

SCIENCE

AN ILLUSTRATED JOURNAL PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

Vérité sans peur.

NEW YORK: THE SCIENCE COMPANY.

FRIDAY, JULY 1, 1887.

WE HAVE THE PLEASURE of informing our readers that a step long considered desirable has been taken. The price of *Science* has been reduced to \$3.50. This has been rendered possible by the improving position of the paper financially, and by taking a form which saves largely in the items which make up the cost of manufacture. The saving in paper by making the page nearly double the size of the old *Science* page allows a saving of many hundred dollars each year, which would otherwise be spent on white paper for extra margins. We mention this as an item little suspected by most people. Each subscriber will find that his subscription has been extended *pro rata*.

THE ACT TO REGULATE the licensing and registration of physicians and surgeons, and to codify the medical laws of the State of New York, has been signed by the governor, and is now a law. By Section 9 of the act, all pre-existing laws relating to these subjects are repealed; so that to this single act physicians, attorneys, and courts must hereafter look for the regulation of the practice of medicine in this State. It is gratifying to find that this act is indorsed by all the different schools of medicine, and that the only opposition made to it has come from those who believe that the power of healing by the laying-on of hands is likely to be diminished or impaired by the course of study required by the medical colleges. We are glad to see that the objection which we had to make to one of the sections in the act of 1880 is thoroughly and satisfactorily met in the present law. Physicians may hereafter practise in other counties than that in which they first registered, by simply mailing to the county clerk their certificates of registration. Upon this an indorsement will be made which will render practice in the new county legal. Provision is also made by which registered physicians can attend isolated cases in other counties without re-registration, provided they do not intend to habitually practise in such counties. By another section of the act, no person can be licensed or permitted to practise who has been convicted of a felony by any court of competent jurisdiction; and conviction of a felony cancels the license, if one has been granted. We are informed that there is now practising in New York one who has served three terms of imprisonment for criminal practice. The following offences are also punishable under this law: perjury, in false affidavit of registry; counterfeiting, buying, selling, and altering diplomas, or practising under counterfeited diplomas; or falsely personating another practitioner. It is not improbable that this act may in the future require some modification; indeed, it would be strange if it did not; but the medical profession is to be congratulated on having all the laws pertaining to it codified, and thus enabling its members to ascertain their privileges and responsibilities without searching through the session-laws of many years. To Mr. W. A. Purrington, counsel for the medical societies of the State and county of New York, much credit is due for the skill with which this act is drawn, and for his persistence in urging the measure upon the legislative and executive branches of the State government.

THE NINETEENTH ANNUAL co-operative congress of delegates from co-operative societies in Great Britain and Ireland has closed its session at Carlisle. An exhibition was held in connection with the meeting, which included products purchased or imported by the wholesale for distribution to the retail societies. The exhibits indicated the strength of distributive co-operation in the power to purchase on the largest scale from producers or importers. There were also fabrics and manufactured articles which indicated the advance of co-operative production. It is in this sphere of production that the question is raised whether the benefit of co-operation embraces the working producers as well as the consumers, whether spinners, weavers, and dyers, tailors, needlewomen, and shoemakers, are really co-operative producers, or wage-earners having no interest in the sale of that which they produce. The voluminous returns made to the congress throw much light on the present position of co-operative production. There are in England fifty-eight productive societies, and they make cotton-cloth, elastic web, flannel, hosiery, quilts, table-covers, worsted, boots and shoes, galvanized ware, nails, watches, cutlery, locks, baking-powder, portmanteaus, trunks, and biscuits. Scotland has eight such societies. Last year these sixty-six societies sold goods to the amount of £1,817,000, and the net profit was £74,000. Of this profit, £24,871 was paid on share capital, over £1,913 was paid to labor by seventeen societies, and £33,733 to purchasers. Mr. Thomas Hughes delivered an admirable address at the opening of the congress, summing up the past, and pointing out the future problems for co-operation to deal with. He said that the problem of distribution was already fairly solved, and that there is hardly any neighborhood, from John O'Groat to Land's End, to which co-operation has not penetrated. "Our membership," the speaker continued, "is numbered by millions, and the poorest member of the smallest society can now be sure that he gets as full value for every shilling he has to lay out as the richest. Co-operation has taught English working-men how to get full and fair value for the wages of their work: can it help them in like manner to get full and fair value for the work itself? This, Mr. Hughes asserts, is the pressing question, and it must be faced at once. He deprecates the solution of it in accordance with those who favor centralization rather than federation. He pressed this point very earnestly, and apparently with the approbation of a majority of the delegates to the congress. Lord Ripon, speaking in London just before the congress met, also urged the necessity of settling the question of co-operative production without having recourse to centralization.

AT THE RECENT graduation exercises of the St. Louis Manual-Training School, Professor Woodward pointed out the fact that the number of graduates was increasing each year. The first class numbered twenty-nine; the second, twenty-nine; the third, thirty-nine; the fourth, forty-five; and the fifth, fifty-two. Professor Woodward also enlarged upon the way in which the course of instruction at the school is organized. He showed that but one-third of the time is given to shop-work, and that it is distributed in such a way that the students acquire not so much dexterity in a single direction or in a few directions, as a knowledge of principles and methods in many directions. He protested against the assumption that the graduates of the school are skilled workmen in several crafts. They are simply better educated than their fellows who

have had no manual training. The St. Louis school has never received a dollar from either the city or the State, and, as Professor Woodward phrased it, "the director is gratified by the thought, that, in spite of its many shortcomings, the school has served to demonstrate the entire feasibility of incorporating intellectual and manual training in such a way that each is the gainer thereby, and that it has correctly read the public demand for a valuable mental discipline which shall at the same time insure the acquirement of knowledge and skill of intrinsic worth."

THE INCREASE OF STATE INTERFERENCE IN THE UNITED STATES.—I.

THE most casual newspaper-reader and observer of legislation must have had his attention attracted to a growing tendency in our legislation toward the regulation of private and personal concerns. We are aware, of course, that the term 'private and personal concerns' may be said to be more or less indefinite; but it is nevertheless true, that, as used by the majority of intelligent people, its content is, in a general way, understood and agreed to. It is in this generally accepted sense that we use it here.

A few weeks ago we editorially called the attention of the readers of *Science* to an article in which Dr. Albert Shaw of Minneapolis illustrated the tendency of which we speak, from recent legislation in Minnesota. Dr. Shaw gave a digest or summary of the session-laws of 1885 in his State, and pointed out not only the relatively large number of laws that may be put under the head of 'State interference,' but the great variety of subjects with which they attempted to deal.

It is our opinion that the majority of the American people are not aware of this tendency in legislation, and that many of those who are informed about it do not appreciate its real character, nor the result to which it logically leads. To arouse discussion on these points, as well as to secure more accurate data than have yet been laid before the general public, we have addressed letters to various students of legislation and political science in all parts of the country. In our correspondence we have presented four questions, as follows: 1. How far does the legislation in your State show a tendency similar to that observed in Minnesota? 2. In what new particulars is State interference being manifested? 3. Do you believe such interference to be advisable? 4. If not, what measures would you adopt to check it? It is the answers to these questions which we now desire to lay before our readers. As was to be expected, the different correspondents differ widely, both in standpoint and in method. In a few cases correspondents from the same State interpret the tendency of legislation in that State differently. The one considers it in the line of State interference, the other does not so view it. In a small number of cases the writers have considered the questions as affording them an opportunity to make an attack on protection, prohibition, or some similar question. These answers, involving as they do a begging of the question, are of no value for our discussion. But, setting aside a few such instances as these, the replies are of very great interest and value, and are of practical unanimity in stating that State interference is becoming more general in all parts of the country, and along pretty much the same lines. Granger legislation pure and simple, anti-co-operation legislation in general, and labor legislation, are the classes under which the vast majority of the laws indicating State interference may be brought. The question at issue is, we take it, twofold, involving, first, the conception of the powers and duties of the State; and, second, the application and use of these powers and duties. This has not always been comprehended by our correspondents. And, furthermore, for others than professed students of economics, it will require some thinking and investigation in order to take a position on the questions involved which shall be worth any thing. As Pres. Francis A. Walker writes, "For an out-and-out *laissez-faire* it is easy to dash off some highly objurgatory remarks on the subject of State interference; but for one who believes that the State has important functions, social and industrial, as well as political, it would require much time and thought to give a proper expression of one's views as to where State interference should begin, and where it should end."

Although the expressions of opinion which we have received come from all parts of the country, it will conduce to clearness if we discuss them by locality. For that reason we begin with the New England States.

In Maine it seems that the tendency referred to is quite noticeable, though it has only become so recently. Mr. F. E. Manson of the *Kennebec Journal*, Augusta, writes, that, until the Legislature of 1886 passed slight restrictive measures, there were no laws which regulated the formation of private and corporate concerns. Prof. A. E. Rogers of the State College at Orono designates three particular directions in which State interference is being manifested: (a) the increasing stringency of sumptuary laws, (b) the tendency to diffuse education among the masses, and (c) the increasing tendency to protect individual interests against corporate power. Professor Rogers is emphatically in favor of this development of State interference. He writes, "The government exists for the benefit of the people, and whatever, *all things considered*, conduces to their benefit, is in the province of the government. In the proposing and determining of legislation is the test of statesmanship. No fixed rule can be laid down as to what measures may or may not be undertaken." And then, with a bluntness that sounds like Patrick Henry, the professor defiantly adds, "If this smacks of socialism, so does the very organization of man into society, so does government itself."

From Massachusetts we have received a large number of replies; and it is extremely interesting to compare the views they take as to whether legislative interference is extending or not. Mr. Thomas Wentworth Higginson, himself a legislator as recently as 1881, does not believe that the tendency, while observable, has reached a dangerous point. He believes that the town organizations, with their jealousy of all centralization which curtails their powers, will effectually check State interference in Massachusetts. Mr. Higginson instances educational supervision in support of this position, and states that the strong feeling in the towns against State interference has thus far defeated all attempts to secure a more efficient supervision of the schools. Mr. Higginson believes that this local feeling is similar in force and character throughout New England, and attributes the increase of legislative interference in the Western States to the absence of the town organization, with its attendant local feeling.

Prof. John B. Clark of Smith College finds the tendency to have been stronger last year than this, and attributes the re-action to an effort on the part of conservative men to keep the growth of State interference within bounds. Professor Clark instances an arbitration bill (by which either party in a labor-dispute may secure a decision), an employers' liability bill (which makes employers responsible for the acts of their employees resulting in injury to other employees, in cases in which the common law would exempt them on the 'fellow-servant' principle), and a bill fixing uniform times for meal-hours in the case of factory-employees, as examples of the most recent manifestations of State interference. Professor Taussig of Harvard adds to this list certain legislation regarding food-adulteration, but fails to find any distinct tendency toward an increase of legislative interference, save in the case of labor-troubles. Professor Perry of Williams College is of the opinion that Massachusetts is, on the whole, true to "that sound political maxim, 'That government is best which governs least.'" He is inclined to believe that the tendency toward interference is for the most part exhausted in the introduction and push of bills of that general character, and exercises but slight influence on the positive enactments. Professor Perry defines State interference as "nothing but the interference of certain individuals for their own profit with the rights and property of their fellow-citizens in the alleged *name* of the State." We shall refer again to this definition, which seems to us to reach the kernel of the whole matter.

Another correspondent, Mr. Joshua H. Millett of Boston, finds that Massachusetts legislation shows a very great increase in the number and variety of measures that may be styled 'interfering.' On the statute-book he finds laws very similar to those cited from Minnesota. "Laws treat of almost every article of consumption and use," writes Mr. Millett. Among the articles legislated about are butter, cheese, fish, bread, vinegar, hops, leather, ashes, milk, oil, gas, lumber, fertilizers, fruit, hay, marble, nails, and sewing-