

essentially repugnant to the free institutions of Anglo-Saxon civilization as that of "blacklisting." The ultimate effect of this practice, when developed on a large scale, would inevitably be the subjection of a constantly increasing number of employes to disabilities and restrictions scarcely less oppressive than those to which servants were formerly subjected in England by statutory provisions long since obsolete¹, and to which they are still subjected by the laws of some of the countries of Continental Europe. A passport system of this kind has always been found to be productive of serious evils even when it is worked by public officials; and it must be immeasurably more dangerous to leave in the hands of private parties so formidable an instrument of potential tyranny, capable of being used, and, as human nature is constituted, certain to be used in many instances, as a means of gratifying personal animosity or class hatred.

These considerations go far to justify the drastic action already taken by those American legislatures who have enacted statutes, of which the general purport is, that any corporation or individual who "blacklists" an employé, with the intent of preventing him from obtaining employment from any other person, is guilty of a penal offence¹. One of the statutes, viz., that of Minnesota, has been pronounced to be constitutional². Another

¹In 5 Eliz. ch. 4, § 10, it was enacted that a servant in any of the various occupations specified should be liable to imprisonment, if he departed from the city or parish in which he had been employed, without obtaining an official testimonial, stating that he was licensed to depart from his master and at liberty to serve elsewhere. It is manifest that if the practice of "black listing" is permitted to go on unchecked, the employers of our own times will be able by private compact to place large bodies of employes in a position analogous to that which would result from the operation of such a statute.

²Colorado. 1 Mills Ann. Stat. Colo. p. 487, chap. 15; Georgia. Code of 1895, § 1873; Indiana. Horner's Ann. Stat. (1901) § 5206p; § 5206q, 2; Iowa. Code of 1897, §§ 5027, 5028; Kansas. Gen. Stat. Daasler (1901) Laws 1897, §§ 2421-2423; Minnesota. Laws, 1895, chap. 174; Missouri. Rev. Stat. 1899, § 2166; Montana. Political Code (1895) §§ 3390, 3391; Penal Code (1895) § 656; North Dakota. Rev. Code, 1899, § 7042; Oklahoma. Laws, 1897, p. 144; Virginia. Hurst's Code, 1898, § 3845b (Acts, 1891-92, p. 976); Wisconsin. Rev. Stat. 1898, § 4460b.

By the statutes of Georgia, Indiana, Montana, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Iowa, it is expressly provided that they shall not be construed as prohibiting the employer from furnishing, when requested by a discharged employé to do so, a truthful statement of the causes for his discharge.