

situation is different. For one thing, wealth and position fight on his side, as does corporate influence. Nobody believes that the United Railways of San Francisco has been superior in its morality to the average city transportation company, or that its feelings would have been much outraged if it deemed it wise to pay \$200,000 to secure certain favors. But even a railway president is entitled to justice in court, and the impression is gaining ground that the effort is to "railroad" Mr. Calhoun to prison at any cost, and that the daring procedure of Messrs. Heney and Burns in obtaining evidence—such as entering Mr. Calhoun's office and blowing open his private safe, under warrants of questionable validity—is not justifiable even in the endeavor to free an utterly demoralized city from the toils of scoundrels and blackmailers. For a couple of years San Francisco's destiny has lain in the hands of two men. Rudolph Spreckels has furnished the money—and been characterized publicly by Mr. Roosevelt as one of the most patriotic and unselfish of citizens—while James D. Phelan is credited with being the real power behind the throne. These men have decided who should and who should not be Mayor of San Francisco; which men should go to jail and which go free. They have been the despotic tyrants of the city, even if it be believed that they have always been wise and benevolent tyrants.

For instance, it has recently been brought out in a letter of the late Chief of Police Biggy, originally appointed to that position by Mr. Spreckels, that, having been visited by Mr. Spreckels (on November 16, last), he was told to resign because he was "surrounded by crooks" and was an "associate of dive-keepers and brothel keepers." Why should a private citizen have the right to order a police chief to resign, or, for that matter, to appoint him? Is there anything in democratic government which recognizes such a privilege? But in Biggy's case, the demand was practically an ultimatum to be obeyed, and he so felt it. The reason is simply that Mr. Spreckels has financed the reform movement. Although Mr. Heney is a public official, he has received, according to Mr. Spreckels's own testimony, \$23,828.22 from Spreckels for his office expenses, while \$38,400.00 has been paid to Heney's law partner and associate, and Burns is

openly stated to have received no less than \$132,446.05 from the Spreckels privy purse.

Granting that this is pure civic philanthropy, it was again brought out in the examination of Mr. Spreckels himself that, just prior to the fire, Mr. Phelan and Mr. Spreckels had organized the Municipal Railways with a capitalization of eleven millions of dollars for the purpose of building underground trolley lines in competition with the United Railways. It is this fact that has led to the many reports that the real motive of Mr. Spreckels for his attack upon Calhoun was a business one, and the allegation that he expects to receive in return three dollars for every one he is now investing in reform. On the other hand, so far as the trial of Calhoun has gone, Mr. Heney has apparently woven a very strong chain of circumstantial evidence about him. There was a payment of \$200,000 from the United Railways to somebody about the time the bribing was done, but no explanatory entry was made, and there is the usual profound official ignorance as to what use the money was put to.

Now, the *Nation* has only the feeling which every lover of good government must have—that it would welcome the conviction of Mr. Calhoun if the facts warrant it. The country would then be able to say that at least in one city "the man higher up" was reached; that in San Francisco Mr. Heney could do what Mr. Jerome failed, for one reason or another, to accomplish in New York. We should very much prefer to believe that Messrs. Spreckels, Phelan, Heney, and Burns are fighting the people's battle against the worst type of political corruption. But the point which we wish to make to-day is simply that even a reformer cannot turn despot and run the machinery of government himself without provoking an immediate reaction. The best kind of reform is that which comes from the people themselves by regular democratic means, and not that which emanates from a handful of men financed by the well-filled purse of a business rival of some of the men accused of wrong. Undoubtedly, we shall be told that this is a counsel of perfection; that to overthrow such a monstrous conspiracy as existed in San Francisco every possible means must be resorted to in order to ferret out the criminal; that to be practical in such

matters one must not be thin-skinned, but use the power that falls into one's hands. To this we would make the reply that it is neither desirable nor practical, when in the midst of so great a prosecution, that the enlightened public sentiment should become suspicious both as to methods and motives.

#### THE LORDS AND THE BUDGET.

Mr. Goldwin Smith, whose interest in current politics the years are not able to dim, writes to the *Spectator* urging the House of Lords to debate, and, if desirable amend, Lloyd-George's budget. He takes the ground that the measure is political. It is not a money-bill, pure and simple, which will pass the Commons and go up to the Lords. It is, incidentally, a scheme of social reform, with a plan for readjusting taxation so as to make its burdens fall chiefly upon certain classes of the community. This being so, Mr. Smith argues, it is as much a part of the duty of the second chamber to examine and pass upon these proposals, as it was to debate the bill for old-age pensions, or the one to abolish plural voting, or to restrict the sale of liquor. It is, in a word, a question of public policy, not merely of finance.

This distinction, we fear, is not one that could be successfully upheld. The Lords are not entitled to go behind the form of a bill that comes to them from the Commons, and inquire what are its motives and purpose. If they were, there would be an end of the constitutional principle that the power of the purse resides exclusively in the Commons. It is settled that the English upper house has no voice in financial matters. The Lords can neither increase nor cut down appropriations. For them to attempt to do so now, would be revolutionary. The budget will reach them, as have all preceding budgets, with every technical appearance of a bill to raise revenue. With that, the House of Lords cannot meddle on any pretext that it is not a bona-fide financial measure. Were the Lords to arrogate any such power to themselves, there would be no limit to the lengths which they might go. The naval estimates, for example, they might cut down. They could say that provision for eight Dreadnoughts was political, designed to win votes for the Liberals; or that it was a matter vitally affecting

the foreign policy of the nation, about which both houses of Parliament had a right to express an opinion. Such a contention would not, of course, be listened to; but it would have as many legs to stand upon as the claim that an increase in the income tax, or a shifting of the land tax, is political, and therefore within the Lords' purview. Once begin letting out the waters, and there is no telling where the floods will go. We think, therefore, that the Lords will remain where the British Constitution has placed them—dammed up so that they cannot touch money-bills.

There is, however, much quiet talk in England about their doing what they have the undoubted power, if they have the stomach, to do—namely, throw out the budget and force a dissolution. Some Conservative newspapers have advocated this course, and it has been much canvassed in the clubs and salons frequented by the aggrieved victims of the budget, as they choose to consider themselves. Why not, they ask, make an end of the business at once, and get a speedy verdict of the country on this miserable and despoiling Ministry? This question has been echoed by some Conservative members of Parliament, but it is significant that none of the leaders of the party have given countenance to the impetuous suggestion. Mr. Balfour has attacked the budget repeatedly, but never has he given an intimation that it might come to grief in "another place"—to use the Parliamentary expression for referring to the Lords. When it has been intended to destroy in the Lords previous Liberal legislation—such as the two education bills, the licensing bill, etc.—there has been no lack of premonitory speech and action. Mr. Balfour has openly consulted Lord Lansdowne; the latter has begun to talk ominously about the responsibilities of the hereditary legislators. In connection with the budget, however, nothing of this kind has been observed. If the Conservatives really mean to order the House of Lords to refuse to vote it, they are keeping their intention a deep secret.

It is hard to believe that they have any such intention. The question is not so much one of political power, as of political tactics. By forcing matters, Mr. Balfour would simply risk losing what he is almost certain to gain if he bides his time. The tide is running so

powerfully for the Conservatives at present that they may reasonably count upon returning to office at the next general election. And that trial of strength cannot be long postponed. Within two years it must come; it may easily come in the course of the next twelvemonth. So cool and patient a leader as Balfour is not at all likely to precipitate the struggle. And more than the mere element of time is involved. The entire issue might be changed if the Lords were to reject the budget on the ground that it bore too heavily on the rich. We should then see a great outburst of indignation at the selfishness and arrogance of the privileged classes; there would be a good chance of the socialists and the Labor Party pooling issues, for the time being, with the Liberals, so that the issue of the election would be a much less sure victory for the Conservatives than they now appear bound to win. All told, therefore, the probability is that the Lords will make wry faces at the budget, but will swallow it. Mr. Balfour will let it do its work of still further alienating rich and middle-class Liberals; will use vague phrases about undoing its injustices when his party is in office again; and when he actually is once more at the head of the government, will doubtless not remove a single one of the taxes which are now denounced as confiscatory and socialistic.

#### "SOCIALIZING" RELIGION.

The *Outlook* recently printed two remarkable articles by clergymen strongly attacking the education given in theological seminaries. Against it, the gravamen of the complaint is that the course is too scholastic and antiquated; that candidates for the pulpit do not get an insight into the social problems which will confront them later. The drift of the protest is practically against the old idea of a learned ministry. It is argued that a fairly educated man, "with facility of speech, a knowledge of the English Bible, and a real interest in the welfare of mankind," may be better fitted to preach than students who have put in three years at Greek and Hebrew, and have wasted a lot of time over people who "have been a long time dead." The seminaries should throw overboard the dead wood in their traditional curriculum, and put their main strength into "sociology, economics,

pedagogy, and ethics." The chief aim should be to teach "the social character of religion, and, specifically, the social application of Christianity." In one word, religion should be "socialized."

This term is not defined, but its meaning, in the mouths of these men and those who think with them, is not hidden. They want the churches and the ministers to regain touch with the masses; and they believe that this can be done by an active sympathy with the causes and aspirations that to-day lie near the hearts of the masses. Workingmen are more and more standing aloof from Protestant churches; to Socialism many of them are transferring the feeling which they once had for religion: therefore, the thinly veiled argument runs, religion must take on a tinge of Socialism to win them back. The Rev. Charles Stelzle frankly puts the case in a way to show both what he thinks the trouble is to-day, and what the dominant purpose should be to-morrow:

The profound religious spirit which is so evident in the labor movement bids fair either to capture the church or to become the heart of a great religious movement which will rival the church as it is now organized—*unless* the church herself so enlarges her life and vision as to include this movement. If once this movement of the working people takes on a distinctively religious aspect—and it is quite possible for it to do so—the church will with difficulty keep in the procession.

Such conceptions and hopes are amiable; but the fear caused by the growing alienation of wage-earners from the churches should not blind the latter. Take the great fact of the relation of the Catholic Church to workingmen. This is seldom referred to in the laments of Protestants over their slackening hold upon the toilers, yet it is most significant. Here we have a vast religious organization, the very life-blood of which in this country has been the attachment and devotion of the working-classes, but do we find it saying that it must move heaven and earth to bring itself up to date and become "socialized"? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the weight of Catholic authority has been cast against Socialism; and the Pope is as much opposed to "modernity" in labor and political movements as in theological. Doubtless, the Catholic Church in the United States loses its power over many immigrant and other workingmen who, by antecedent faith, ought to be in its com-