

prevalent in certain English journals, is, as we have said, similar to that which is apparent in the social world. It implies an ignoble view of life; it indicates a curious lack of humility of soul, an absence of the fearless pursuit of truth. But Americans can easily reconcile themselves to its expression when uttered with the lion roar of a Carlyle. What they particularly object to is the thin imitation of this roar by third- and fourth-rate journalistic critics, whose attitude is singularly like that of the Southern negroes, in the old days, toward the "white folks" with whom their masters did not happen to be acquainted. There is a difference between being snubbed by the colored butler and by the "head of the house." Neither snubbing is pleasant, but the one is a trifle less absurd than the other.

No doubt every thoughtful Englishman deprecates certain faults, certain unfortunate tendencies, in the world about him; so, surely, does every thoughtful American, and the latter, as the former, welcomes helpful, sane criticism from whatever source. American spread-eagleism, unfortunately, is never quite extinct, any more than is the traditional John Bull arrogance. But the tremendous problems that confront all modern society in the old world as in the new should induce a spirit of mutual understanding and sympathy. This is no time for the look from above downward; it is no time for bearing false witness. We commend the latter saying especially to religious writers.

#### Voting by Machine.

THE opinion is virtually unanimous among the advocates of ballot-reform who have inspected in operation the working of the Myers ballot-machine, that it, or some similar invention, is destined within a few years to come into general use in this country. They recognize in it the next logical step, after the adoption of the Australian blanket-ballot, in the direction of an absolutely secret and honest system of voting. That it does insure not only secrecy and honesty in the voting, but also honesty in the counting, cannot be questioned. In these respects its merits are beyond dispute, as a summary of its methods of operation will show.

It should be said, before entering upon a description of the machine, that it has been tried in many town elections in New York State in 1892 and 1893, and in all cases has worked to complete satisfaction. Its use in town elections was authorized by a law of 1892, which provided that any town might, by a majority vote of its town-board, put the system into operation as an experiment. The law was passed so late in 1892 that only one town, Lockport, was able to avail itself of the privilege in that year. The trial there was so successful, however, that in 1893 many towns, aggregating 50,000 or more voters, were induced to make the experiment, and the result in all cases was a success so unequivocal that no dissenting voices were heard.

The machines are very simple in their operation. They are inclosed in booths, or cabinets, of sheet steel, seven feet high and five feet wide and deep. Each booth is divided by a steel partition into two compartments, one for the voter, which is about four or five feet in dimensions, and the other for the automatic counting-device, which is about one foot by five. The voter enters his compartment by the entrance door, which is guarded, and which locks behind him. The interior is lighted

by electricity or a lamp, there being no windows. As he steps inside, the voter sees before him an enlarged blanket-ballot, with the names of candidates arranged vertically in party columns, each column printed in a different color, and to the right of each candidate's name a small knob to be pressed. That is to say, the Democratic ticket appears as a long yellow card, the Republican ticket as a red one, and the Prohibition ticket as a blue one. By pressing a knob at the right of a candidate's name, he moves a numbering-device which registers one vote for that candidate on the other side of the steel partition, and at the same time locks all the knobs for other candidates for that particular office, so that no one can vote for more than one candidate for any one office. If he is an illiterate man, and wishes to vote a straight party ticket, he need know only the color of his party-ticket in order to vote intelligently. All he needs to do is to press in all the knobs on that ticket. If he is an intelligent voter, and wishes to vote for candidates on various tickets, he can very easily do so by making his selections upon all the ballots as they are arranged side by side before him. All the knobs pressed in remain in that position till the voter leaves the compartment by a door other than that by which he entered. This door can be opened only from the inside. The opening of it releases all the knobs, restoring them to their original position in readiness for the next voter, and at the same time unlocks the entrance door. As the outgoing voter closes the exit door behind him, a gong sounds, and the machine is then ready for the next occupant.

The speed with which voting is done by this method is surprising. In an election in the town of North Tonawanda, in April, 1893, there were three machines in use in a total poll of 1359 voters. There were three party tickets, with a grand total of ninety candidates. Not a single mistake or failure was made. The shortest time occupied by any one elector in recording his vote was five seconds, and the longest one minute and forty-five seconds. In the first half-hour 122 electors voted. When the polls were closed, sealed doors at the sides were removed, uncovering the counting-device upon which the vote for each candidate was registered. A wire screen inside the sealed doors so guards the figures that they cannot be reached or changed. Within an hour after the polls were closed, the exact result on all candidates was announced. In small towns in which only one machine has been necessary, like Brighton, with 551 votes, 44 candidates, and two ballots, the result has been announced within six minutes after the closing of the polls. One machine will take the place of ten or twelve voting-booths required by the Australian system.

The merits of this method of voting are obvious. In the first place, the vote is absolutely secret. The voter can leave no trace whatever of the kind of ballot that he has voted, for nothing is recorded except the figures. There is no ballot upon which a distinguishing mark of any kind can be placed to show to an election official that a bribed voter has kept his bargain. In this respect the machine is the only method of voting thus far devised which cannot be circumvented by election bribers. In the second place, there can be no tampering with the count, for it is made automatically and with unquestionable accuracy. In the third place, there is greater speed in ascertaining the result than is possible under any other system. All expense for ballots

is eliminated. The use of colors makes unnecessary the granting of aid to illiterates within the compartments.

The objections to the machine are, first, that it affords no means of rectifying mistakes on the part of the voter, for if he presses the wrong knob inadvertently, the vote is recorded beyond recall; second, that it is in the interest of straight party voting of the blindest and most unreasoning kind; and third, that it makes no provision for the voter who wishes to cast a ballot for some name not upon the regular ballots. The first objection is the most serious, though there is this to be said of it, that in all trials thus far made of the machine no mistake of the kind mentioned has been made. The second objection is one that applies to all those adaptations of the Australian ballot-system which arrange the names of candidates in party columns, with a party name, and sometimes an emblem also, at the top. There are nineteen States which have laws providing such arrangements. The third objection is met by an improvement in the machine which its inventor has designed. It consists of a blank column arranged with

knobs like the others. When one of its knobs is pressed in, a slot opens in the column in which appears a roll of paper of sufficient width to allow a name to be written or pasted upon it. The slot is closed by the opening of the exit door, and the roll of paper is turned in such a way as to present a blank space to the next voter wishing to use it.

A machine similar to the Myers was invented by J. W. Rhines of St. Paul in 1889. He applied the principle which Myers uses to a desk with a keyboard. When the voter opened the desk, which was placed in a stall in the voting-room in full view of the election officers, a screen was drawn up before the stall, shutting him from observation. The vote was recorded in the same manner as in the Myers machine. The Rhines machine arranged the keys in the alphabetical order of candidates' names under each office, requiring the voter to read and select the name of each candidate for whom he wished to vote; but its inventor also had in mind the adaptation to it of the party-column principle in colors which is employed in the Myers device.

## OPEN LETTERS.

### Forestry Legislation in Europe.

#### GERMANY.

I SHOULD like to know who first started the nursery-story, which has been propagated in the United States beyond extirpation, that paternalism in forestry is so rampant in Germany that the owner of forest property who cuts down one tree is obliged to plant two. Curiously enough, in Germany, where forestry is found in the highest state of development,—or perhaps just because of that condition,—laws regarding the use of private forest property are less stringent than among the other nations who have paid attention to the matter.

The various governments own and manage in a conservative spirit about one third of the forest area, and they also control the management of another sixth, which belongs to villages, cities, and public institutions, in so far as these communities are obliged to employ expert foresters, and must submit their working-plans to the government for approval, thus preventing impudent and wasteful methods. The principle upon which this control is based is the one we recognize when we limit by law the indebtedness that any community or town may incur. The other half of the forest property in the hands of private owners is managed mostly without interference, although upon methods similar to those employed by the government, and by trained foresters who receive their education in one of the eight higher and several lower schools of forestry which the various governments have established.

The several states differ in their laws regarding forest property. Of the private forests seventy per cent. are without any control whatever, while thirty per cent. are subject to supervision, so far as clearing and devastation are concerned.

In Saxony no state control whatever exists. In Bavaria, Baden, Wurtemberg, and other principalities, clearing without the consent of the authorities and de-

vastation of private forests are forbidden, and there are also some regulations regarding the maintenance of "protective forests"; but altogether the laws are not stringent.

In Prussia, which represents nearly two thirds of Germany, private forests are absolutely free from governmental interference. When, however, a neighbor fears that by the clearing of an adjoining forest his land may be injured, he can call for a viewing jury, and obtain an injunction against clearing, if such anticipated damage is proved. Since he has to bear not only the cost of such proceedings, but also any damage resulting from the interference, the law is rarely if ever called into play.

The government, either communal or state, can also make application for such a process in cases where damage to the public can be proved from a wilful treatment of a private forest.

From the fact that hardly 10,000 acres have in this way become "protective" forests, it may be gathered that the law has been largely inoperative.

The tendency on the part of the government has been rather toward persuasive measures. Thus, in addition to buying up or acquiring by exchange, and reforesting waste lands,—some 300,000 acres have been so reforested during the last twenty-five years,—the government gives assistance to private owners in reforesting their waste land. During the last ten years \$300,000 was granted in this way.

However, voices have called loudly for a closer supervision, and for extension of the control of the state over the use of private forest property.

#### AUSTRIA.

THE status of forest legislation is very different in Austria, where, with a larger proportion of mountainous territory, the results of the unrestricted free will of private owners are more severely felt. The country on