

increased rates of interest." He further ridicules "the most brazen claim of all made by these pestiferous malcontents, that a tax on any kind of property produced by human industry increases its cost." In advocating taxation of merchants and manufacturers he declares exemption of them to be inexcusable, even though "it is greatly to the interest of the city of Houston to encourage the coming here of manufactories and wholesale and retail merchants." He urges the enforcement of law for taxation of household goods, suggesting that it can be done through "a house to house visitation by properly authorized city officials, at a comparatively trifling expense." As to taxation of bank deposits he argues, "few people so fortunate as to have money in bank on the first day of January of any year would object to the payment of one per cent or two per cent of it for the support of the city government." The strongest objection he has to urge against the Houston system is that the exemption of improvements is a discrimination in favor of small homestead owners and of renters and is "injurious to the vacant lot industry." "Tax discriminations favoring the rich are bad enough," he says, "but those which favor the poor are intolerable."



Mr. Ring's letter makes clear the dilemma in which the Houston plan of taxation has placed monopolistic interests. If allowed to continue unmolested, the example will surely spread. If overthrown by the courts the city will be compelled to strictly enforce to the letter all the provisions of the general property tax. The result of this—with all due respect to Mr. Ring's statement to the contrary—must be a tremendous loss to the city, and will bring on such a storm of popular dissatisfaction as must lead to institution of a far more radical system than now prevails in Houston. The objectors' organization is playing with fire. s. d.



Another Democratic Victory.

A splendid victory for democracy was won by Congressman Crosser of Ohio in securing a favorable report on his bill to municipalize the street railway system of Washington. He had to fight, not only the opposition of the Chairman of the House District Committee, but of the traction interests of the United States. Municipal ownership in the Capital of the nation will be too conspicuous an example to suit monopolists already greatly concerned over the spread of sentiment in favor of that reform. Then Crosser had to meet the additional obstacle involved in the fact that one of

Washington's biggest local monopolists is John R. McLean, owner of the Washington Post, and of the Cincinnati Enquirer. Of course these papers employ every effort to defeat the measure. Municipal ownership in Washington will remove one incentive that has made these papers, masquerading as Democratic organs, most bitter foes of democracy. Congressman Crosser has performed a splendid public service. s. d.



Paying Other People's Taxes.

No taxation without representation! What a brave sound the words have as they come rolling down to us from the Revolutionary days; but how hollow when contrasted with present-day facts. Women have for years been calling attention to their lack of representation, coincident with their obligation to pay taxes. And of later times others have taken up, in a broader form to fit modern conditions, the cry of no taxation without benefits. For why should one pay to government for things not received any more than to a shopkeeper, or any other commercial agent? Why, indeed, should one pay for more or less than what one receives from government, any more than for what one receives from any other dispenser of values?



Chicago is now confronted with the problem in acute form. An attempt to bring some order out of the jangled street transportation brings to the front once more the question of whether the cost of operation shall be borne by the citizens who receive the pecuniary benefit of streetcar service or by those who patronize the cars. At the last streetcar "settlement" there was a conflict between those who sought to fix the fare at the cost of service and those who wished to add to the cost of service an amount to be used for the relief of other taxpayers. Had the proposition been to tax the users of automobiles for the benefit of the cash girls, messenger boys, and others, to whom car fare is an unpleasantly large portion of the income, it would have savored somewhat of benevolence if not of justice; but when it was proposed to tax the daily patrons of the street cars for the benefit of the automobile class, it was neither just nor benevolent. It might be inferred by a stranger that, since the vast majority of the voters belong to the street car class the latter plan was adopted. But it was not. The auto class won. And during the seven intervening years the cash girls, errand boys, and others who use the trolley instead of the auto, have paid into the city treasury, over and above the cost of their transportation, more than \$13,000,000.

Nay, the case is worse than that. For the street car companies were obliged, in addition to paying 55 per cent of their net earnings into the city treasury, to pave and clean streets to an amount exceeding \$11,000,000. Hence, the patrons of the cars saved to the landowners during the seven years \$24,647,381.



Another "settlement" is now in progress. It will be noticed that the social activities that have been operated by the municipality, such as the water works, were settled once for all, when the city took possession; and that the private activities operated by individuals, such as merchandising, cause no friction; but the social activities that have been placed in the hands of individuals, such as street-cars, gas, and telephones, have been a continuous and vexatious source of trouble. The present undertaking to combine the surface and elevated roads, together with the introduction of subways, again raises the question of fares and services. The president of the surface line makes the point that that part of the nickel that goes to the city should be put into betterment of service. Whether or not the city's portion of the nickel should go to betterment of service can be determined only by experts conversant with all the facts. But with three cent fares in successful operation in Cleveland, and in other places where the companies declared it impossible, it is rather late in the day to advance the rate in Chicago. And any one who has risen to the plane of distinguishing thine from mine can see that under no circumstances should a part of the nickel go to the city. When the cash girl and the messenger boy pays his fare for a ride on the car, it should be with the full consciousness that that fare pays the full cost of the ride, and not a mite more. A tax added to the fare is one of the most unjust and inexcusable of all the indirect taxes. If the controlling political power of the city is determined to delegate this social service to private agents, let it at least see to it that the fare collected from the patron goes to pay the car service, and not toward paying the taxes of the land owners. s. o.



William M. R. French.

In the death of William M. R. French Chicago has lost a true leader of her people, a democratic lover and true critic of art who for more than a generation has used his versatile talents in the highest sort of service for his city—the interpretation and the introduction of art to her citizens. Largely due to Mr. French is it that in

the three decades since the now world-famous Chicago Art Institute first opened its unknown doors to the public, it has never failed to prove itself the whole people's institution. Its free days and evenings have been those most convenient for school children and their busy elders. Its beautiful halls and corridors have been the generous meeting-places for all sorts of public gatherings always upon the condition that no admission should be charged. Prosperity has not spoiled its first ideals, and Mr. French's Art Institute is today one of the most precious possessions of every Chicagoan.

A. L. G.



INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP.

In the long run of history it will be found some day that the present administration in Washington has done nothing greater for the advancement of civilization than to take and hold its attitude of friendship and fairness toward other nations. Whether it be toward Mexico, or England, or Colombia, this attitude of friendliness and fairness has been bravely maintained in spite of the awful, and, alas, too popular temptations to displays of jingoism. Oh, the shoutings that come so easily to the bullying attitude! Snap fingers in the face of Colombia, put thumbs in waistcoat sleeves to England, wipe up the floor with Mexico, all such proceedings still win shouts loud enough to drown quiet disapproval.

And yet the world and we have been growing in healthy disapproval of this ancient barbaric regime. The civilizing influences are increasing, and they have been immensely helped forward by President Wilson and Secretary Bryan during the past few trying months. How the administration has withstood jingo shouts and stood steadily for peace and friendship will some day be set down to its glory.

Any reader of history can see that the tiger spirit was in the ancient past the accepted attitude between nations. Even in the peaceful matter of trade, in later times, the thought was that the good of one had to mean the hurt of the other. In all ways the international feeling was conceived of as necessarily hostile. Gradually has come the dawn of another thought. The reader of history can see the gradual evolution of the new spirit, which knows that co-operation and good will are better than hatred and fighting. Talk of national pride: well may we feel pride that the present government of this nation has the new spirit in promoting the evolution of higher civilization in the world.

As a corollary of the ancient false pride of na-