, and I am willing to stake all I have on an extension of this policy. I talk about that with which I am familiar. I don't go thinking about flying machines when I know what can be done with railroads."

It was in this bold, open style that Albert Johnson proclaimed his purpose to ask the people of Philadelphia for the right to construct a new railroad system on all the unoccupied streets of that city. "I talk publicly," he said at the time, "because I propose to go into partnership with the public by giving, in low fares and free transfers, what usually goes to the politicians who peddle railroad franchises. I shall give a three-cent service that will be better than the present five-cent service."

The Johnson proposal was hailed with rejoicing by the masses of the people, but the politicians were not slow to see their own advantage. The Quay faction, commanding at Harrisburg as well as in Philadelphia, rushed through a bill, and then, by virtue of this act, several franchises, giving all ungraded street railroad privileges in Philadelphia and several other cities of Pennsylvania to members of their own "gang," and when Mr. John Wan-

amaker offered to give to the city of Philadelphia \$2,000,000, and to the franchise stealers themselves half a million dollars, for the newly obtained grants, they scorned to answer, treating him with contemptuous silence. Nothing so brazenly corrupt had ever been done in notoriously corrupt Pennsylvania. Albert Johnson foresaw the reaction that would sooner or later come. His comment, when he heard of the franchise robbery, was: "These politicians are really helping me, for their theft of these franchises comes very close after my unusual proposal to give the people three-cent car fare. The politicians propose to give the people nothing. They have stolen those franchises, not to use them, but to sell them, and the people will get no benefit. I shall fight, however. I shall carry the matter into the courts, and in the meanwhile I shall build my Lehigh Valley road down to the city line of Philadelphia, where my passengers may find cars of the Union Traction company, the street railroad system that now serves Philadelphia."

"Man proposes, but God disposes," and so it was that great, stalwart Albert Johnson, a very giant to outward seeming; Albert Johnson, with his brilliant plans—plans that he believed would lift humanity to higher planes—was called to the long sleep. He had all that a man could desire to live for; a happy home, an affectionate family, a wealth of friends, a large and rapidly increasing fortune, and he was elated by exalted aspirations. In the prime of manhood, for he was but 40, and in the flush of success, he was called. Years before, while driving 12 horses before a snow plow over the street railroad system in Cleveland, he had been thrown to the ground by breaking harness. It is supposed that he then injured an artery in his chest. Time, with its stirring action and heavy mental strife, insidiously developed the injury, until, with warnings that could scarcely be believed, nature yielded to death.

The death came suddenly, as befitted the man of action that he had always been. He died standing, enfolded in his brother Tom's arms—united to the last with that brother to whom he was so devotedly attached, and for whom he had such loyal, such unstinting admiration.

#### BOOK NOTICES.

In his "History of Medicine" (New Sharon, Me.: New England Eclectic Publishing Co.), Dr. Alexander Wilder presents an outline of medical history from the period of the earliest records. The book was written pursuant to the request and under the sanction of the National

Eclectic Medical Association, made in 1890, and aims to divest the story of medical development, as told by the regular schools, of the partisanship which not unnaturally colors it. Aside from the interest that so readable a history of medicine as Dr. Wilder's excites, the book is especially valuable to the general reader for reference purposes. It deals not only with the progress of the healing profession in itself, but also with its relations to social progress, and in this connection is permeated by a genuinely democratic spirit.

PERIODICALS.

—The Comrade for February begins a new serial by Tolstoy—"Forty Years, a Legend of Little Russia."

—The political articles of the February Atlantic are by Henry Loomis Nelson and Edward M. Shepard, the former on "Three Months of President Roosevelt" and the latter on "The Second Mayoralty Election in New York."

—The Railroad Trainmen's Journal for February deals with anarchism through E. A. Burleigh, with municipal ownership through Clinton Rogers Woodruff, and with "Jesus, Churches and the Masses," through Jose Gros.

—The notable article in the Pilgrim for February is "A Day on Transcendental Ground"—the seat of the Concord School of Philosophy—by Eleanor Root. There is also a page of pulpit talk on current topics by Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, and a gem of a short story by Stewart Edward White.

—The Review of Reviews for February gives place to something exquisite in the way of treating anarchism. It is by Henry Holt, and we suspect will be read by anarchists with relish. The chief feature of Mr. Holt's proposal is to say to the anarchists: "As long as you behave yourself and pay your way, and do not endanger our health by bad sanitation, you sha'n't have any" government.

—Starr Cadwallader contributes to the Outlook for February an interesting illustrated "Story of Home Gardens," which is an account of a pleasing and successful Cleveland experiment, now three years old, on backyard beautification. The same number contains a critical but appreciative illustrative paper on Verestchagin's paintings, by Charles De Kay.

—R. Heber Newton contributes to the February Arena a dispassionate, timely and scholarly paper on the "Political, Economic and Religious Causes of Anarchy," the judicial sanity of which is in refreshing contrast to the mass of ignorant and bigoted stuff on this subject that has got into the magazines since last summer. An interesting comparison, by Eltweed Pomeroy, of the French Chamber of Deputies with the English House of Commons, and a lucid and welcome explanation by Leigh H. Irvine, of the political situation in San Francisco, out of which came the election of the Union Labor mayor, also appear in this issue of the Arena.

—The winter number of the Single Tax Review contains a full report of one of the unique single tax banquets of the Massachusetts league, and some reflections, by the editor, Joseph Dana Miller, on the recent elections and their gains, and on the humbug of reciprocity. James Love contributes another of his witty and wholesome criticisms of current "economics" and its professional professors; while Byron W. Holt writes on the export prices of protected trusts, and Henry George, Jr., offers an interesting interview with the late Albert Johnson, who, like his more distinguished brother, the mayor

of Cleveland, was a single tax man. The news of the single tax movement is voluminous and comprehensive.

JUDGE CHARLES G. NEELY  
WILL LECTURE ON  
"The Constitution of the  
United States."  
Louis F. Post also will speak.  
Sunday, February 9, at 3 p. m.,  
17th Floor of the Masonic Temple,  
Under the Auspices of the  
HENRY GEORGE ASSOCIATION.

**LAUGHLIN  
FOUNTAIN PEN**

Sent on Approval to  
Responsible People

We offer your choice of these popular styles, superior to the \$3.00 grades of many makes for only

**\$1.00**

Try this Pen a week, if you like it remit, if not, return it.

Finest quality hard Para rubber reservoir holder, highest grade, 14 K. gold pen, any desired flexibility, in fine medium or stub. Perfect ink feed. Sent postpaid on receipt of order (by registered mail 8 cents extra). **Safety Pocket Pen Holder Free** with each Pen.

Do not miss this special opportunity to secure a strictly high-grade guaranteed Fountain Pen at a price that is only a fraction of its real value.

Ladies, to a young man or an old man, to a married man or a single man, there is nothing in the world more appropriate, more welcome, or useful, either as a birthday gift, philopena souvenir, card prize, or keepsake, than a Laughlin Fountain Pen, which is ever ready, ever handy and ever suggestive of the fact that the pen is mightier than the sword.

Remember, there is no "just as good" as the **LAUGHLIN**.

State whether ladies' or gentlemen's style is desired. Illustration on left is full size of ladies' style; on right, gentlemen's style. (Either style, richly trimmed with heavy solid gold mountings for \$1.00 additional). Agents wanted. Write for Catalogue. Address

**LAUGHLIN MFG. CO.,**  
288 Griswold Street,  
Detroit, Mich.

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,  
1501 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:  
THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

CIGAR SMOKERS  
ATTENTION!

Send me \$3.50 and I will send you 50 of the best 10c straight Clear Havana Cigars that money can buy. Express prepaid. J. POPPERS, Manufacturer, 1556 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

ATTORNEYS.

Chicago.

**HARRIS F. WILLIAMS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
805 Chamber of Commerce Building,  
CHICAGO.

**WALTER A. LANTZ,** T. G. MCELLIGOTT  
Telephone Central 2254.

**LANTZ & MCELLIGOTT,**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW,  
1025-1030 Unity Building, 79 Dearborn St., Chicago.

**CHARLES H. ROBERTS,**  
ATTORNEY AT LAW,  
ESTATES, CLAIMS, PATENTS,  
614 Roanoke Building, Chicago.

Cleveland.

**SAMUEL DOERFLER,**  
ATTORNEY AND COUNSELOR,  
501 American Trust Bldg. Cleveland, O.

Houston.

**EWING & RING,**  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELLORS,  
HOUSTON, TEXAS.  
Presley K. Ewing. Henry F. Ring.

New York.

**FRED. CYRUS LEUBUSCHER,**  
COUNSELOR AT LAW,  
BENNETT BLDG.  
99 Nassau St., Borough of Manhattan,  
Tel. Call, 1353 Cortlandt. Rooms 1011-1015  
NEW YORK.

THE PUBLIC

WILL BE SENT ON TRIAL for the purpose of introducing it to new readers, for the term of six weeks for **10 CENTS.**