

called 'possessors of privileges.' I think that three sources of privilege will account for this: First, franchise privilege granted by representatives of the people; second, taxation of the many for the benefit of the few, the so-called protective tariff; and third, increasingly concentrated control of land, the foundation source of all wealth. The special fact under the third clause is the almost invariable valuation of land for taxation on a basis of favoritism for the holders of unimproved land, and also to the great advantage of those holding large tracts of land."

REFERRING TO THE platform to be adopted, Mr. Peabody says: "I would assert in such a platform government ownership as the future policy for all business based on rights to use of streets or roads, or the exercise of eminent domain, as the only equitable solution of this greatest modern problem. I would assert the necessity of municipal operation of street railroads and lighting facilities as of water distribution as the only sure reliance for pure politics in our vast centers of population and to offset the serious hindrances caused by street mains and railroad construction and operation, and to avoid unnecessary duplicate and competitive construction, always in the end paid for by the people."

MR. PEABODY DECLARES that the platform he would write would oppose President Roosevelt's plan of railway control because he can see in such control only a crop of scandals and the development of the most powerful machine for political influence ever known. According to Mr. Peabody, government ownership of the roads is the only solution, and he adds: "I have for ten years or more held the confident opinion that government ownership of all railroads was the one final solution; but the details must be worked out patiently and the steps taken conservatively." He further suggests that the democratic party follow the lines indicated by the liberal party of England in its advocacy of the principle of ground-rent taxation.

COMMENTING UPON Mr. Peabody's letter the Springfield Republican says: "Thus briefly stated, the Peabody platform for the democracy is: Public ownership of railroads and street railroads and other public-service businesses based upon the use of streets or right of eminent domain; reform of the tariff as a protector of trusts; and ground rent taxation as a remedy against monopoly in general having its basis in private ownership of the stores and wealth of Nature. It may well be doubted if these views of what is safe and sane will find acceptance among those democrats who invented and make an authoritative use of the phrase. Nevertheless, having regard to the great problem of monopoly, which is almost universally recognized as upon the country in serious and aggravated form, it is quite possible that more safety and sanity may be found in such a program than in any one so far presented under the title of 'safe and sane.' Anyhow, it is of no slight significance that a man of Mr. Peabody's surroundings should advance so radical a program as this."

PRESENTING TO THE house the pension appropriation bill, Representative Gardner, republican, of Michigan, gave some interesting information concerning pensions. According to Mr. Gardner, although forty years have intervened since the Civil war, the pension appropriation is at its maximum. There are one million pensioners, all but 53,424 of them from that war, with an annual roll of \$139,000,000. In the 53,424 are represented surviving veterans of all the other wars of this country. The Civil war cost \$6,000,000,000. Up to the present, half as much again has been paid out for pensions, and Mr. Gardner predicts that before the end of its pension rolls comes the first cost of the war will have been equalled. In twenty years from now he predicts the pension rolls will contain half a million names, of which 132,414 will be chargeable to the Spanish-American war. At present, he says, the pension roll costs the government just one-fourth of all other expenses. In 1867, one year after the Civil war, the interest on the public debt was \$143,781,591, and the pension roll \$20,933,551. Now these two items are practically reversed as to amount.

IN HIS STATEMENT to the house, Representative Gardner compared the American pension rolls of \$139,000,000 to that of France which has an annual expenditure of \$26,000,000; Germany has an annual expenditure of \$21,000,000; Austria Hungary \$10,000,000 and Great Britain \$9,000,000.

Mr. Gardner said that there are now more Spanish war veterans on the American pension rolls than were in Shafter's entire army in Cuba. Defending the incorporation in this appropriation bill of Mr. Roosevelt's order No. 78, Representative Gardner said that this order was intended to work automatically and to make age the only proof of disability. He declared that Commissioner Warner had found the order in conflict with statute provision, and it was thereby robbed of its operation. By eliminating surgeons' fees, Mr. Gardner estimated that by enacting the order into law, money would be saved the government, and benefit extended to the veteran. The amendment he regarded as a virtual service pension law, saying in time it would place every soldier of the Civil war on the pension roll at a maximum pension of \$12 a month.

IN 1904 THE United States exports to Germany amounted to \$215,000,000. Referring to this fact the Louisville (Ky.) Times says: "The following table shows the principle articles exported, the present duty and the increase which will be enforced as a result of the refusal on the part of the United States to make some concessions from the Dingley rates, which would enable Germany to deal with this country under the most favored nation clause:

PER 100 KILOGRAMS, EQUAL TO 220.4 POUNDS.

Articles	Value.	Present. Duty.	New. Duty.
Wheat	\$ 6,000,000	.83	\$1.88
Lard	15,600,000	\$2.38	2.97
Leather and mfg.	1,200,000		
Shoes	11.90-15.47	20.23-42.84
Corn	7,200,000	.38	1.19
Fruits	3,600,000
Dried	95	2.38
Fresh Apples...	Free	2.38
Flour	2,200,000	4.74	4.36

REFERRING TO THE offer of the New York jeweller to sell watches purchased in England and returned to the United States at a lower price than the same could be purchased in the home market with the duty of 40 per cent added, L. A. Jennings of Silver Creek, New York, says: "It is the invariable contention of protective tariff advocates, that the fundamental object of the protective system, is the protection of American labor; to make business for that class, as remunerative wages, and to this end, prevent the competition of the pauper labor of the old world, and not for the purpose of extending an undue advantage to manufacturers in this country. It seems to me, that my plan would relieve our tariff laws of the feature that is most criticised, without diminishing, in the least, the demand for labor. My measure would provide, that all manufactured goods, which are shipped to a foreign market may, be imported back to this country, free of duty, other than a nominal one, sufficient to remunerate custom house officials for transacting the business. This would enable the merchants at home to sell American made products as cheaply as the foreigner could, at the same time that the regular duty, will shut out foreign made products, from waging a ruinous competition. Now if our protective tariff friends are sincere in their professions, that the prime object of their system is to protect American labor, I cannot see what grounds they can have for objecting to the passage of my amendment. The McKinley tariff bill did, and, presumably, the Dingley law does, allow a rebate of 99 per cent of the duties charged on imports, to exporters who ship the same goods abroad again. That law took all but one per cent of the duty, out of the treasury; my amendment avoids the trouble of putting it in, while the result is the same. It is unnecessary to elaborate my measure, until I find out if it is likely to avoid one of those committee pigeonholes, which ought to be, if it is not, labeled 'oblivion.'"

REPRESENTATIVE SULZER of New York made no end of trouble for republican leaders when he introduced his resolution providing for an inquiry into the details of the sale by the government of the old customs house property in New York. Several more or less interesting efforts have been made by government officials and bankers to explain this sale, but none of them appears to be entirely satisfactory. Referring to this peculiar deal, the Washington correspondent for the New York World says: "Lyman J. Gage, who was secretary of the treasury when the New York custom house was sold to the National City bank, told James Stillman, president of the institution, how much to bid for the property. Secretary Gage

also was responsible for the contract which enabled the bank to get control of the property without paying taxes to the city of New York. The government is not required to pay taxes and the retention of the title by the government put thousands of dollars into the coffers of the bank, of which Frank A. Vanderlip, a protege of Secretary Gage's, was afterward made vice president."

IN THE PROCEEDINGS leading to the sale of this property, congress gave to the secretary of the treasury authority to sell the New York customs house property, lodging in the secretary discretionary power so as not to force a sale at a sacrifice. Members of congress had been assured that nothing less than a reasonable price would be accepted. Referring to the subsequent proceedings the World's correspondent says: "Secretary Gage advertised and received two bids, but they had not been opened when Mr. Stillman called on him and told him that the directors of the National City had instructed him to bid \$3,100,000 for the property. Mr. Gage said he was glad, but he could not understand how a bank could afford to put that amount into real estate. Mr. Stillman said the bank had decided to increase its capital stock by \$10,000,000 and so could afford it. Mr. Gage thought so too, and he said: 'I would not accept less than \$3,250,000 for the property, and I will not say positively that I would sell for that.' After a hurried return to New York, Mr. Stillman, acting on the tip from the secretary, put in a bid for \$3,265,000, notwithstanding the directors had instructed him to bid only \$3,100,000. The tip by Mr. Gage gave him a great advantage over the other bidders. Stillman's bid was higher than the other two, and the property was sold to the bank. The property was sold under a contract and the title was not transferred. The contract provided that the entire purchase price must be paid before the bank should be given possession, also that the bank should pay 4 per cent interest on the deferred payments. Shortly after the bank paid \$3,215,000, leaving a balance due of \$50,000. By Secretary Gage permitting the bank to make this large payment, the government lost the 4 per cent interest while it still held the title. There was a great demand for deposits of government funds, and Mr. Stillman proposed that to offset the payment of the \$3,215,000 Secretary Gage deposit \$3,000,000 of government funds in the National City, the bank depositing United States bonds to secure the government. Thus the government not only lost the 4 per cent interest, but also turned over to the bank \$3,000,000 without interest."

A TOUCHING STORY concerning a mother's love is told by the New York World in this way: "Mrs. Christina Barbara Hoch laid her dearest son Carl, to rest a dozen years ago in Woodland cemetery, Newark, N. J. She was already sixty-six years old, and hardly hoped for an extended span of life. She gave herself to no morbid grieving, but with her own hands planted upon his grave a sturdy rose bush. Though her home was moved to Brooklyn, and the way was long, she returned again and again to watch the plant with the fostering love she had given to the dead son as child and man. The seasons came and went, the roses budded and bloomed and faded, only to renew themselves again, and the mother-hunger was satisfied. Death had lost its sting. Mrs. Hoch died last Tuesday. She had been visiting her married daughter in Bloomfield, N. J., and on the cars, en route to New York, she was stricken with paralysis. They took her unconscious to her home at No. 70 Schermerhorn street, Brooklyn, and it was hours before she roused to recognize her children about her bed. Her dying thought was for the rose, and she bade her daughter, Emilia Hoch, with whom she had lived for several years, to remember her cherished wish that after death she be cremated and the ashes of her body be used to nurture the plant she had tended. The cremation took place yesterday at Fresh Pond, and with the opening of spring the desire of this simple-hearted old German woman will be fulfilled. Born in Neifern, Germany, in 1828, she came to this country with her children in the first dawn of her widowhood. Her two sons, Otto, a justice of the peace in Newark, and Emil, a vaudeville actor, and two married daughters, Mrs. Edward Batts and Mrs. Anton Brenk, have long been absent from the maternal roof. Miss Emilia Hoch was her mother's devoted companion, and both were members of the German Evangelical church in Schermerhorn street, whose pastor, the Rev. Jacob W. Loch, conducted the funeral services on Thursday night."