

injured, but for the profit of contractors); and they confirm him in criminal ways, if indeed they do not actually create the criminal impulse within him.

\* \*

### Keeping the Police Within the Law.

Senator Grady of New York has secured the passage by the New York Senate of a measure which ought to become law promptly, not only in New York but in every State of the Union. It is a bill to make it a crime to subject unconvicted prisoners to police "sweating" or "rogues' gallery" photography (p. 55). This custom has prevailed ever since Superintendent Byrnes of the New York force introduced it there, and many a poor prisoner has suffered under it. Not until a banker had gone through the ordeal was its outrageous character realized. But the banker's experience rose above Senator Grady's horizon as "one of the most glaring outrages ever perpetrated in New York city," and he brought forward his bill. In England there is a common saying that a bishop or a lord must be killed by a railroad before new safeguards are provided. So here a bank president must be police-"sweated" and police-"mugged" before the legislature awakes to the iniquity of the oppression. But this awakening seems to have begun. The Grady bill imposes a penalty of imprisonment for from six months to a year upon any one who, having arrested any person upon any charge, or having in his custody or under his control any person under arrest or held upon any charge, shall "photograph, measure, or make for record any physical examination of such person," or "shall order, assist or take part in the photographing, measuring or prohibited physical examination of such person" before such person has been convicted of a crime; or "shall restrain such person more than is necessary for his or her detention to answer the charge; or who shall fail to take such person, so arrested, before a magistrate without unnecessary delay"; or "shall subject such person, so arrested, to any interrogation or examination, beyond such as may be required for his or her identification, except by direction of a magistrate and in the presence of a magistrate, or in obedience to an order of a court of competent jurisdiction." Such a law is badly needed in Chicago, where the police run riot with lawlessness of the kind prohibited by the Grady bill.

\* \*

### Disfranchising Anarchists.

Where is our "saving sense of humor" when we punish men who don't believe in voting by dis-

franchising them? If a man is in fact an anarchist, he won't suffer from the loss of the voting right, which he doesn't use and doesn't want; if he is in fact not an anarchist, depriving him of the voting right is well calculated to make him one. In neither case does the punishment fit the crime.

\* \*

### Death of Campbell-Bannerman.

A democratic statesman passed away on the 22d, when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman died. He was one of those rare men who learn their democracy narrowly and in aristocratic environments and practice it broadly in the field of general politics. His democracy had taken deep root, for his mind had grasped the essential principles that are identified with the fame of Henry George. As leader of the Liberal party and prime minister of Great Britain he had sought to secure a practical recognition of those principles in British law, and had made notable advances in this direction when illness forced him to relinquish his place to Mr. Asquith. How far Mr. Asquith will go in the same direction remains to be seen, although his appointment of David Lloyd-George to the position in the cabinet next his own is reassuring. But he will need to strike a radical note that rings sharp and true, before he can hope to command the confidence which Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman inspired among the men of England and Scotland and Ireland who believe that the land of a country is the birthright of all its people.

\* \* \*

### TENEMENT HOUSE REFORM.

Years of disappointment should convince us of the futility of longer depending upon merely regulative methods for the correction of housing abuses. Legislation fixing the minimum of air space, light and ventilation necessary for each tenant has not been effective, because it has attempted to secure these betterments at the landlord's expense. The result has been unexpected law evasions, worse living conditions, and private and public corruption. Landlords and tenants have much the same human nature, and the play of ordinary selfishness must, under the circumstances, give the advantage to the stronger—the landlord.

Exempting modest homes from taxation will make it more profitable to furnish healthy living quarters. The increased gain to landlords will stimulate the construction of more and better dwellings, and the resulting competition will, without coercive regulations, gradually and in-

evitably eliminate dwellings that are undesirable.

The tax exemption of improvements on homesteads to the amount of \$3,000 proposed in New York, will not materially disturb existing tax conditions; because the number of such homesteads is at present comparatively unimportant as revenue producers. But the encouragement to builders will induce rapid improvement of the nearby and soon-to-be-available land within the greater city, by the wholesale erection of tax-exempt houses.

BENJ. DOBLIN.

**EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE**

**GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS IN AUSTRALIA.**

Melbourne, Australia, March 3.—The alleged extract from an alleged Australian press-organ, "The Melbourne Review," which American journals, many no doubt in good faith, are republishing, is deceptive. For purposes of explanation I quote it:

"Not a single Australian government has made a success of its railways. They have always nearly been bankrupt and get deeper and deeper into the mire every year, while in some of the States they are years behind the times. If the lines were run by private companies, with no general taxpayer to draw upon, they would have been wound up years ago."\*

There are two facts connected with this statement which seem to point to its being part of an organized campaign of misrepresentation. One is that no such journal as "The Melbourne Review" exists or has existed for twenty years. The second is, that the statement—either wholly invented or attributed to a wrong source, because the true one is not avowable—is in itself an absolute perversion of fact.

+

It is untrue that Australian railways are unsuccessful; it is untrue that they really have been bankrupt; it is equally untrue that their financial position is or has been growing worse.

All these statements, moreover, can be easily proved to be malicious inventions by the publication of the official statistics. The following figures, as far as they apply to Australia, constitute part of the elaborate and carefully audited balance-sheet for

\*This extract, purporting to have been taken originally from "The Melbourne Review," was extensively published in the United States last Fall by newspapers opposed to government ownership of railways. We forwarded it with a request for a report upon it, to Mr. Max Hirsch, of Melbourne, a man of distinction in the Australian Commonwealth, whose veracity cannot be questioned and whose reputation as a political economist and publicist is established. He is the author of "Democracy versus Socialism," published by the Macmillans, a work which takes ground in opposition to socialism. Mr. Hirsch responds to our request in the present letter. His report, a demonstration of the success of government ownership in Australia, is the most complete and convincing presentation of facts upon the subject that has yet been published in the United States.—Editors of The Public.

1907, published by every state-railway system in the Australian Commonwealth. I owe them, as well as the comparative figures for other countries, to the kindness of the government statist of the Commonwealth, who has been good enough to furnish them to me in advance of publication and has thus saved me the enormous labor of extracting and combining them. These then are the true facts:

Country.*	Capital Cost Per Mile, £.....	Net Return on Capital Cost, Per Cent.....	Working Expenses, Per Cent. of Gross Revenue, Per Cent.....	Per Gross Revenue, Pence	Train Mile. Working Expenses, Pence	Mile. Net Revenue, Pence
Australian Commonwealth ...	9,669	4.35	57.18	86.57	49.50	37.07
Great Britain and Ireland...55,798		3.45	67.21	62.73	42.17	20.56
United States ...13,735		5.01	66.77	99.00	66.10	32.9
Canada .....12,994		2.87	69.52	89.50	62.25	27.25

	Mileage Open for Traffic.	Per Mile Area in Square Miles.	Open for Traffic. Population.	Per Mile Killed and Injured.
Australian Commonwealth .....	14,190	200.9	281	0.168
Great Britain and Ireland .....	23,063	5.26	1,912	†
United States .....	217,341	13.6	387	0.438
Canada .....	21,353	175.4	290	0.065

	Working Expenses.	Interest Charge.	Net Revenue.	Surplus Over Working Expenses and Interest Charge.
Australian Commonwealth. £7,968,374	£4,975,341	£5,968,288	£992,947	

The foregoing figures show that the net returns from the Australian state railways is higher than those from the privately owned railway systems of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of Canada, and approximates very closely to that of the railways of the United States.

If, then, the Australian system is "really bankrupt," those of Canada and of the United Kingdom are worse than bankrupt, and that of the United States is nearly so. Yet they are privately owned.

Moreover the Australian system shows the lowest percentage of working expenses and the highest revenue per train mile; it shows a smaller percentage of accidents than the United States, and, crowning glory of all, its cost of construction per mile is lower, much lower, than that of any of the privately owned systems with which it is here compared.

The statement published in the United States and now under review is thus seen to be a slanderous falsehood with regard to every allegation which it contains.

+

The foregoing facts, inclusive as they are, by no means exhaust the case in favor of public ownership of the railroads of Australia. Permit me to point out a few more.

\*Australian Commonwealth for 1907. Great Britain and Ireland, and Canada, for 1906, except that "Killed and Injured" is for 1905. United States for 1905.

†Not available.