

deputies, was recently proscribed, but, being warned in time by his friend, General Blanquet, he fled to Vera Cruz last month, and took ship for Europe.

Huerta's preparations for escape seem well timed, for a plot to assassinate him in the capital on May 24 was only discovered by an accident, and involved the death of ten Federal mutineers at Tacuba, D. F. When even the Pretorian guard begins to mutiny, it is time for a tyrant to take heed. Hitherto, Huerta has exhibited the utmost recklessness to personal danger; he has ridden around without guards and could be seen often of mornings at the Globo public cafe in Mexico City, drinking brandy with one or two companions only. This careless conduct perhaps indicates more shrewdness than bravery on Huerta's part as he well understands the degeneracy and cowardice of the populace of Mexican cities.

RESIDENT OBSERVER.



### McNAIR'S VICTORY.

Pittsburgh, Pa., June 11.

It appears to be popular to be known as a Singletaxer in Pennsylvania. During the recent primary campaign the Palmer-McCormick-Rowley ticket was supported by the National Administration. The Budd-Ryan-McNair ticket was actively supported by the old reactionary element. Of all these candidates but one was openly radical, namely McNair. McNair was the conspicuous Singletaxer. When at a meeting of the Singletaxers Mr. McNair proposed to enter the campaign as a Singletaxer he was strenuously opposed by our local Singletax leaders on the ground that it would hurt rather than help the cause.

Here is what happened:

On the Administration ticket were Palmer, McCormick and Rowley; on the opposition ticket were Budd, Ryan and McNair. Palmer beat Budd by 49,050, McCormick beat Ryan by 20,270; but McNair turned the table around and beat Rowley by 32,080. The newspapers of Pennsylvania were so sure of the complete sweep of the Palmer-McCormick-Rowley ticket that for nearly a week they kept on printing Rowley's name as among the winners. McNair's Singletax activities gave the unpopular Budd-Ryan ticket thousands of votes, and likewise Budd's anti-Wilson speeches on the Panama toll question, and Ryan's "afraid-as-death" attitude to say something radical lost McNair many thousand votes. If McNair's name had been associated with the administration side it is safe to say he would have led the ticket.

The Democratic ticket as it stands is: For Senator, A. Mitchell Palmer; for Governor, Vance C. McCormick; for Secretary of Internal Affairs, William N. McNair.

H. W. NOREN.



Willis: What's the election today for? Anybody happen to know?

Gillis: It is to determine whether we shall have a convention to nominate delegates who will be voted on as to whether they will attend a caucus which will decide whether we shall have a primary to determine whether the people want to vote on this same question again next year.—Puck.

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

### REFORM IN ASSESSMENTS SPREADING.

Cleveland, O., June 11.

The city of Austin, Texas, will hold an "informal" election some time during the month of July, at which the citizens and taxpayers will, upon the request of the City Council, vote on the question of the adoption of the Somers System for the re-assessment of the real estate of that city. The City Council by a vote of 3 to 2—the 2 votes being in favor of accepting the proposal for the installation of the System—at first decided to submit to a referendum an ordinance for the adoption of the Somers System and the making of a contract for its installation. It was afterwards provided, however, to hold an "informal" election which would not be mandatory upon the Council. Although the election will not be mandatory, three of the five members of the Council declare that they will be bound by its results.

Mayor Wooldrige is a very strong supporter. He declares that the city cannot continue to prosper and progress unless there is more money raised for general expense purposes. The campaign in behalf of the system in Austin has been directed by the Young Men's Business Club. Editor A. C. Baldwin of the Austin Tribune has taken a very active part in the movement, and declares that he anticipates the election will result in a 6 to 1 affirmative vote on the adoption of the proposal.

San Antonio and Corpus Christi are the two latest Texas cities to adopt the Somers System, the reassessments in those cities having been completed within the last week.



In Multnomah County, Oregon, the commissioners having charge of the assessment of the cost of good roads have adopted the Somers depth percentage, as used for measuring the depths of city lots, as the basis for distributing the cost of the roads to land lying a mile on each side thereof. Lands nearest the good roads are of course benefited more than those at a distance, and it was found that the Somers depth percentage used for measuring values of inside lots in cities presented a very fair relation for the computation of benefits.

Assessor Henry E. Reed of Portland, Oregon, last November invited a proposal for the installation of the Somers System, with the result that it was accepted and the work of reassessing the entire city is well under way at this time. Of the 50,000 buildings in Portland more than 40,000 have been measured and appraised; of the 120,000 lots in the city about 30,000 have been computed, the basis of such computation being the judgment of the assessor of the values of the Somers unit-foot upon the various blocks. There has been no opposition in Portland, but the most cordial co-operation has been shown by the owners of real estate throughout the city.

Under direction of the State Tax Commission of Arizona the Somers System has recently been used for the revaluation of the land in Phoenix, Tucson and five other cities in Arizona. The members of the Tax Commission recently visited the various

cities where the work was undertaken, and supervised the work in all of its phases—the holding of public meetings for the discussion of street values, the computation of lot values, and the review of the computed values. There is a local Maricopa County Taxpayers' Association in Phoenix, of which Mr. Dwight B. Heard, capitalist and newspaper owner, is the head, which has taken the initiative in bringing about equity in assessments in that state.



The policy of the State Tax Commission of Ohio, which under the Warnes Law has the full power of direction and control of the methods of assessment, has been to make few changes in the real estate valuations this year. However, Tax Commissioners William Agnew and John D. Fackler of Cuyahoga County, in which Cleveland is located, have used the Somers System for revision of the land values in practically all of the suburban towns and cities adjoining Cleveland, including Lakewood, East Cleveland, Chagrin Falls, Berea, Rocky River and other places. They have very successfully used the Somers principles in the valuation of farm lands, holding public meetings at which the relative values of lands located upon the various highways were discussed.



In Dubuque, Iowa, at the April election two proposals were presented at a referendum vote affecting the question of assessments. A year ago an Equitable Assessment League was organized in Dubuque, with Dr. Eugene Lewis at its head. The City Council, preferring that any radical change in the assessment situation should first have the definite approval of the citizens, submitted two questions. The first question was as to whether a scientific assessment of the real estate of the city should be made. This question carried with a vote of 3,678 for and 947 against. The second question was whether the Somers System should be used for a re-assessment. The vote on this question was 3,627 for and 940 against. There was no agitation at the time of the election, and the decisive result was a very great surprise, even to the members of the Equitable Assessment League.

WALTER A. POLLOCK.



#### Why We Oppose Pockets for Women.

1. Because pockets are not a natural right.
2. Because the great majority of women do not want pockets. If they did, they would have them.
3. Because whenever women have had pockets they have not used them.
4. Because women are expected to carry enough things as it is without the additional burden of pockets.
5. Because it would make dissension between husband and wife as to whose pockets were to be filled.
6. Because it would destroy man's chivalry toward woman if he did not have to carry all her things in his pockets.
7. Because men are men and women are women. We must not fly in the face of nature.

8. Because pockets have been used by men to carry tobacco, pipes, whisky flasks, chewing gum, and compromising letters. We see no reason to suppose that women would use them more wisely.—New York Tribune.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 16, 1914.

### The Illinois Suffrage Law.

The Constitutionality of the Illinois Woman Suffrage act was sustained in its entirety by the State Supreme Court on June 13 by a vote of 4 to 3. In a suit brought in the name of a Chicago citizen, William J. Scown, December 10, 1913, arguments in which were heard by the Supreme Court on February 13, the validity of the act had been questioned on three principal grounds: (1) That the act violated the Constitution because it amended the general election laws but did not contain the section amended, in answer to which the Court found that—

This act does not purpose to amend or revise any other act and it is complete within itself. Its only object is to extend to women the right of suffrage so far as the offices and subjects mentioned in it are concerned.

(2) That the Legislature had no power under the Constitution to extend the franchise to women. In answer, the Court replied that—

If an office is not of constitutional origin it is competent for the legislature to declare the manner of filling, how, when and by whom the incumbent shall be elected or appointed, and to change from time to time the method of election or appointment;

and cited as precedent the two cases of over 20 years ago, namely, *People vs. English and Plummer vs. Yost*, when the right of women to vote at school elections was questioned, and was upheld as Constitutional by the State Supreme Court. (3) That the granting to women of the right to vote on questions of public policy was unconstitutional, in answer to which the Court ruled that—

In attempting to give to women the right to vote upon all questions or propositions submitted to the voters or electors in the municipalities or political subdivisions of the State the Legislature exceeded its power. There are many questions and propositions, however, not mentioned in the Constitution which may be submitted by the Legislature to a referendum at which women may be authorized to vote.

It is a well settled rule that a statute may be in part constitutional and in part unconstitutional and that in such cases the constitutional part of the act will be given effect and the unconstitutional part disregarded unless the unconstitutional part is of