cided that the effect of annexation was to make Hawaii a part of the United States so far as to abrogate the treaty under which Hawaiian products were admitted free, but left it in the condition of a foreign country so far as to make those products subject to full Dingley rates.

Democratic platforms are being lifted this year to distinctly higher levels. Particular instances have already attracted our attention, and we are now able to point to the democratic platform of Michigan as in many respects a model of what at the present juncture a state platform should be. On the subject of taxation and franchises it demands—

> a specific tax upon the great mining interests of the state, levied in accordance with the value of their unearned stores of wealth, which ought never to have been given to private control. . . . . A tax upon existing franchises of a semipublic character commensurate with their earning power. . . . . The regulation of property taxes so as to prevent the shifting of the burden on to the shoulders of productive labor. . . . . The prohibition of the granting of further franchises by municipalities except by the direct vote of the people of the territory affected.

And on the subject of trusts this extraordinarily direct attack upon the source of their power harmonizes in principle with the other principal clauses of the platform:

> We look with apprehension on the progress of the trusts toward the industrial subjugation of the republic, and, recognizing that their power of oppression is founded on special privileges derived from the statutes, we pledge ourselves to repeal all laws by which special privileges are confirmed.

In this platform, then, are to be found the essential principles of sound taxation, of just land tenure, and of franchise regulation; and when the clause on trusts shall have become the accepted doctrine of the laws, trusts will be no more. Combination there will be. But combination for service is beneficial. There will be no combinations of special privileges, the only kind of combination that is harmful. For special privileges will have been abolished.

The soundest and most complete decision ever rendered by an appellate court upon the labor question is a recent one of the appellate division of the New York supreme court. It was rendered in an injunction case. Two labor organizations were at war. Both were composed of steam fitters. They were known respectively as the "National" and the "Enterprise." The latter warned employes in the building trade that if they continued to employ members of the "National" union the members of the "Enterprise" and of all allied unions would quit work. This threat had its effect. Employers were discharging such of their men as belonged to the "Nationals;" and in defense of their organization the "Nationals" procured an injunction. The injunction has now been dissolved. In deciding to dissolve it the appellate division reasoned that every workman has the right to say for whom and with whom he will work; that the exercise of this right is absolute and cannot be affected by any motive; that every employer has a corresponding absolute right to say whom he will employ; and that from all this it follows that an individual may legally refuse to work for the purpose of inducing his employer to discharge a fellow workman. Then comes the question of combination, which is the vital one. The court conclusively disposes of it by holding that a workman having this right as an individual—

> does not lose it when acting with others, clothed with an equal right, so that employers may continue to say they will not employ persons who are members of labor organizations, and laborers may continue to say they will not work for employers who engage any but members of labor organizations.

This decision goes to the root of the labor question in the law. It holds precisely what the courts should have held from the first, and what they would have held from the first had they not been class courts instead of courts of justice. That which all men have a right to do individually, all, or any number less than all, have a right to do together. Mere association or combination can make no act criminal if both the end and the means are lawful, unless it is declared to be so by express statute. But judges in the past, striving to serve one class by interfering with the rights of another, have strained statutes and disregarded principle in order to throttle labor organizations. All the sophistries of these judges have now been swept away by this single common sense decision of the New York court.

To be sure, the decision works in favor of employers as well as workingmen. But that does not alter the situation. It is long since employers' unions have been held to any judicial accountability analagous to that to which workmen's unions have been subjected. Were this otherwise, however, the decision of the New York court would be none the less commendable. It is sound doctrine that both employers and workingmen ought to be free to make their contracts. Any workingman ought to have the absolute right, individually or in combination with others, to refuse employment whenever the terms do not suit him. So any employer ought to have the absolute right, individually or in combination with others, to deny employment to any person to whom he objects. If it be urged that this privilege might work hardship through combinations for blacklisting, let it be observed that it is not the combination that would work the hardship. Mere combinations of competitive business agencies cannot work hardship. It is because the combining persons or combinations have legal monopolies which enable them arbitrarily to close all other doors of employment as well as their own. Abolish the legal monopolies, and no workman need have the slightest fear of a blacklist.

In a comment upon the McCann case, of which we published a lengthy account last week, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 25th exhibits a curious flaw in its faculty for distinguishing differences. It defends the incarceration of McCann for re-

fusing to pay a license to be permitted to act as a real estate agent. This is not a tax upon his right to work, it argues, but upon the opportunity to work which the city of St. Louis affords him. Perhaps the point will be better understood if we quote:

> Let Mr. McCann use his ability in St. Genevieve or New Madrid or in the open country, and he will find his tax for using his brains will be considerably less; perhaps he will not be taxed at all. But why should 700,000 people permit Mr. McCann to profit by their assemblage in a great city, thus giving him the opportunity to become wealthy, without charging for it—a small sum to be expended for the general good?

In that quotation, but all unknown to the Globe-Democrat, is the gist of Mr. McCann's contention. He admits that the 700,000 people of St. Louis ought not and do not allow anyone to profit "by their assemblage in a great city" without charging for it. But he contends that the sums they charge are not put into the public treasury. Let us explain. No one can do business in St. Louis without paying ground rent. Either in purchase price or rentals he must pay a premium for the privilege of profiting by the assemblage of 700,000 people in that great city. The premium will be very much higher than anything he would have to pay for equal accommodations in St. Genevieve or New Madrid. It is this higher premium that constitutes the charge which the 700,000 people of St. Louis may legitimately make for allowing people "to profit by their assemblage in a great city." The opportunity for work or business is better; consequently location rents are higher. But instead of devoting these location rents to the general good, as it should according to the very just principle suggested by the Globe-Democrat, the city of St. Louis allows the lot owners of the city to keep them. And this notwithstanding the fact that they do not earn the location rents, but that they are wholly due to the assemblage of 700,000 people. One result of this diversion of common funds is a low city treasury, which is supposed to necessitate license taxes on business. These license taxes, therefore, instead of being a moderate compensation to the public of St. Louis for allowing men to profit by the assemblage there of 700,000 people, are arbitrary extra charges. Now, Mr. McCann insists among other things that no such charges should be made so long as the lot owners of St. Louis hold back for private use any of the location rents which the assemblage of 700,000 people in that great city enables them to exact. In other words, he demands that these location rents be expended for the general good. It is one thing to tax Mr. McCann for the privilege of doing business in St. Louis in proportion to the value of the location he occupies; it is a very different thing to allow some lot owner to levy and retain that tax for his own use, and then to make Mr. McCann pay another and wholly arbitrary tax. The former is benefit for benefit; the other is confiscation.

A very pretty illustration of the fact that the benefit of local opportunities is paid for in location rentals, comes from London. "Some time ago the London county council decided to establish and maintain a free ferry at Woolwich," says Pearson's Weekly of June 2, 1900, "and to place the charge for the same on the rates." It was to be a free ferry. "The fact," continues Pearson's, "that in six years the ferry has carried 30,500,000 passengers proves its success. But when the council attempted to buy 11 acres of land they had inspected at Woolwich before the ferry had been projected, they found the price increased by £3,000 [about $15,000, or more than $1,000 an acre] solely on account of t he ferry they had themselves established."

Mr. McKinley's junior partner was not always the strenuous advocate of conquest that he now sets up to be. There was a time when his policy of expansion was the same as that of the democratic platform of Kansas City which he now contemns. It was expansion without imperialism. He formulated this policy once in a life of Benton, which he wrote. Considering in that book the question of annexing the Canadian provinces, he said:

> Of course no one would wish to see these or any other settled communities now added to our domain by force; we want no unwilling citizens to enter our union; the time to have taken those lands was before settlers came into them. European nations war for the possession of thickly settled districts, which, if conquered, will for centuries remain alien and hostile to the conquerors. We, wiser in our generation, have seized waste solitudes that lay near us, the limitless forests and never-ending plains, and the valleys of the great lonely rivers, and have thrust our own sons into them to take possession.

Congressman Grosvenor, of Ohio, forecasts the result of the forthcoming presidential election in dangerous detail. We give his figures because they may be interesting later in the season:

Certainly Republican.			
California	9	New York	36
Connecticut	6	North Dakota	3
Delaware	3	Ohio	23
Illinois	24	Oregon	4
Indiana	15	Pennsylvania	32
Iowa	13	Rhode Island	4
Kansas	10	South Dakota	4
Maine	6	Vermont	4
Maryland	8	Washington	4
Massachusetts	15	West Virginia	6
Michigan	14	Wisconsin	12
Minnesota	9		
New Hampshire	4	Total	278
New Jersey	10		

Certainly Democratic.			
Alabama	11	North Carolina	11
Arkansas	8	South Carolina	9
Florida	4	Tennessee	12
Georgia	13	Texas	15
Louisiana	8	Virginia	12
Mississippi	9		
Missouri	17	Total	132
Nevada	3		

Two instances of mob assaults for the suppression of freedom of speech are reported since our last issue. One occurred in North Carolina and the other in Ohio. The Ohio outrage was perpetrated at Mansfield upon four missionaries of what is known in Chicago as "Dr. Dowie's Zion church," but which distinguishes itself as the "Christian Catholic church." These men were obeying the law, and in a congregation of their church at a private house were peaceably exercising their religious rights, when a mob of a thousand people dragged them out of the house and stripping them of clothing daubed their bodies with paint. Instead of protecting the mis-