

been presented, private bills were considered and the Senate adjourned to the 4th.

*

House.

The denatured alcohol bill was taken up on the 28th and the Senate amendment concurred in (p. 7745), and on the 29th consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill was resumed (p. 7870). There was no session on the 30th. On the 31st the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill was again taken up (p. 7852) and passed (p. 7858), after which the postoffice appropriation bill as amended by the Senate was ordered to a conference (pp. 7859, 7863). No business of general interest was done on the 1st, but on the 2d the bill to establish a bureau of immigration and naturalization was taken up (p. 7986). Conference reports on the railroad rate bill (p. 8008) and the Statehood bill (p. 8012) were then presented and the House adjourned to the 4th.

*

Record Notes.

Speech of Representative Smith of Michigan in favor of a postal telegraph (p. 7689). Speech by Representative Landis of Indiana on prosperity and protection (p. 7867). Speech of John Sharp Williams of Mississippi on protection and prosperity (p. 7879).

RELATED THINGS CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

WHAT HAVE YOU DONE TO-DAY?

For The Public.

What have you done to-day to make this world
A better habitation for the sons of God?
How have you worked, what effort have you made
To bring alleviation to the countless horde
Who, like the humble Nazarene of old,
Have hardly where to lay their weary heads?
What have you done to-day to ease the pain
Of outraged and exploited brain and brawn
Of every land, whose ceaseless, patient toil
Produces all that swells our hearts with pride
Of civilization? What the gracious deed
Or generous thought; what noble sacrifice
Of self can you recall with teeming joy
As yonder setting sun, in sweet repose,
Withdraws its purifying rays and sends
A night of contemplation? What have you,
O man, performed to earn the quiet rest
And pleasant dreams of day's accomplishment?

What have you done to-day to make yourself
A better man, more worthy of the love
Of brother here or Father on the throne
Of Heaven; what display of courage bold
In righteous cause, regardless of the whips
And jeers of fool or knave, have you exemplified?
What mercy have you shown as, in mad race
For earthly things, your vulgar pathway led
O'er stifled souls or bodies weak and sore
Of fortune's derelicts? Have you bethought
That mercy blesses him that gives and him
That does receive? Can you in justice claim
Its chastening balm? O, highest type of all
Of God's creation, glorified and raised
Above the brutes by that most precious gift,
Ennobling reason, can you say to-day
That it has been your sure and faithful guide?
You answer, "No." Then come, 'tis not too late;
Retrace your steps, for there lies heaven's gate.

ELLIS O. JONES.

* * *

THE MISSION OF EVIL.

"You tempt men to sin," said I to the Devil.

"Not so," said the Devil to me. "Men desire the apples of Sodom, which I give to them, that by eating, they may find that they are filled with ashes."

"You are a bad paymaster," said I to the Devil.
"I am no paymaster," said the Devil to me, "for it is written, 'they shall eat of the fruit of their own way.' I only take care that they do."

"You trouble the world," said I to the Devil.

"Nay, I am the left hand of God," said the Devil.

—Bolton Hall, in The Game of Life.

* * *

A SINGLE TAX ILLUSTRATION.

For The Public.

The objection so often raised by opponents of the single tax, and by new students of the subject, that it is only a theory, or a new issue, and has never been tried, can be easily, plainly and convincingly disproved by citing the case of the proprietor of any large office building.

The owner is applying the single tax completely in his management of the building. The study of this example is a forcible and lucid exposition of what single taxers ask in the management of governmental affairs.

The proprietor of a building rents floor spaces according to their rental value; the more valuable rooms for business, ease of access and sightliness, rent for more than back rooms, small rooms and unsightly rooms opening on a court, etc.

The rent paid is a veritable single tax. For this one rent (or tax) per month (or year) the tenant gets heat, light, water, elevator, and janitor services to keep the halls clean, free, or without any further payment.

The single taxer contends that for a single rent or tax, per year, on the land spaces he occupies, he should and could get water, light, street cars, street cleaning and sprinkling free; and that the scheme is as practicable in the one case as in the other.

The office building is a veritable little city, the halls run like streets by the doors. Many and varied are the industries carried on there. The owner does not come around monthly or yearly, prying into your business or private affairs, auditing your book accounts, noticing the elegance or simplicity of your furnishings, for the purpose of fixing your rent; but the more finely you furnish your rooms, the more likely he is to reduce your rent to induce you to stay, as it pleases him to see his building looking attractive to those who come in on business or other matters, and many a man has had his rent raised to force him to move because of the dirty and slovenly appearance of his offices.

The elevator is a perpendicular street car, to all intents and purposes, to facilitate the transportation of passengers to and from their places of business or of amusement, or for other matters that may call them to the upper floors, but more especially is it put in for the purpose of raising the rental value of the upper or more distant floor spaces. How much rent, think you, would the upper floors bring if there were no elevator in these buildings? Nobody would take the trouble to climb to the third floor even, to see you.

Then again, think of a man who expected to rent a room cheaply because he had no use for it but

as a dumping room for sweepings, old papers, rags, and broken furniture, much as is now done with vacant lots. He would be thought crazy or foolish, and told that some one else would pay full rent who had use for it, and would not make it a garbage can and fire trap, to menace the lives and property of all in the building; and further, that the rent was needed to help defray the expenses of the building and its accommodations.

If "municipal government is business," as we so often hear, why don't we follow the example of this business man and manage our cities in the same way—by putting a rental value on all land spaces (lots) and taxing them only, to pay the expenses of the city government, and for expenses of streets, sewers, water, light, street cars, etc.; and by exempting improvements, stocks of goods, personal property, etc., as the landlord does?

The expense of running street cars free would be met by the higher tax, or rental value of the lots benefited; and just so with the water mains, light, heat and telephone advantages. And our citizens would be saved time and annoyance by settling all these bills at one time, once a year, instead of having to go to the gas company every month, and stand in line for hours to get to your window, and the same at the water company's, and the electric and telephone company's, besides your visit to the county treasurer once or twice a year.

How it would simplify county business and reduce cost, if the assessor had only a map of the lots and lands to assess from, like the plan of the rooms in an office building. The assessor could be the county treasurer, too, as he would have all the year to make out tax receipts, these containing only one item to consider; and when once on the books there would be very little variation from year to year.

Why don't we do business in a business-like way when we have such a good example to follow as the hard-headed, conservative business man who is the proprietor of an office building?

Denver, Colo.

L. C. LAW.

* * *

WOMAN'S RELATION TO PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

Louis F. Post, Member of the Chicago Charter Convention, in the Columns Controlled by the Women's Organizations of Chicago in the Chicago American of May 5, 1906.

Women have public as well as private duties. They cannot rid themselves of these if they would, and no good woman of intelligence would if she could. But public duties can be performed in only one of two ways: either by means of public persuasion and through civic action necessitating the ballot, or by private persuasion and through personal influence exerted in the irresponsible capacity of a non-voter.

Many disfranchised women try to perform their public duties in the latter of these two ways, and all women are urged to do so. Adversaries of woman suffrage urge it as the only way. Women are to solicit, with sweet smiles and engaging frowns, the votes of fathers, brothers, husbands, sons, friends, and dependents, and as mothers to

build up the state by molding the civic character of embryonic citizens.

But how can women fitly solicit the votes of voters, if unfit to vote themselves? Or if the mere vote would burden them unduly? Or if it be "infra dig." for them to vote?

And how can they efficiently mold civic character in the young, if denied other than academic opportunities for molding their own civic character?

The only dignified and effective way for women to perform their public duties is through the responsibility of the ballot. This is also the only way in which most women can qualify themselves to rear worthy citizens or to influence political opinion and action worthily and with propriety.

For as a rule it is only as they face the responsibility of considering and deciding public questions authoritatively that they can practically familiarize themselves with civic principles or become intelligent critics of civic policies and competent teachers of civic life for the young. This is not because they are women; it is because they are human.

So the question resolves itself into this:

Shall women participate at all in civic life and civic thought and the development of civic character and progress?

If the answer be negative, then let women hold their peace entirely on public matters; if it be affirmative, then invest them with the only known method of authoritative expression, which is the ballot.

* * *

STATE AND MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN SWEDEN.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

For The Public.

In preceding issues the plain facts regarding state and municipal ownership in Sweden have been put forth. We have seen that government ownership is no recent experiment. We have seen that it can be conducted so as to prove a financial success. We have seen it extended to practically all the various public utilities which have a tendency to become improper private monopolies. We have seen how the government's services can be rendered for a very small compensation with no loss to the national or municipal treasury. In short, we have seen that state and municipal ownership has actually proven to be all that its advocates in this country claim for it.

There is no good reason why the success of a European country should turn to failure in this country. The defenders of private monopolies tell us that conditions here and in Europe are so different. Most of those who tell us so have very likely no clear idea of European conditions. All they know of Europe is either from the superficial impressions of a traveler, or from the columns of the encyclopedia. In fact, conditions in Europe and here are not so different after all. Human nature is pretty much the same everywhere, and what differences there are consist more in degree than in kind. Those who thus defend inequity often base their defense upon this alleged difference of conditions, and they particularly love to refer to the "free institutions of the United States," as if freedom were an obstacle to a