THE DAILY JOURNAL

MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 1903.

Telephone Calls (Old and New),

Business Office....238 | Editorial Rooms....86

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

BY CARRIER—INDIANAPOLIS and SUBURBS.

Daily, Sunday included, 50 cents per month.
Daily, without Sunday, 40 cents per month.
Sunday, without daily, $2.00 per year.
Single copies: Daily, 2 cents; Sunday, 5 cents.

BY AGENTS EVERYWHERE.

Daily, per week, 10 cents.
Daily, Sunday included, per week, 15 cents.
Sunday, per issue, 5 cents.

BY MAIL PREPAID.

Daily edition, one year.....$5.00
Daily and Sunday, one year..... 7.50
Sunday only, one year..... 2.50

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

Weekly Edition.

One copy, one year.....60 cents

Five cents per month for periods less than a year. No subscription taken for less than three months.

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or send subscription to

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails in the United States should put on an eight-page or a twelve-page paper a 1-cent stamp; on a sixteen, twenty, or twenty-four-page paper, a 2-cent stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in this paper must, in order to receive attention, be accompanied by the name and address of the writer.

Rejected manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is inclosed for that purpose.

Entered as second-class matter at Indianapolis, Ind., postoffice.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL

Can be found at the following places:

NEW YORK—Astor House.

CHICAGO—Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street; Auditorium Annex Hotel, Dearborn Station News Stand.

CINCINNATI—J. R. Hawley & Co., Arcade.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner of Third and Jefferson streets; Louisville Book Co., 264 Fourth avenue, and Bluefield Bros., 442 West Market street.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House, Ebbitt House, Fairfax Hotel, Willard Hotel.

DENVER, Col.—Louthain & Jackson, Fifteenth and Lawrence streets.

DAYTON, O.—J. V. Wilkie, 39 South Jefferson street.

COLUMBUS, O.—Viaduct News Stand, 384 High street.

The battle of San Carlos will not figure in history as one of Germany's great naval victories.

Perhaps Germany only wants to prove the truth of Premier Balfour's statement that "there is no such thing as a pacific blockade."

Secretary Hay has negotiated and signed more important treaties than any one of his predecessors, and they are all favorable to the United States.

An anthracite coal trust in Great Britain with a capitalization of $100,000,000 is one of the latest announcements from London, but the free-trade papers would never have let us know it.

There was a time when Great Britain boasted of her "splendid isolation." She would better have maintained it than to have entered into the foolish compact with Germany to worry little Venezuela.

A pledge in advance that the report of an investigating committee shall vindicate a certain line of action seems equivalent to admitting that the committee will be given to understand what is expected of it.

The United Mine Workers propose to raise the largest defense fund ever known. With a bank balance of $1,027,120 to begin with and the machinery for indefinitely increasing it, they can probably carry out their plan.

Minister Bowen knows the exact status of the Venezuelan controversy better than anybody else, and his statement that he has good reason to believe a satisfactory settlement will soon be reached is doubtless well founded.

As nothing has been heard of it for some time there is reason to believe that the proposition to unseat the Democratic senator receiving a plurality of the votes in Jefferson and Ripley counties has been abandoned. It is hoped that such is the case. There can be no doubt that Mr. Singer, the sitting member, received a plurality of the votes, and it is almost as clear that on the day of his election he was under a technical disqualification by virtue of being a member of a school board. But Republicans cannot afford to take advantage of a mere technicality.

A few days ago it was telegraphed over the country that all of the larger coal dealers in Chicago had been indicted for joining in a conspiracy to bring about the present coal famine. Now it is stated that the members of the special grand jury declare that the men and corporations are entirely guiltless of any connection with the coal famine, and that they had not conspired to enhance the price of coal. Such being the case, why was the sensational press made happy with the names of a long line of men charged with having been in a conspiracy to freeze the people?

Announcements in various parts of the country indicate that there is a general movement among farmers to form a general union which, like other unions, is designed to look after the special interests of those who till the soil. Organizations of farmers, except the Patrons of Husbandry, have been short lived because they were captured by a class of men who gave them a political bias, making them the champions of impossible schemes. They rose rapidly, controlling many votes in the aggregate, but vanished as quickly as they grew.

It is claimed by the Germans that the Venezuelans in the San Carlos fort fired the first shot at a patrolling vessel. There should be sufficient evidence to sustain or disprove this charge, as the British were about and must have known something of the matter. But, whether they or the Venezuelans began the firing, it must be deeply regretted by the Germans if it is true that they bombarded an insignificant fort for hours and did not knock it to pieces. Such a display of imperfect gunnery must be very humiliating to a government whose ambition is to be a rising naval power.

If Mr. Fowler had reported his latest currency bill to the House at the time he reported the cumbersome measure during the last session, there is every reason to believe that it would have passed both houses of Congress. The House has been considering the bill and will doubtless pass it, as it is a simple measure to expand the currency whenever needed by authorizing the banks to issue notes to one-fourth of their paid-in capital. The tax imposed upon such circulation is sufficient to lead banks to retire it as soon as it shall return to their vaults, because it is not needed to do the work of money. The tax imposed for issue is ample to redeem the bills of all failing banks, so there is no element of risk in such circulation.

BOLSTERING UP A BAD BILL.

The concessions, explanations and promises which the supporters of the Goodwine Reformatory bill are now making are in marked contrast to the uncompromising spirit shown at the beginning. They indicate recognition of the strong public sentiment against the bill and the necessity of placating it. Among the latest apologies offered for the bill are Senator Goodwine's statement of alleged irregularities in the management of the institution and also an official promise that, if the present board of managers is removed, an investigation shall be ordered that it is believed will fully justify the action of the Legislature. Senator Goodwine's statement is understood to be based on information obtained during an official visit to the institution in December last by a committee of which the senator was chairman. Without directly charging it insinuates irregularities in the awarding of contracts, the purchase of supplies, the construction of a cellhouse and cruel treatment of prisoners. The report of this committee was in the hands of the Governor before the Legislature met, and if he had believed the charges to be true he had the power under the law to remove the offending members of the board, or all of them. The fact that the law provides a way for the removal of the managers "for misconduct or neglect of duty" shows it was not contemplated that it should be done by legislating them out of office.

The promise that an investigation of the affairs of the institution shall take place after the present board is legislated out and a new one appointed is a concession to public sentiment which it is not asking. It is a novel idea of justice that would convict and punish a man first and try him afterwards. The present law says: "The Governor may remove any of the managers for misconduct or neglect of duty after an opportunity to be heard upon written charges." This implies the filing of charges and the granting of a hearing. To remove the managers without charges filed and without giving them an opportunity to be heard would be a violation of law which no subsequent ex parte investigation by a new board could cure.

The legal way of proceeding is always the best way. If it is important to get the present managers out of office before their terms expire it should be done in the way the law provides. The law does not make the Governor ex officio a member of the board of managers of the Reformatory, nor give him authority to instruct a new board to investigate the administration of its predecessor. It does, however, make him ex officio president of the Board of State Charities, and that board has authority to make an investigation by the whole board or by a committee of its members of the management of any penal, reformatory or charitable institution of the State, with power to send for persons and papers, and administer oaths, and to report to the Governor. There is the machinery at hand for an investigation of the Reformatory before removing the present board. The president of the Board of Charities, Timothy Nicholson, of Richmond, said a few days ago:

> I am most emphatically opposed to the bill. I so told Senator Goodwine two days before the bill was introduced; that it was the wrong thing and would prove poor politics; that if anything was wrong with the Reformatory to send down a committee of the legislators to make a thorough investigation. Then, if they find out that anything is wrong, and who is to blame, let them be removed.

If there is any reason for preferring a committee of the Legislature to the Board of State Charities to make the investigation let that mode be adopted, but the investigation should be made before final action is taken, and the present members of the board should be given a hearing. The people have a right to expect that public affairs, which are their affairs, shall be conducted in an open, legal way, and not by methods that require apologies, explanations and promises of future justification. It is a bad bill that needs that kind of bolstering.

THE MINERS AND INJUNCTIONS.

As the miners are solidly opposed to what is called "government by injunction" it is worth while to try to ascertain what they really desire. If their demands are reasonable and practicable they should be complied with as far as can be done without sacrificing established principles of law or the rights of society at large, which are more important than those of any class. They have formulated their views in the following resolution:

> We demand of the Congress of the United States a law that will classify the cases that are subjects for the jurisdiction of the federal courts when issuing injunctions in labor troubles.
>
> That federal judges can issue injunctions in labor troubles only on the application or approval of two or more elective judges.
>
> That a reasonable time be fixed by the court when the defendant shall answer to an injunction issued against him, but in no case shall the time exceed thirty days.
>
> That the applicant for an injunction in labor troubles must submit reasonable proof in support of his application for an injunction under penalty of being imprisoned for perjury.
>
> That persons arrested for alleged contempt of court shall not be tried by the judge who issued the restraining order.
>
> That persons arrested for contempt of court shall have a trial by jury.

It is believed that nearly all of these demands are impracticable and beyond the power of Congress to grant. First, as to classifying the cases that are subjects for the jurisdiction of the federal courts when issuing injunctions in labor troubles. Congress could not give the federal courts one kind of jurisdiction in labor troubles and another kind in other cases. That would be class legislation. The law of injunction must apply to all classes alike. Neither would it be possible to enumerate the cases in which injunctions may issue, because every labor dispute and almost every day raises a new case. Injunctions are issued to prevent trespass, to restrain wrongdoing or to protect property rights, and it would be impossible for Congress to enumerate the infinite variety of such cases that may arise.

The demand that federal judges shall issue injunctions in labor troubles only on the application of two or more elective judges is open to the double objection of creating a special line of procedure for labor troubles that would not apply to others and of making federal courts subordinate to state courts. The idea is not to be thought of for a moment.

The demand that the applicant for an injunction in labor troubles must submit reasonable proof in support of his application under penalty of being imprisoned for perjury does not suggest any practical relief. The court alone could judge as to what was reasonable proof in support of the application, and that is the situation now. An ex parte statement that something is being done that damages the property or impairs the rights of the applicant will always be held by a court as sufficient ground for an injunction pending further investigation of the case. The judge must determine as to what constitutes reasonable proof in support of the application. That is what he is there for.

The demand that persons arrested for alleged contempt of court shall not be tried by the judge who issued the restraining order would change the whole order of proceeding in contempt cases. It seems most reasonable that the judge who issues an order should be the one first to construe it and to decide whether it has been violated or not. Only the judge who issues an injunction can take notice of its violation, or issue an order citing a person who violates it to appear for contempt, and that order must be returnable in his own court. The power of enforcing their process and of vindicating their authority against obstruction or defiance is inherent in all courts and cannot be taken from one court and delegated to another. The miners ought not to expect the whole system of jurisprudence to be revolutionized and reorganized in their interest.

REVISION OF CORPORATION LAW.

The present Legislature ought to provide for the codification and revision of the laws of the State relating to corporations. By this is meant the laws relating to county and township business, highways, gravel roads, street improvements, insurance—in short, those relating to all municipal, public and private corporations. There has been no general revision of the laws of the State since 1881, and that was incomplete. A commission appointed under an act of the Legislature of 1879, consisting of James S. Fraser, John H. Stotsenberg and David Turpie, reported to the General Assembly of 1881 sixty-seven bills, of which thirty-two passed, two were defeated and thirty-three failed in the Senate for want of time to act upon them. The failure of these bills to pass necessitated a new compilation, and the board was continued for that purpose. Its final report was not satisfactory to the board itself. There has been no authorized revision of the laws since that time, and in the interval many new ones have been enacted. A general revision of all the laws is desirable, but at present it is proposed to revise and codify only those relating to corporations. According to the testimony of lawyers these are inharmonious and quite unsuited to present conditions. This is so far true that some important corporations doing business in Indiana have found it advisable to organize under the laws of other States, and this State is constantly a large loser in fees on this account.

The present movement for revision of the laws originated with the Indianapolis Bar Association, which unanimously indorsed a suggestion of its president in this behalf and appointed a committee to present the matter to the Legislature. This committee consists of Messrs. John R. Wilson, chairman, and John W. Kern, Ovid B. Jameson, Edward Daniels and Merrill Moores, with Mr. Nathan Morris, president of the association, a member ex officio. The recommendations of this committee should carry weight with the Legislature and insure for the subject the careful consideration its importance demands.

In noticing the recent death of Francis A. Hoffman, who was the first German nominated for office in Illinois, he having been nominated by the Republicans for Lieutenant Governor in 1856, the Chicago Tribune says: "Like most of the early German settlers in this country, he was a Democrat at first, but the pro slavery attitude of that party was repulsive to him. The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska bill drove most of the Germans out of the Democratic party, and Mr. Hoffman took a prominent part in the foundation of the Republican party in Illinois." The conditions were much the same in this State, where in all of the large towns the Germans constituted an important element. When the slavery question became prominent they nearly all joined the Republican party and remained with it during the war and until they were almost driven out by the temperance agitation. In 1858 the Republicans nominated for auditor of state Albert Lange, of Terre Haute, a popular German of that day, who could address German audiences in their own tongue. The Republicans were defeated in 1858, but Lange was nominated again in 1860 and elected, and renominated and defeated in 1862. In 1868 the Republicans nominated for secretary of state Max A. Hoffman, of Logansport, a relative of the Illinois Hoffman mentioned above. Shortly after this the legislation began which resulted in alienating most of the Germans from the Republican party, but they were an important factor in the organization and early successes of the party.

Nothing that Governor Durbin has done while he has been in office warrants the insinuations which have been published to the effect that he would veto bills in which members who are opposing the Reformatory bill are interested. For instance, it has been charged that he would veto the Indianapolis school bill, which has passed both houses, because of the supposed attitude of the Marion delegation toward the Reformatory bill. That insinuation has been in the newspapers for several days. When the Governor's attention was called to the matter he said that he would sign the bill as soon as it came to him. The only Indianapolis bill Governor Durbin has vetoed was that pushed through the last Legislature increasing the compensation of the fire department. Those who should have fought it had not the courage to do it. The Journal opposed it, and when it came to the Governor he vetoed it on the ground that it would be an infringement upon the local government which the State had conferred upon Indianapolis to interfere with the compensation of any class of city officials. It was the right thing to do, yet some men would have let it become a law rather than accept the odium of its defeat. Because the Journal does not believe that the Reformatory bill is a wise measure it does not propose to engage in any general raid by insinuation or otherwise upon Governor Durbin.

A movement is on foot to raise a memorial fund in commemoration of the heroism of Wesley A. Reynolds, the sixteen-year-old boy who was killed by burglars while defending a bank in Westville, Ind., against their attack. The boy's father is an invalid, the family is in needy circumstances, and in commemoration of his heroism it is proposed to raise a fund to help them and erect a monument to the boy. A circular signed by State Senator Crumpacker and all the leading citizens of Westville has been sent out and trustees have been appointed by the Laporte county court to administer the fund.

Is the St. Louis Globe-Democrat serious when it says that the bill requiring railroads to furnish passes to members of the Legislature and State officials has been followed by another calling on the State to provide board and lodging for members of the Legislature during sessions? Is that the Legislature of Missouri? Is Missouri practicing for "midway plaisance" for the world's fair?

The statement of Mr. John G. Williams in refutation of the implied charges against the board of managers of the Reformatory, which is printed in the news columns of this issue, is a straightforward, dignified presentation of the board's side of the case which will command the respect of every unprejudiced reader.

The decision of the immigration commissioner to appoint four women inspectors whose duty it shall be to board incoming steamships before their arrival in port in order to inspect the passengers, has caused considerable comment in New York. Even Commissioner Sargent was in doubt as to whether women could be found to accept the positions, inasmuch as the duties would involve climbing a long ladder from a cutter to a steamship with both vessels in motion. His doubts have been removed, however, by a host of applicants, women of all kinds expressing their willingness to undertake the work, ladder-climbing and all. Men are slow to learn that women are not more reluctant than themselves to do service for their country—when there is a salary attached.

An erroneous statement, widely disseminated in Western newspapers, that the Postoffice Department has decided to furnish free boxes for the rural free delivery service, is causing much embarrassment in the establishment of new rural free delivery routes. The fact is that though numerous suggestions have been made by the department and in Congress for the furnishing of rural boxes by the government at cost, no action of the kind indicated has been either authorized or taken. The patrons of rural free delivery service are required, as heretofore, to supply their own boxes from lists approved by the department, these boxes then falling under the protection of the United States statutes in regard to the safe delivery of mails.

THE HUMORISTS.

Ought to Be.

Life.

"I never could understand why a woman puts anything on her face. She deceives no one but herself."

"Isn't that enough?"

All Gone.

Syracuse Herald.

"Did Johnson's purchase include also the good will of the business?"

"There wasn't any good will to it. It was a coal dealer that Johnson bought out."

A Dream Gone By.

Detroit Free Press.

Harry—Can't you think of anything that would make you happy, Harriet?

Harriet—Yes; I wish I were a little girl again, to play with the paper dolls made nowadays.

Force of Habit.

Kansas City Journal.

"I want to speak to the spirit of my dead sister," said the tall woman in black to the medium.

"Talking now," absently replied the latter, who had once been a "hello" girl.

Persistent Memory.

Boston Transcript.

Norton—I noticed you were very quick to give up your seat in the street car to that lady in black.

Spinks—Yes, since childhood's days I never have felt easy when I saw a woman with a strap in her hand.

A Limit Somewhere.

The Bulletin.

A six-year-old of my acquaintance, just returned from London, had been admonished by his governess that if he were not good he would never go to heaven. "I've been to the coronation, the circus and the zoo," he replied. "I can't expect to go everywhere!"

His Achievement.

Chicago News.

Farmer Jones—Heow be yewr son doin' sens he went tew th' city?

Farmer Smith—He's doin' purty well. He's made a name for himself.

Farmer Jones—Yew don't tell me!

Farmer Smith—Yass I dew, b'gosh. He's got tew spellin' it Smythe now.

GERMANY'S BLUNDER.

Wireless connection between the Panther and the German Foreign Office might save a lot of trouble now.—Boston Journal.

The Kaiser is still our great and good friend. But what about his wicked partners who are gunning down off Venezuela?—Boston Herald.

Germany, seemingly, has found nothing in the Monroe doctrine incompatible with the use of South American republics for target practice.—Detroit Free Press.

This would be a good time for the Kaiser to decide that his naval representatives at Venezuela have caught Von Holleben's case of grip and are in need of a long rest. —Chicago News.

Emperor William's covetousness of South American territory manifests itself in many ways, and every effort to conceal them exposes the German designs to plainer view.—New York Press.

The Emperor of Germany is ill-advising or ill-advised by his servitors. His naval officers seem to be searching or "spoiling" for a fight, where they could well keep out of trouble. Those whom they threaten do not want trouble, but they can accommodate those who will insist on having it. —Brooklyn Eagle.

It will be advantageous for Germany to remember that American patience is not based upon timidity. Now, as always, the United States government stands ready to maintain its right to first consideration in the affairs of the western hemisphere and to protect the smaller American republics from European aggression.—St. Louis Republic.

This German highandedness in Venezuelan waters has just about reached the point where a command to halt, in more or less diplomatic terms, must soon proceed from Washington. * * * The more Castro is distracted by such bombardments and the greater grows the strength of the revolutionists, the nearer does Venezuela approach that condition of anarchry which will demand foreign intervention. And when that time comes Germany will be there. And once German troops are landed on the soil of Venezuela it will be a long time before they are withdrawn.—Minneapolis Journal.

The truth of the matter is that Germany has manifested a disposition to make all the trouble possible out of the Venezuelan situation. Great Britain and Italy have been much more reasonable. They have been entirely judicious, in fact, and they have not suffered the least in dignity or prestige by their rational policies. They have proceeded much as they would have acted if Venezuela had been a first-class power. Germany has persistently shown its supreme contempt for Venezuela, and has constantly aggravated rather than conciliated popular feeling.—Kansas City Star.

Observing Germany's acts since the inception of the critical stage of the Venezuelan trouble, and remembering certain previous acts within the past five years, one is forced to the conclusion that the German Emperor's naturally "scrappy" disposition has been so intensified by his jealousy of the constantly growing prosperity and power of the United States that he has discarded reason and is working to bring about a rupture with this government, at the same time craftily putting out friendship talk so that when the break comes, if he can effect it, he can at least make the attempt to put the blame on this government.—Albany Journal.

The bombardment of Fort San Carlos, Venezuela, by the German cruisers, is a very serious matter. So far as appears there is no justification for it and it looks like a piece of wanton aggression, wholly unwarranted and inexcusable. The right to maintain a blockade of Venezuelan ports, pending an adjustment of the preliminaries to arbitration, has not been questioned. It is the privilege of the powers having claims against Venezuela to make the blockade as effective as possible. But this does not include the right to seize and destroy Venezuelan ships of war and to shell Venezuela ports under whose guns those ships are at anchor.—Omaha Bee.

It certainly is a most remarkable state of things, that after an agreement has been reached for the settlement of the Venezuelan troubles by The Haugue tribunal, Grman warships go right on attacking Venezuelan forts. It is not claimed at Berlin that there has been any fresh "insult" to the German flag. No accusation is brought against President Castro of having broken any of his promises since he agreed to the terms of arbitration. Minister Bowen had but just arrived at Washington from Caracas, bearing amicable offers on behalf of the Venezuelan government to the creditor nations, when the second bombardment of Fort San Carlos was begun. If such conduct is not unprecedented in the history of civilized warfare, we are much mistaken.—Boston Advertiser.

INDIANA EDITORIAL NOTES.

Now that it is settled that President Schwab's salary is only $100,000, instead of $1,000,000, he becomes an object of sympathy, along with those who were credulous enough to believe the million-dollar creation.—Terre Haute Express.

The mother of the little King of Spain is Austrian by birth and virtues. The kid is Bourbon by environment and training—the deciding factors of heredity. The Bourbon is the unsafest man or party to trust with power in existence, even in America.—Fort Wayne News.

Another practical demonstration of a peaceful blockade was given yesterday when the German warships bombarded the fort of San Carlos, Venezuela. It begins to look as if the only peaceful thing which Germany would appreciate would be a good whipping.—Anderson Bulletin.

An editorial in the Indianapolis Journal says it ought to be decided whether Sullivan county or the State of Indiana is supreme. Yes, and it ought to be decided in about three hours, too. This thing of a lawless lot of lushers riding over the law is becoming far too frequent an occurrence.—Knightstown Sun.

In some counties of the State the delinquent tax lists are so small and insignificant that the treasurers will not go to the trouble and expense of publishing them. This unheard-of condition is just one more proof of the existence of what Mr. Bryan has denominated "apparent prosperity."—Terre Haute Tribune.

In the attack upon Senator Beveridge by the ex-Governor of Arizona in which he says that the senator was "led by older members of the Senate," he is surely mistaken in his man. Those who happen to know the senator personally have no definite knowledge of his "being led" by anyone.—New Castle Courier.

Senator Wood's garnishee bill should become a law. It provides that merchants may protect themselves against "dead beats" by garnisheeing one-fourth their wages. No honest man, rich or poor, should oppose such a law. It is a sad comment on the labor unions of the State to say that they are opposed to the bill as organized bodies, while the merchants' associations are in favor of it. Our laws on the question of debts all favor the poor man. There is the exemption law, the mortgage exemption law and the mechanic's lien law, all protesting and enforcing the rights of the laborers. On the other hand there is no way by which the merchant can head off the "dead beats," and as all merchants know the "woodsis full" of these individuals. Honest laborers should favor this bill, as they have to pay in the cost for goods a part of the loss to the dead beats. —Noblesville Ledger.

Questions About Elevated Tracks.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal:

Would it be impertinent to ask whom it may concern a few pertinent questions about the location of the Union Railroad tracks, now that it is an open question? I certainly mean no disrespect to that able commission that is wrestling with it at the request of the mayor, for, though its decisions can bind nobody, they will receive at the hands of the Council, as well as of all the people, much consideration.

First of all, let me ask, do we, the people, want elevated tracks at all, no matter who pays the cost? Our children may want them fifty years hence, when our population may be a million or so, but is that a sufficient reason for discommoding as well as burdening ourselves prematurely with them in advance of the time? As to the pretext on which they are urged, that is most emphatically a false one. Security to life and limb is not in it at all. More than twice as many serious accidents happen with the trolley cars as happen with the steam cars, and there is no suggestion of elevating their tracks. The undisguisable truth is that it is a scheme of the railroads to run through the city at railroad speed without the danger of an occasional suit for damages, just as the trolley cars run. It is the railroads that want the tracks elevated, not the city. Can we afford to allow them to elevate their tracks even if they propose to do it at their own expense? It may seem a small matter to them that every passenger that gets on or off here must climb up or descend the stairs at the station, especially since just as many passengers will go and come, and they will all pay the same fare as if there were no stairs to climb. Can we afford to do this just to exempt the roads from an occasional damage suit? Of course there is no fine to be feared for violating the speed ordinance. Will the commission take into its account the fact that an elevated track will practically divide us into two cities—North Side and South Side? It is bad enough as it is, in politics and business and social life, but elevated tracks would deepen and broaden the chasm almost as much as a river would. Is the commission to pass upon such a question as that?

But, more than everything else, can we allow the railroads to practically destroy many of our most profitable industries? These have located here in good faith that they might enjoy forever, or at least for a long while, the inestimable advantage of grade crossings, and they have at great expense made their railroad connections accordingly. Will the scope of the commission's inquiry require them to ask at whose expense these tracks are to be adjusted to the elevated tracks? And suppose it finds, as it certainly it must find, that the adjustment of every switch to every present manufacturing plant is to be paid for by the railroads, who is to pay the extra cost to the scores of new plants that will come if we continue to offer our present unrivaled railroad facilities, if, indeed, any more come at all? There is even a more difficult and more important question for somebody to solve, whether the commission attempts it or not: who will compensate the present manufacturers for the inevitable loss they must sustain in being deprived of the present advantage they have over Chicago and other centers of industry in this very item of railroad facilities? It is not the cost of adjusting their switches to the elevated track system that is most to be protested against, the loss of this advantage over rival establishments is paramount to everything else. It seems to me, therefore, that the first question for the commission to settle is whether we want the tracks elevated now or not, no matter at whose cost, or what may be the decision of the Supreme Court in the case now before it. I certainly do protest against all this cost to the city, even if the railroads foot the bill for the work, only to keep the roads from paying damages for killing somebody now and then by reckless speed. The safety of the people is not in it a little bit, nor the welfare of the wealth of the city, as represented by our great manufactories. Less than half a dozen well-located viaducts will relieve the danger as to crossings, and some day the people will demand that street and steam railroads shall regulate their speed so as to secure all possible exemption from damage.

Indianapolis, Jan. 24. U. L. SEE.

FOR THE LEGISLATURE.

A Bundle of Suggestions Offered by a Rush County Man.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal:

Before the Legislature convened I saw quotations from several members of both branches to the effect that they had no bills to present, or not more than one or two, but now that it is in session the reverse seems to be the case, up to the present at least. I had hoped they would go back over some of the old laws and make some needed changes. I refer more especially to the laws as to district roads and their officers; the schools and the laws governing them, such as transfers, pay of teachers, etc. I refer to these because I know more about them than I do about any other of our laws, but I think other laws bearing on other subjects need some readjusting as well..

Take the roads and free pikes. The voters elected the road supervisor in each road district for a long time; then somebody wanted a change in the method of electing road supervisors, but about 1891 the law was again changed, and they were appointed by the township trustee; in 1900 the Legislature changed it back to electing them. About the time the people got familiar with one method it was laid aside and another adopted. As to the amount per day that a taxpayer was to be credited with for hauling out his tax we have had about the same number of changes that we have had as to road supervisors; it was $3 per day for team, wagon and hand; then somebody wanted a change, and about 1885 a bill was passed allowing $2.50 per day for team, wagon and driver, and in 1900 another bill was passed making it $3 per day for eight hours' work, or $3.75 for ten hours' work. All of this is confusing to the public, and altogether unnecessary; $2.50 for eight hours was right for eight hours' work. Farmers were satisfied with that; they had wagons and teams and a great number of farmers drove their own teams, and oftentimes when it did not cost them anything, as they would not be doing other work.

The laws governing the free pikes have been changed to suit the whims of the Legislature. Each change complicates the laws more or less and makes it harder for the officer, whatever he may be, to get at the right and proper interpretation of the laws the different sets of officers have to deal with. These changes involve more or less expense; for instance, the Legislature of 1899 made it the duty of the road supervisor of each road district to keep the free pikes in repair; the law prescribed a certain form of bookkeeping (it was rather complicated, too), and each county had to procure the proper books. The Legislature of 1901 made another sweeping change, passing a law making the county auditor secretary at an additional salary of $100 or $200 per year. If there is any economy or reform in all these changes I fail to see it.

As to the laws governing the district schools it is the same. There were several changes while I was trustee, and I fail to see where the schools are any better than they were before all these changes took place. The old transfer law was the most equitable. Under it we transferred all the property and the State school, let that be much or little.

One of my teachers did not make a high grade license as to per cent. When I say best I mean a teacher that can show up a grade in the bimonthly report; that can get the best out of each individual scholar; that has the school under perfect control; that gives the best satisfaction to parent, pupil and the school officers. Because a teacher makes a big average per cent. in his or her license is no proof that they are the best teachers. It is the teacher that shows the best work and results in the schoolroom that should be well paid.

All the old township trustees and all the new trustees that I have talked to say the old law as to the time of taking office was the best and that is should be restored.

The so-called "ripper" bill that passed the Senate and is now in the House should be defeated. Let the present law stand, and if there is anything wrong with the board of control or the warden let the proper authorities bring charges and have the matter investigated, and if they or any one of them are found wanting let the Governor remove one or all of them if found guilty. When we have a good law let it stand—let it stand as long as it serves its purpose well. The charitable and penal institutions will be here long after the men who are so anxious for a change have returned to mother earth. What the people want is good and capable men at the head of those institutions; it makes no difference to us if they do come from the State of Ohio or any other State if they understand their business and discharge their duties with fidelity and to the best interest of all concerned.

A change is proposed in the method of electing the county superintendent of schools. I am in favor of popular elections generally, but for the present it will be well to let the present law stand. I see it suggested that the present law be changed so as to allow a township trustee to succeed himself as often as the people want him and can be elected. The law is right as it is on that point.

Let the Legislature give the people a chance to change the State Constitution making the county recorder, clerk, sheriff, treasurer, auditor and county superintendent four year terms, and make them ineligible for two terms in succession.

GEORGE W. LOONEY, JR.
Rushville, Ind., Jan. 23.

The Garnishee Law.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal:

Business interests and labor interests have been unnecessarily antagonized in Indianapolis this week. There has been no conflict of direct interest, either. They ought to be working in harmony, as they do in other cities and States, a local labor leader to the contrary notwithstanding.

Bradstreet figures that something over 75 per cent. of the retail failures in this country are due to bad debts. Every such failure injures the jobber, the manufacturer, and ultimately the laborer. Indiana and Indianapolis have had more than their share of such failures. To remedy this, retailers have proposed to make credits more secure. They ask the Legislature to permit enforcement of all claims for labor and for necessaries of life. Certain ambitious labor leaders have scented a chance to make capital out of this situation. Declaring their unrelenting opposition to the passage of any "garnishee" law, and in apparent ignorance of what is sought to be accomplished, they have appeared before the legislators of Indiana as champions of dead beats—perhaps unwittingly. Only one argument has been made by them. They unite, as a rule, in fearing that if collection of claims for labor or necessaries is permitted some unfortunate person may be compelled to pay for goods furnished to his family in time of misfortune. Does this mean that the merchant is required, by union labor, either to refuse credit to the unfortunate, or to be punished by confiscation of his goods if he does help out a sick or unfortunate family? If this is the attitude of union labor, would it not be wise for merchants to refuse credit to any member of a labor union? This is logic. As a matter of fact, union labor takes no such attitude. In Ohio, for example, union labor has come out flatfooted in support of a garnishee law. In Ohio, also, the percentage of retail failures last year was less than half that of those in Indiana. (See Dun's annual report.)

Labor unions stand for the highest ideals of laboring manhood. Not a labor union in Indiana will, if it knows the exact intention of the Woods amendments, stand against them. Let it be known that a garnishee law has stood on the statute books of Indiana ever since the Constitution was adopted. Within two weeks past a workingman has been garnisheed and compelled to pay a saloon bill. The defendant in this case had no family. It is now proposed merely, to enforce payment of bills for labor and for goods furnished to a man's family. The printed copies of the law include the old law and only two or three lines of amendment for that purpose. Opposition to the proposed amendment will not do away with the garnishee law. It will merely continue the existing situation, making the retailer the victim of dishonesty and retaining for Indiana its proud position near the top of the column of States where the most retailers fail in business.

Indianapolis, Jan. 24. CREDIT.

Free Text-Books.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal:

Many opponents of the free text-book bill argue that it is as much the duty of the State to furnish clothing to the children as it is to supply them with text-books. This might be true under certain circumstances, but it is not at all applicable to our present case. The State allows us to buy our clothing wherever we please. We are not restricted as to the price to pay for clothing nor the kind that we shall wear; no two persons are compelled to dress exactly alike. Indeed, we may wear fig leaves if we choose. But in regard to the text-book the State now says that we shall buy certain books, of a certain firm, and at a certain and fixed price. Many children cannot and do not meet these requirements, and are thus hindered in their pursuit of an education. Free text-books may cost the State considerable money, but the investment would be a good one.

W. E. STIPP.
Mitchell, Ind., Jan. 22.

Seal for Peace Justices.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal:

The bill of Senator Gochenour compelling justices of the peace to use a seal in acknowledgements is a good bill and would aid the justice and make his office pleasant, as he then would not have to go to the clerk to get his certificate of office and pay 50 cents for it. The seal would make his work the same as that of a notary public and would improve his office very much. The justices of the peace have had very little legislation for many years, and the above law is needed. I think this bill ought to pass. It will save each justice from $5 to $10 a year and many long trips to the clerk of the Circuit Court. J. B. MILLER.
Laughery, Ind., Jan. 24.

THE STATEHOOD BILL.

The Position of Senator Beveridge in the Matter Is Right.

Washington Star.

Yesterday's debate in the Senate over the statehood legislation developed that there are two issues now pending upon the question of the bill's right of way. Senator Quay charged Senator Beveridge with obstructing the passage of the measure, while Mr. Beveridge charged Mr. Quay with obstructing general legislation. Mr. Beveridge furthermore charged Mr. Quay with having applied political convention methods to this highly important question permanently affecting the welfare of the States, by the formation of what might be termed a voting trust, pledged to the passage of a particular measure and the obstruction of all else.

It is decidedly unfortunate that the statehood matter should have reached this stage. It is indeed, as Mr. Beveridge said yesterday, a vital issue, and if Congress errs now in the admission of States its blunder cannot later be corrected. This class of legislation is unlike the general run of proposed laws, which can be repealed if found unworkable. Therefore, there is needed the utmost caution and conservatism, and full debate is by no means an unreasonable requirement.

Thus far only two senators have spoken at length upon each side. Out of a total membership of eighty-eight this is hardly to be regarded as full debate of a vitally important issue. It is by no means debate in the senatorial sense, and this proposition can be advanced without the least danger of incurring the charge of obstruction. Therefore, it was quite within the right of Senator Beveridge yesterday to object to the setting of a date for a vote on the measure when, as he showed, there has been only a minimum of discussion and the whole great subject lies open for illumination and analysis.

The charge that the opponents to his way of thinking are obstructing the course of business in the Senate came with rather bad grace from Senator Quay, whose record as an obstructionist is long and formidable. His celebrated tariff "speech" of a few years ago lingers yet in the memory as a flagrant abuse of senatorial privilege. There have been thus far in the course of the statehood debate no signs of filibustering tactics on the side of those who believe that Arizona and New Mexico are not yet ready for statehood. On the other hand, this bill, with, as charged, an organized combination pledged to vote for it regardless of reason or argument, is being undeniably used with open threats to block important legislation. That obstruction, which, in behalf of a questionable measure for the passage of which there is no particular urgency, checks the whole course of general legislation at a short session is unmistakably of the offensive and injurious type. Will the Senate permit the legislative business of the Republic to be brought to a standstill through Senator Quay's threatening hold-up?

DISCRIMINATION NEEDED.

Eight-Hour Laws Do Not Apply Equally Well to All.

St. Paul Pioneer Press.

If eight-hour laws are to become a national habit why not discriminate a little? Why treat all employments, light and heavy, easy and laborious, safe and full of peril, as if they were pursued under identical conditions? There are some occupations in which an eight-hour day is far too long, like that of the coal miner or the fireman in a steamer's stoke-hole, or the worker in a white-lead factory, or the modern Pluto who puddles iron and performs various other labors in the iron mills. In others again, like most of the skilled trades where muscle and endurance are required, eight hours is ample. Where only light or supervisory labor is required, as in tending machinery, it would seem that hours a little longer might be spent at work without detriment to the worker. And in the class of employments where almost no work is required, but the duty consists almost entirely in being "on hand," as in the cases of toll-gate keepers and bridge-tenders, the requirement of an eight-hour day would be simply preposterous. In the hasty passage of an eight-hour law by the New York legislature, not long ago, the lack of discrimination produced some ridiculous results. For instance, the State employs a large number of lock-tenders and bridge-tenders on some old canals and streams from which navigation has almost disappeared. These men have so little to do that most of them spend the greater part of their time in farming, gardening or the pursuit of other private enterprises which do not prevent their being on hand when their services are required. Yet lo! as soon as that law was passed it was claimed that it applied to them; and, the courts sustaining the contention, the State was compelled to employ three sets of men in the place of one—to do practically nothing all day long.

The Bullying Germans.

Kansas City Journal.

While the Monroe doctrine does not yet call for inter