

as a dumping room for sweepings, old papers, rags, and broken furniture, much as is now done with vacant lots. He would be thought crazy or foolish, and told that some one else would pay full rent who had use for it, and would not make it a garbage can and fire trap, to menace the lives and property of all in the building; and further, that the rent was needed to help defray the expenses of the building and its accommodations.

If "municipal government is business," as we so often hear, why don't we follow the example of this business man and manage our cities in the same way—by putting a rental value on all land spaces (lots) and taxing them only, to pay the expenses of the city government, and for expenses of streets, sewers, water, light, street cars, etc.; and by exempting improvements, stocks of goods, personal property, etc., as the landlord does?

The expense of running street cars free would be met by the higher tax, or rental value of the lots benefited; and just so with the water mains, light, heat and telephone advantages. And our citizens would be saved time and annoyance by settling all these bills at one time, once a year, instead of having to go to the gas company every month, and stand in line for hours to get to your window, and the same at the water company's, and the electric and telephone company's, besides your visit to the county treasurer once or twice a year.

How it would simplify county business and reduce cost, if the assessor had only a map of the lots and lands to assess from, like the plan of the rooms in an office building. The assessor could be the county treasurer, too, as he would have all the year to make out tax receipts, these containing only one item to consider; and when once on the books there would be very little variation from year to year.

Why don't we do business in a business-like way when we have such a good example to follow as the hard-headed, conservative business man who is the proprietor of an office building?

Denver, Colo.

L. C. LAW.

* * *

WOMAN'S RELATION TO PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

Louis F. Post, Member of the Chicago Charter Convention, in the Columns Controlled by the Women's Organizations of Chicago in the Chicago American of May 5, 1906.

Women have public as well as private duties. They cannot rid themselves of these if they would, and no good woman of intelligence would if she could. But public duties can be performed in only one of two ways: either by means of public persuasion and through civic action necessitating the ballot, or by private persuasion and through personal influence exerted in the irresponsible capacity of a non-voter.

Many disfranchised women try to perform their public duties in the latter of these two ways, and all women are urged to do so. Adversaries of woman suffrage urge it as the only way. Women are to solicit, with sweet smiles and engaging frowns, the votes of fathers, brothers, husbands, sons, friends, and dependents, and as mothers to

build up the state by molding the civic character of embryonic citizens.

But how can women fitly solicit the votes of voters, if unfit to vote themselves? Or if the mere vote would burden them unduly? Or if it be "infra dig." for them to vote?

And how can they efficiently mold civic character in the young, if denied other than academic opportunities for molding their own civic character?

The only dignified and effective way for women to perform their public duties is through the responsibility of the ballot. This is also the only way in which most women can qualify themselves to rear worthy citizens or to influence political opinion and action worthily and with propriety.

For as a rule it is only as they face the responsibility of considering and deciding public questions authoritatively that they can practically familiarize themselves with civic principles or become intelligent critics of civic policies and competent teachers of civic life for the young. This is not because they are women; it is because they are human.

So the question resolves itself into this:

Shall women participate at all in civic life and civic thought and the development of civic character and progress?

If the answer be negative, then let women hold their peace entirely on public matters; if it be affirmative, then invest them with the only known method of authoritative expression, which is the ballot.

* * *

STATE AND MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP IN SWEDEN.

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS.

For The Public.

In preceding issues the plain facts regarding state and municipal ownership in Sweden have been put forth. We have seen that government ownership is no recent experiment. We have seen that it can be conducted so as to prove a financial success. We have seen it extended to practically all the various public utilities which have a tendency to become improper private monopolies. We have seen how the government's services can be rendered for a very small compensation with no loss to the national or municipal treasury. In short, we have seen that state and municipal ownership has actually proven to be all that its advocates in this country claim for it.

There is no good reason why the success of a European country should turn to failure in this country. The defenders of private monopolies tell us that conditions here and in Europe are so different. Most of those who tell us so have very likely no clear idea of European conditions. All they know of Europe is either from the superficial impressions of a traveler, or from the columns of the encyclopedia. In fact, conditions in Europe and here are not so different after all. Human nature is pretty much the same everywhere, and what differences there are consist more in degree than in kind. Those who thus defend inequity often base their defense upon this alleged difference of conditions, and they particularly love to refer to the "free institutions of the United States," as if freedom were an obstacle to a