

points out, in his scholarly contribution, that the need today of a new party for economic re-adjustment, for corporate reform, for tariff revision, is precisely the same need that called the republican party into existence when the Missouri compromise was repealed in 1854. The seven years of the Roosevelt administration are characterized by the eminent jurist as the period of awakening—a period of sentimental revival with Roosevelt as the preacher—and on the Taft regime he sees laid the duty of accomplishing the reform outlined by his predecessor. No results have yet been shown and there is no prospect of any, he says, and concludes that this failure may lead the workers of the country to band themselves together in a new party. The tariff, as Judge Grosscup sees it, is not the purely economic question that it is commonly supposed to be, but a question of fundamental human right, the right of every man to an individual share in property. "The central figure of the period of awakening," said Judge Grosscup, "was President Roosevelt, but no one saw more clearly than himself that his administration had accomplished little in the actual work of re-framing the laws to carry out its spirit—no one saw more clearly than he that his work was chiefly that of a preacher of righteousness. To his successor—wholly selected by himself—was left the constructive work that was expected to be done. Roosevelt had summoned the people; had impaneled them as a great jury before whom to frame and to whom to submit the constructive proposals that would carry out the purpose of the awakening. The proposals themselves he left to be framed and submitted by his successor. And upon that understanding his successor was overwhelmingly elected. The first of these proposals was tariff revision. That proposal was distinctly framed in the convention that nominated Taft. It was submitted by him pointedly to the jury of the people. The verdict returned was for revision—not make-believe, but a real revision; and nothing remained after that but to put the verdict into judgment at the special session of congress. Whether the verdict has been put into judgment or whether it was set aside—Senator Aldrich wielding the real authority of the party in power, the president satisfied with a concession here and there around the edges—will be determined speedily, not by what the president says, but by what experience shows the tariff beneficiaries can do under cover of the so-called revision. And if experience shows that this, the first promise of the new administration, has been broken, then what? Is it not then time to inquire where we are?"

IN ANALYZING his subject, "Prosperity with Justice," Judge Grosscup insists that the right of every man to have the surplus of his labor coined into property, without loss or diversion to any one else, is just as fundamental a human right as are the rights to possession of the bread a man earns by the sweat of his face, of an open field for mind and soul development and of free and untrammelled exercise of the right of franchise. Our banking system, he points out, enables the big corporations to operate largely with the savings of the workers. He quotes Senator Dolliver for the statement that the people pay, in tariff taxes, \$2,100,000,000 annually. Of this huge sum, he declares, only one dollar in seven has gone into the government treasury. The remainder, he shows by statistics, does not go to the laboring man as a bonus over labor costs in foreign countries, but into the coffers of the trust magnates themselves. "Mr. Taft promises," he proceeds, "that the present commission of tariff experts shall be employed in getting together data for a better tariff next time. The trouble with this promise is that it is the only thing saved out of an otherwise utterly wrecked promise—simply a promise that the next promise will not be broken." The article advocates the sharing of the profits of large corporations with employees, not as a present but as a matter of right. "Our present tariff policy and our present corporation policy," says the writer in summing up, "twin wrongs feeding on twin human rights, are fast becoming institutions, and as such are fast becoming intolerable. What political organization will take up the cause of this new attack on human rights? What political organization, coming forward as did the young republican party in the generation preceding us, will stand for the man in the common walks of life, our brothers in blood and race, as the young republican party stood for those who were our brothers only in the larger family of mankind? For one, I am willing to give that or-

ganization my humble aid. If that aid can be better exerted within any existing party, I am ready to go along with it. If to give that aid effectively, I must cast aside political connections in which I have spent a good part of my life, I am ready to do that. My father, at the beginning of his maturity, that he might be on the right side of the great human cause involved in the slavery question, left the party in which he had been born. Both of my grandfathers, in the same cause, left the party in which they had grown old. I can, if necessary, follow their example. All that I wish to know—all that an awakened public mind will wish to know—will be that at last we have associated with a movement that is in earnest. Let no one think that the world is going to stand still. Let no one fear that the material civilization, from which our prosperity in the mass comes, is going to stand still. But the relation of the individual to this property in the mass can not, on the other hand, be made to remain as it is today. That is a problem that has existed since man's race began and will exist while time endures. Upon the settlement of that problem a right depends the future of mankind."

IF THE 158 largest cities of the United States were to merge themselves into one great corporation they would need a working capital of \$1,250,000,000, or just about the equivalent of the capital stock of the United States Steel corporation turned into hard cash. The United States census bureau has made an investigation as to the cost of municipal government, how the money is spent and who gets it. The result of this investigation is described by the Associated Press in this way: "The net amounts spent on public works and departments, or collected from taxes or other sources of revenue composed about 58 per cent of the total transactions for 1907. The remaining 42 per cent was spent incidental to the conduct of the city's business or in transactions where the city acted merely as a fiscal agent, as in the collection of revenue for the state or county. To maintain the departments of city government is 36 per cent of the total cost. During 1907 the 158 cities enumerated collected nearly \$600,000,000 in their own revenues and then borrowed more than \$400,000,000 for improvements. But an American city as a collective institution is far from a bankrupt. During 1907, after paying for all maintenance and operation and interest upon debt, the cities of the United States had among them \$122,000,000 to push new work. It costs more than \$103,000,000 a year to protect life and property; it costs more than \$37,000,000 for sanitation and the preservation of health; the leading item of \$109,000,000 is for education, and for recreation we spend least of all, a little more than \$12,000,000. It costs \$3.37 per capita in New York to maintain the police force, and it only costs 49 cents in Oshkosh. It costs \$3.42 in Washington, and it only costs 44 cents in Lincoln, Neb. It only costs 40 cents per capita to maintain the fire department in Newport, Ky., and it costs 44 cents in Harrisburg, Pa., but it costs \$3.62 in Atlantic City. The tendency of municipal ownership shows itself in some directions. Of these 158 cities, 116 own and operate their own water plants. Only seventy-six of them own their own market places. In summing up the costs of all the items of city government it appears that interest upon borrowed money makes almost as great a showing per capita as any other item. It averages \$3.40 per capita, and goes up as the size of the cities increase."

ALL THE WORLD is interested just now in David Lloyd-George, chancellor of the British exchequer, and the commanding figure in the great political contest now going on. Referring to Lloyd-George, a writer in the New York World says: "The rage with which his opponents assail him is their tribute to his talents. Mr. Balfour is the polished, scholarly parliamentary orator who addresses the people with the distant air of his class. Mr. Asquith is a great pleader of any cause or policy he may adopt, but he lacks the fire to thrill an audience of workmen and the imagination to enter into their feelings and capture their hearts. Mr. Lloyd-George is of and from the people. By birth and sympathies he is bound to them. Success has not dulled his insight or chilled his ardor as a reformer of the conditions in which the British masses live. As a public speaker he has been compared to Mr. Bryan, but Mr. Lloyd-George has a more genial nature, a

nimbler wit and less of the pulpit manner than Mr. Bryan. Speaking at the National Liberal club a few days after the house of lords threw out the budget, Mr. Lloyd-George quoted Carlyle's remark, 'It is wonderful how long a rotten institution will hang together, so long as it is not roughly handled,' and added: 'It is time it were handled firmly. You can not with menacing speeches cast down even the most rickety and gimcrack of idols.' As for the favorite tory argument that the house of lords was controlled by men of business and achievement, he replied: 'You have got just a few in the house of lords, and the rest of them are of no more use than broken bottles stuck on a park wall to keep off poachers. And that is what they are there for to keep radical poachers off their lordly preserves.' Lord Lansdowne had been forced into rejecting the budget against his own better judgment, 'but having been forced, seeing no way out of it, being in the trap, he thought he might as well eat the cheese, and not leave it for the consumption of any other mouse or rat.' The great financiers had indulged in a good deal of plain speaking at his expense, said Mr. Lloyd-George, and he wished to show his appreciation of their style. Lord Rothschild and Lord Revelstoke had complained that British investments were absolutely of no use at the present moment, and the only fit thing to invest in was something foreign. 'These two noblemen are great exporters of British capital. They are making a competent and a respectable living out of that business. And when I hear these two able financiers say that the British fish smells rather strongly and that the foreign fish on their stalls is both sweet and wholesome, then I say, my lords, you are two very good salesmen.' As for surrendering the power of the house of commons to redress wrongs through the control of the finances, Mr. Lloyd-George regarded it as the greatest act of folly any democracy could perpetrate. 'Every grain of freedom,' he said, 'is more precious than radium, and the nation that throws it away is the most wanton of prodigals.'

HERE IS A pretty story from life told by the Morrill (Kan.) News: "He was the worst boy in school; she was the teacher. She was angered by his stubbornness; he was defiant. She took him to the hall for punishment. Angrily she administered the penalty and—then somehow a great wave of pity for the boy swept over her. She looked at the worn coat of the little fellow; she thought of the frail body deprived of nourishing food; she thought of the hard and loveless home and of the starved soul of the poor kid. Tears sprang to the teacher's eyes as the boy waited for further punishment. Then he saw the tears. His own eyes grew moist and overflowed. Thinking of how the poor boy had no chance, in an impulse of love she put her arms around the boy and they cried together. That is religion. She and the boy both found it."

ACTS OF HEROISM performed by a negro are told in a Kansas City dispatch carried by the Associated Press as follows: "Heroic rescue work on the part of Washington Johnson, a negro janitor, saved the lives of a score of persons in the Rialto building, a five-story structure at Ninth street and Grand avenue, which was destroyed by a fire caused by a gas explosion. The loss is estimated at \$300,000. Johnson discovered the fire and, realizing that a number of physicians and medical students were sleeping on the upper floors, he rushed through the halls shouting an alarm. When he believed everybody had escaped he made his way to the street. There he learned that Charles R. Manley, a medical student, who slept on the fifth floor, was still missing. Without a moment's hesitation Johnson rushed up the stairs to the top of the building. As he started through the hall on the fifth floor he met Manley dazed and half choked, groping about. Taking the stifled man by the arm the negro guided him through the smoke and flames and the pair reached the street just as a second explosion shook the building. The second explosion occurred just as twenty firemen entered the building. Six of the firemen were thrown a distance of several feet by the force of the explosion, but none suffered more than minor injuries. After three hours' work the fire was under control, having been confined to the Rialto building. The loss falls principally upon Albert Marty, owner of the building. The insurance totals two-thirds of the loss."