sorship, from allowing presentation of scenes objectionable to their patrons. If the taste of the patrons is at fault the remedy is in education, not in force. S. D.

Boosting Boston.

City boosting through extensive advertising of local advantages, has suffered a decline in popularity in Boston. Mayor Curley started a boosting campaign, apparently along conventional lines, with the usual approval of the superficial and unthinking. But a million dollar fund was needed. To get it the Mayor simply published a list of alleged contributors, putting opposite each name the amount that he assumed they would have agreed to pay had they been asked. A loud protest immediately arose and Mayor Curley has by this time realized his error. Of course some one must pay the expenses of boosting. Possibly Mayor Curley thought he was apportioning these expenses according to benefits. If so, he was mistaken. Had the boosting movement succeeded in attracting business to Boston, land values in the city would have increased, and business men and workers would have been compelled to pay higher rents for living in a boosted city. If there is to be a boosting campaign land owners should bear the entire expense. The mayor's attention has been called to this by the Massachusetts Singletax League, which furthermore offers the practical suggestion that Boston adopt the Houston, Texas, plan as an attraction to business. If adopted the boosting campaign will meet with certain success.

S. D.

A Just Tax System for Washington.

The half and half system of paying local expenses in the District of Columbia is defended on the ground that the federal government owns much valuable property in the District. To the superficial that argument sounds convincing. But even the superficial should see it in a different light on reading in the Congressional Record of February 24, on page 4154, a conversation between Representatives Sims of Tennessee and Caraway of Arkansas as follows:

Mr. CARAWAY. Practically all that the Government owns here is in parks, and the entire citizenship enjoy the use of them, do they not?

Mr. SIMS. Yes. Let me tell you, my friend, this: The people discount the free use to themselves and magnify the ownership of the Government.

Mr. CARAWAY. In their view, it owns it only for the purpose of paying on it?

Mr. SIMS. Yes. You will see that, if you look into these propositions that are coming up all the time, where people are urging the Government to buy this tract of land and that tract of land and the other tract of land before it goes up. They are always trying to save the Government and not the people; urging the Government to buy lands before the price goes up. That was the case with respect to the proposed Rock Creek Park extension. They said: "Buy it now, before the Government has to pay too much for it." Oh, my! Such sympathy for the Government!

Mr. Sims then proceeded to show what should be done:

Levy no taxes upon personal property at all. Levy no taxes upon improvements at all. Levy on the land owned by the Government and on the land owned by everybody else. The Government not owning any personal property, you can not put any personal tax on the Government. The question of depreciation can not be figured on these great public buildings as it is on private buildings. The way to do that is to levy a land tax; levy it on what the Government now owns and what it may hereafter acquire. Then, if the tax rate is increased, the Government's share would increase just as the other land is increased in value.

Mr. Sims remarked on the fact that suggestion of this remedy raises the cry, "you are committing Congress to the Singletax." But he evidently does not see that that detracts any from its merits. However displeasing his position may be to the land monopolists of the District, he is advocating a just measure that, if adopted, will lighten the burdens of tenants and home owners. His course deserves approval.

S. D.

Democrats Who Reject Democracy.

Why the money spent in building an Alaskan railroad should be repaid through a tax on land values was concisely explained in the House on February 18 by Congressman David J. Lewis of Maryland. Said Mr. Lewis "We are taking this money from the tax payers, who have earned it, and when we see it is going to produce some money on its own account, as an incident, perhaps enough ultimately to repay the whole investment, it is our duty as a matter of loyalty to our paymasters to conserve it for them instead of letting it drift into the hands of the schemers of this country." Mr. Lewis was speaking in behalf of the amendment proposed by Congressman Warren Worth Bailey of Pennsylvania, providing for repayment in that manner. The justice and common sense of the proposition seems clear enough, but sometimes it takes something more than justice or common sense to influence a congressional majority. It is not surprising therefore that the Bailey amendment was rejected by a vote of 126 to 27. About the only reason given for opposition was that the opponents could not see

how the values could be determined. If they will watch the persons into whose hands the lands will pass they will see that there is not much difficulty in that respect. The fact that they stubbornly refused to bear in mind the ease with which private owners determine such values indicates that they preferred not to see. The names of the 126 who voted to permit monopolization of Alaska were not made a matter of record, but the following spoke against Bailey's preventive amendment: Wingo of Arkansas, Houston of Tennessee, Sherley of Kentucky and Callaway of Texas. These are all Democratic partisans. Perhaps some genuine democrats in their districts may be interested in this information. S. D.

Senators in Need of Light.

Somewhat remarkable is an exchange of views between Senators Cummins of Iowa and Chamberlain of Oregon which occurred on January 12, and is recorded on page 1914 of the Congressional Record. The subject of discussion was Alaska. Senator Cummins said he had been waiting ever since he became a senator to hear discussed the question of what kind of law to devise that will permit honest settlers "to have their rights, and at the same time will prevent the monopoly which was feared in 1906 with regard to Alaska." For answer Mr. Chamberlain made this strange confession: "I am not sure that there is any power in Congress or anywhere to prevent the monopolization and control of resources such as Alaska has." Mr. Chamberlain need but consult with any of the Singletax Congressmen to learn that there is such power. He need but look over the amendment proposed by Representative Bailey of Pennsylvania to the Alaskan railroad bill to learn how the power should be applied. Senator Cummins will find in Congressman Bailey's proposition an answer to the question for which he has needlessly waited five years. He could have got it on the first day of his term had he looked elsewhere than among his colleagues.

S. D.

Legal Disfranchisement.

Of all the methods devised to deprive the voter of his just share in government, yet giving him the semblance of power, it may be doubted if there is another trick known to the machine politician quite so despicable as the "party declaration" of the Illinois primary law. We have long been accustomed to the disfranchisement of the district, or geographical, system of choosing representatives, and the general election by plurality vote. And it has been recognized that to elect Congressmen from the state at large, or aldermen from the city at large, was grossly unjust. But the districts and wards that were introduced for the purpose of correcting this evil effected little good, for the reason that the party that had a majority in the state or city tended toward a majority in each district or ward; and it invariably resulted in a Congress, or a city council, whose members bore little relation to the votes cast at the election. Proportional representation is urged as a corrective for this evil; but proportional representation is still new to the mass of the people, and they need time to familiarize themselves with a new idea.

The evils of the Illinois primary law, however, are without a solitary excuse. One of the reasons given for the fact that only thirty per cent of the Chicago women who had registered, voted at the last primary—and this percentage was as high as that of the men—lay in the fact that they had been advised to keep away from the primaries unless they had made up their minds as to which party they belonged. The explanation of that strange advice lies in the fact that the Illinois primary law requires that the voter shall not only declare which party he or she "belongs to," but that when such declaration has been made the voter is prohibited from voting any other party ticket for two years.

The reason given by the framers of the bill for such a high-handed proceeding is that it is necessary to prevent the change of voters from election to election, in order to keep the bad men in one party from foisting bad candidates on their opponents. But the practical effect is to keep conscientious voters from the polls, and to compel the less scrupulous to commit perjury, if they would exercise their natural right to change their minds from one election to another. Voting at the election cannot be controlled, because it is secret, and all the candidates are on the same ballot; but the candidates at the primaries being on separate ballots, the voter can exercise the right of suffrage only by taking the ticket of his party, and having his name recorded in the poll books as a member of that party. Such a condition, it must be submitted in all candor, transcends the rights even of our political bosses.

This primary disfranchisement of conscientious and independent voters is merely another reason