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 minor 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 penology 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 request 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