

to make way for a boodle president, the tickets and transfers now in vogue will be abolished, and not only the courts but the legislature will be called upon to help the existing monopoly.

One of the mirror ill-results of Hannaistic legislation for Cleveland is the abolition of the power of paroling workhouse prisoners, which had vested in the mayor under the former municipal charter, and was supposed to have been reposed in the board of public safety under the new charter, but is now discovered to have been totally abrogated by that wonderful civic product of the combined business sagacity of Senator Hanna and Boss Cox.

Since Mayor Johnson came into office, Harris R. Cooley has had charge of the workhouse and through his wise and beneficent use of the parole has made of that institution an elevating reformatory instead of a degrading jail. His success has attracted favorable attention among the students of perology everywhere. Although his pardons and paroles were numerous, but few who received them were again convicted of crime—fewer than under the previous restricted system.

It was also Mr. Cooley's practice to parole prisoners who were held for fines alone. He maintained that this was imprisonment for debt, and that as it held in prison the man who could not pay his fine, while releasing the one who could pay, it was in reality punishment not for crime, but for poverty. Mr. Cooley's policy was especially effective with men imprisoned for not supporting their families. By means of the parole he secured this support in many cases apparently hopeless.

But now the Hanna-Cox code has taken away the power of parole, and the workhouse is overcrowded with prisoners who cannot pay fines and with thriftless heads of families whose effective desire to support wife and children is certainly not increased by imprisonment.

L. F. P.

Toronto, Ont., Jan. 31.—A pronounced advance in the popularization of single tax principles has been made by the Single Tax Association here, under the active management of Walter H. Roebuck. A series of successful popular meetings in the opera house, has followed in the Winter an equally successful street campaign during the Summer. Among the prominent opera house speakers have been Dan Beard, of New York; John Z. White, of Chicago, and Harris R. Cooley, of Cleveland. A growing roll of over 300 active paying members has been secured by the association; and some excellent civic agitation has been promoted through its efforts.

One important sign of the effectiveness of its work is the considerate reception given by the city council to an ordinance introduced by Dr. Noble for the

exemption from taxation of \$700 of the value of dwellings. This has brought the whole principle of the single tax into discussion.

Toronto furnishes many fine object lessons in unfair taxation. Most of these may be duplicated anywhere, but it is unique in its treatment of church property. Such property in the United States is exempt if used for purposes of public worship; in Toronto it escapes taxation, no matter to what use it is put. In consequence, some denominations, owning immense values in real estate used for residence and business purposes, and in vacant lots held only for the increase in value, are wholly free from taxation. While these instances make fine object lessons for agitating purposes, they indicate something of more importance. When the day for legislation in favor of the single tax arrives, it will be safe to count upon the opposition, bitter, relentless and powerful, of these extraordinarily favored land monopolists.

L. F. P.

Washington, D. C., Jan. 31.—That my exposure on the floor of the House of the rottenness of politics in Cincinnati has struck home, is clearly evident from the elaborate preparations by the two members from that city to reply to my accusation that that corruption is mainly due to the fact that for years the so-called Democratic party in Cincinnati has been a mere adjunct of Cox's Republican machine. It is also indicated by what took place in the House on December 28. The Cincinnati Post of the day before had a telegraphic dispatch from its correspondent here, stating that it was my intention to insert in the Congressional Record a statement drawn up by the Democratic candidate for prosecuting attorney last Fall, showing how the so-called "non-partisan" board of elections there had protected false registration while hounding whoever dared to expose or present evidence of repeaters who had registered. Late in the afternoon of the 28th, the Democratic leader yielded me time to make a few remarks on this subject, at the conclusion of which I was to make the usual request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record. This was to enable me to cover not only Mr. Oppenheimer's statement of illegal registration, but also part of an article from Frank Leslie's Monthly on George B. Cox, and two speeches in denunciation of Cox's methods delivered four and six years ago by one of the Cincinnati members (Judge Goebel) who, when replying to my speech on this subject, said that "the character of George B. Cox needed no defense by him." Upon concluding my brief remarks (delivered 26 hours after the time when the Post was being sold on the streets of Cincinnati, announcing that I was to insert these matters in the Record), I made the usual formal re-

quest for permission to extend my remarks in the Record so as to include the statement, speeches, etc. Was permission granted? Oh no! For the first time since Congress convened on November 9, objection to such a request was made. It was made by a member from Pennsylvania, not from Ohio, and was persisted in. I therefore at once gave notice that "hereafter there will be no more unanimous consents to extend remarks in the Record," and am awaiting the outcome with entire serenity. It would be interesting to know who inspired Mr. Palmer, of Pennsylvania, to object.

One subject has engrossed the thought of practically the entire membership all through the week. "Are we going to get extra mileage?" No matter what the subject publicly debated, the ever recurring question as men conversed on the floor was, what is the prospect of the extra mileage clause staying in the urgency deficiency bill as reported by the appropriations committee. Judging from the number of those who privately expressed their intention of voting for this "grab"—for that is the only word that adequately characterizes the provision in the appropriation bill to pay members a second mileage on the plea that this is the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress—it appeared sure of adoption by at least two to one. Mr. Underwood, of Alabama, had been the only member of the committee to vote against reporting the clause to the House; and in the general debate he was the only member who discussed the subject, citing the action of previous Congresses against allowing such second mileage.

When the matter was reached late on the 29th, three-fourths of the members were in their seats. The discussion was renewed on the 30th, and at least 250 members were present—a most unusual number for a Saturday sitting. The one plea most frequently advanced was that the mileage was a part of the "compensation" of the members. In common with others I combatted this, contending that it was obviously intended to equalize the cost of reaching Washington, and that compensation must be the same for all members.

When the ayes and nays were called for, on Mr. Underwood's motion to strike the appropriation from the bill, almost as many stood up to oppose as to favor his amendment. Tellers being called for, probably one-half of those present immediately arose and formed in line to pass between the tellers. As soon as it was apparent that the amendment would carry, everybody hastened to get into the "band wagon;" and the "aye" line became two long and converging streams from both sides and consisted of nearly all who were in the House at the time. Not more than 20 remained in their seats. Even these

did not have the courage of their "convictions"—or shall I say determination to get the mileage if possible? The faces of those who refused to vote to strike out the clause were a study, disappointment and chagrin being clearly portrayed. To the Pacific Coast members it meant a "loss" of \$1,200. This chagrin was not, however, confined to them, but was apparent among those who had announced their determination to vote for the mileage, but who did not propose to go on record as favoring it if they were not going to receive it. They are not inaptly described in to-day's *Washington Post*, which says:

House in Stampede! But it was a stampede not of those who had suddenly become virtuous, but rather of men who did not propose to be found out so long as they could not "get the goods."

Everybody's attention having been concentrated on the mileage question for the entire week, it is perhaps not surprising that I was unprepared to discuss the "Rosebud Indian reservation bill" in the manner and to the extent that its importance warranted. This bill proposes to follow the established (and therefore "venerated") practice of selling reservation land outright when acquired from the Indians. As this is the policy (as I said in my speech) which has produced such disastrous results, has transplanted to America and built up here the landlord system of England and continental Europe, and is the primary cause of the fearful inequalities in wealth-possessions which prevail in the United States no less than in other civilized countries, I was in duty bound to oppose the principle of the bill even though quite unprepared at the moment to do so in an effective manner. I was thus forced to make my first speech along single tax lines under the most unpropitious circumstances and without preparation.

Fortunately for the cause I represented, the member having charge of the bill—Mr. Burke, of South Dakota—was so confident that no one would support me in my contention that the land should be leased and not sold, that he attempted to drive the bill through at once and would not permit me to offer an amendment providing for leases with reappraisements at the end of five-year periods. As he persistently refused me an opportunity to offer my amendment, I demanded a division, and on its result being announced as 110 to 1, I raised the point of "no quorum."

Instantly Mr. Burke begged that I withdraw my point. He even offered then to ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to prepare my amendment. "All right!" I said; "all I want is the opportunity to record my protest against your plan, and to give members an opportunity of going on record for or against the leasing system."

Objection to his request that I have

unanimous consent to offer my amendment being made by a Democrat, I renewed my point of "no quorum," and the House was declared adjourned.

No objection to my request for unanimous consent to extend my single tax speech in the Record was raised. This could not have been due to ignorance of the notice I gave in the House on the 28th, for that notice appeared in the Record and was the subject of much private discussion.

ROBT. BAKER.

Topeka, Kan., Feb. 1.—In no other State would such a revolution be possible as the one just consummated in Kansas by the withdrawal of Governor Bailey as a candidate for re-election.

It has been the custom in Kansas to give two terms to all State and county officers; and Bailey was serving his first term, as were all the other State officers. Yet, in a campaign of only 22 days, led by a Quaker farmer and a railroad contractor, with practically all the politicians and corporations against them, the rank and file of the Republican party have smashed the strong State machine and rendered the re-election of any of the present State officers impossible.

For two years, corruption and incompetency have thrown off the mask and planted their shame openly as they asked: "What are you going to do about it?" The utter demoralization of Republican State politics began several years ago in the effort of the railways and other corporations to oust the fusionists from power and to elect J. R. Burton to the United States Senate. This culminated in the infamous election law, which denied a place on the official ballot to the strongest in numbers of the political parties of the State, and in a trick ballot and dishonest counting of votes, made possible by the absurd technicalities of that law, whereby 50,000 Democratic ballots were thrown out. Burton was elected Senator, though he could not have carried one of the 106 counties by the popular vote of even his own party. How the Rock Island and Missouri Pacific railways did all this is but too well known in Kansas.

Next came the election of another Senator—one to succeed the exceptionally able and clean Democrat, W. A. Harris. This new Senator had been allotted to the Union Pacific and Santa Fe railways. But there were several stronger and more popular candidates for the place than the Congressman they had selected; so it became necessary to secure the votes of members of the legislature elected in the interest of and pledged to other candidates. Enough such were secured, but by methods peculiar to large corporations and only through the active assistance of the State administration and a legislative session of unparalleled corruption and extravagance. It was safer as well as cheaper to make the taxpayers of the State foot part of the bribery bills; so

hundreds of useless offices were created and the wives and children, the uncles, cousins and nephews of members placed on the pay roll during the session at three dollars per day, along with "straw" men who have never been located outside the pay roll. Incompetence was as rife as corruption. Nearly one-half the laws passed have proven to be defective and others conflicting. State taxation was fully double what it had been under the fusion regime, while all public institutions were in a demoralized state. The two large insane asylums furnished scenes of horror and infamy, by reason of the incompetence and corruption of administrators and employees.

What a lesson is all this respecting our method of electing United States Senators and of the corrupting nature of corporation politics. Many predict that it will result in a Democratic victory at the polls next November. At any rate it shows that there is a limit to what even Kansas Republicans will stand. * * * *

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Feb. 4.

The British parliament, prorogued in August, reassembled on the 2d. The ceremonies were impressively monarchical. King Edward, attended by the Queen, read his speech from the throne in the House of Lords, where the Lords and Commons had assembled. His speech dealt with various subjects, foreign and domestic, but not at all pointedly with the tariff issue which Mr. Chamberlain has raised (p. 665), and over which factional divisions in the Commons are certain to occur as the session advances.

Seven factions may now be distinguished: (1) The followers of Balfour, the premier, who favor a policy of tariff retaliation, but who object to the protection principle; (2) the Chamberlain faction, which insists that protection is necessary to the unity of the Empire; (3) out-and-out free traders who have been with Chamberlain heretofore, but are opposed to any tinkering with the tariff system; (4) the home rule Liberals under the Campbell-Bannerman leadership, who for the most part propose meeting Chamberlain's protection policy with a demand for land value taxation; (5) the imperial Liberals, under Rosebery's leadership; (6) the Labor party mem-