than state my conclusions and the rules of law upon which they rest.

"'When damage is sustained by one person from the wrongful act of another, an action for compensation is given to the injured party against the wrongdoer.' By wrongful act is to be understood not an act wrongful in morals only, but an act wrongful in law. An act is wrongful in law if it infringes upon the right of another, and not otherwise. An act which does not infringe upon any right of a person is not, as to such person, wrongful. One has a right to decline to enter the service of another, and several persons, acting jointly in pursuance of an agreement to that effect, have the right to so decline. So, one has the right to decline to employ another, and several persons, acting jointly in pursuance of an agreement to that effect, have the right to so decline.

"The existence of malice, of a malicious intent to injure a person, will not convert an act which does not infringe any right of such person into a wrongful act or a civil wrong. It follows that, in my opinion, the facts and agreements of the defendants set forth in the declaration cannot be held to infringe upon any right of the plaintiff, and therefore are not as to her, in law, wrongful. The demurrer is sustained."

Hon. W. J. Strong, who has been attorney in several similar cases, representing the plaintiffs and the case has attracted much attention.

The political question involved is even more important than the legal one; that is to say, whether the Judge is right from a legal standpoint in sustaining the demurrer is not nearly so important as the question, "should the law protect the employe from blacklisting?"

If the court was in error, relief may be had by appeal to a higher court; if the law is not broad enough to protect employes it can be amended. The question of greatest importance is, therefore, whether a man discharged from one corporation should be prevented from obtaining employment elsewhere by agreement among the employers. This question is a political one to be decided by the law-makers.

The democratic national platform adopted in 1900 contained the following plank:

"We are opposed to government by injunction; we denounce the black list and favor arbitration as a means of settling disputes between corporations and their employes."

Each one will decide the question according to his sympathies. Those who think that an employe ought to be thankful for the opportunity to work and should accept without complaint whatever the employer gives, will probably feel that the employers have a right to combine and blacklist any one who is lacking in gratitude or contentment. Those, on the other hand, who regard an employe as a man having the same rights as his fellow-man, and owing a duty to his family as well as to his employer, will feel that the employe should not be shut out of all remunerative employment because he and one employer differ upon wages, terms, or conditions.

The position taken by the Democratic platform is eminently sound. If a man is skilled in a particular industry, and blacklisting is agreed upon by all the employers in that industry, the employe is to a large extent a slave, because if he is not satisfied with the terms fixed by his employer he cannot secure like employment elsewhere, and to go outside of the business in which he has skill would be to throw away all the benefits arising from experience and training.

A blacklist agreed upon among employers brings to the employer many of the advantages, and imposes upon the employe many of the hardships, arising from a complete monopoly. If Judge Baker's decision is sustained in the higher courts, blacklisting will become an issue in Illinois politics, and there is little doubt how it will be settled when the people have a chance to vote upon it. Lincoln said of the Dred Scott decision that courts could not settle political questions; that such questions must be settled by the people. But courts can center public attention upon a question and often a court decision is made the basis of a political movement.

The democratic party's platform utterance on this subject would have been more appreciated by laboring men if Judge Baker's decision had been rendered before the late election.

A Real Watchman.

The National Watchman, published at Washington, D. C., is a real Watchman. From its position at the national capital it surveys the entire field and sounds a note of warning upon the approach of danger. It is one of the few democratic papers having a national circulation, which steadfastly defends the principles of the party and resolutely opposes the schemes of the reorganizers. In its last issue it says:

The money kings are determined to regain control of the democratic party. Their agents who either worked openly or secretly for the success of the republican ticket in 1896 and last year are now screeching loudly for harmony, by which they mean a surrender of the party machinery to them. They are wasting their time. The democratic party will remain loyal to democratic principles, and will entrust its standard to only tried and true democrats.

The Watchman has sized up the situation about right. The corporation element in the party, like the gold element (they are really the same element,) works secretly, and having secured an advantage, becomes a vociferous advocate of harmony. Harmony is a good thing but it is a means to an end, not an end itself. A harmony which would lead the party back to the position which it occupied under Mr. Cleveland's administration would be its ruin rather than its salvation. The Watchman is rendering the party valuable service and ought to be heartily supported by those whose interests it is defending.

Another Case of Contempt.

THE COMMONER is pained to notice that the Philadelphia Press, a paper which for many years has claimed great respectability, has been guilty of contempt of court. It has had such an exalted opinion of the court (when the court has decided its way) that any suggestion which might be tortured into a reflection upon the court has been denounced as treason, but alas, the Press has, inadvertently of course, become guilty of a more heinous offense than it has been able to charge upon any of its opponents. It says:

Governor Stone has been informed by Judge Potter, of the supreme court, that a majority of the members of the highest judicial tribunal of the state are in favor of declaring the Pittsburg "Ripper" constitutional.

Judge Potter, who was the governor's law partner, and who was appointed to the supreme bench upon the death of the late Judge Green, has been keeping Governor Stone informed regarding the standing of the members of the court ever since the case was argued last week.

On the day after the argument he told Governor Stone that three of the members of the court were in favor of sustaining the act. He placed Justice Fell in the doubtful list at that time, but expressed the opinion that there was good reason to believe that he would be the fourth to favor the "Ripper."

On the same occasion he informed the governor that Justice Dean was "dead against it."

Since that time Justice Potter has conveyed to Harrisburg the news that a majority of the supreme court judges have privately declared in favor of the Pittsburg "Ripper."

From the information given by Justice Potter to the governor it would appear that Judges Mitchell, Fell, Brown and Potter will stand for the constitutionality of the bill and Chief Justice McCollum and Judges Dean and Mestrezat will oppose that view of the measure.

Judge Potter has denied that he told Governor Stone, and Governor Stone has denied that he received any information on the subject from Judge Potter or anybody else, but these denials do not affect the matter; in fact, they rather aggravate the case. It would be bad enough if the indictment made by the Press were true; it is still worse if the charge is false. If the Press will read some of its editorials written during the campaign of 1896 it will get some idea of the moral turpitude involved in its act, for no democrat in discussing the income tax ever said anything more offensive to the honor and dignity of the court than the charge made by the Press against Judge Potter.

Emperor of Canada.

It is proposed to add another branch to the ponderous title of the King of England, and he is also to be called the "Emperor of Canada." In some quarters it was suspected that the United States might object on the plea that there could be no such thing as kingly title pertaining to American territory. An English writer is authority for the statement that Lord Pauncefote "sounded the State Department, the president and leading public men at Washington about the matter with a view to ascertaining their views, and that the results of the inquiries have been entirely successful and satisfactory from an English point of view,"

It would perhaps be difficult to find anything which Great Britain was anxious to accomplish which would not be "entirely successful and satisfactory from an English point of view" if the success and the satisfaction depended upon the consent of republican leaders.

It is not clear, however, that this country has any concern in any title which the King of England or any other monarch may choose to assume.

It is said that our neighbor on the north