women most prominent in opposing equal suffrage are holders of public office. Thus the president of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (Mrs. J. Elliot Cabot) was for years a member of the school board in her own town and also overseer of the poor. Yet that association, in its published documents, objects to equal suffrage, on the ground that "suffrage involves the holding of office, and office-holding is incompatible with the duties of most women." Suffrage does not involve office-holding by the majority of women, but only by a few; and there are always some women of character and ability who could give the necessary time. Women, as a class, have more leisure than men.

In the enfranchised states there has been no rush of women into office, and the offices that women do hold are mainly educational and charitable. In Wyoming women have had full suffrage for 32 years, yet no woman has ever been elected to the legislature. Neither Colorado, Utah nor Idaho has ever had more than three women in its legislature at one time. During the first ten years after municipal suffrage was granted to the women of Kansas, in the 300 cities of that state, about 1,600 men were elected mayors, and only 16 women. It is as yet only the smaller cities that have chosen women to serve in that capacity, and the amount of time required is far less than that needed to be a public school-teacher, the matron of a hospital, or for any one of a thousand positions that women already hold without criticism. Mrs. Antoinette Haskell, who was twice elected mayor of Gaylord, Kan., and declined a third term, says that the mayor's duties took her on an average about one hour a day.—Progress.

THE PHILIPPINE LANDS.

It is the avowed purpose of the administration to purchase the lands now owned or occupied by the religious orders in the Philippine islands. Negotiations have been proceeding to this end at Rome and at Manila. The communities must be willing to sell, or, it must be presumed, the administration would not undertake to effect the purchase.

A pending bill enacts that the government of the United States shall become owner of these lands, which are chiefly agricultural, but partially urban. Some of the details of the bill may be altered. President Roosevelt is accredited with the belief that the best way to proceed in this delicate business is for the government of the United States to issue bonds running from five to 35 years to whoever will buy at cost, this country thus escaping loss on the transaction.

History has taught its land lessons in vain if this shall seem the wisest method of meeting the land problem in the islands. While the debate upon the ultimate fate of the archipelago must continue not only at Washington, but throughout the country, it must be obvious to all reflecting Americans that our duty in the islands, a duty forced upon us and not desired, cannot be discharged in a year or two. We can neither abandon those 10,000,000 people to anarchy nor permit a monarchy to intrude upon their desolation for conquest. The first part of our duty to them is to be discharged in a right adjustment of their land problem.

A right adjustment of that problem does not consist in transferring their soil from one set of owners to another set without respect for the natural rights of the people. To them by natural law their soil belongs. The government of the United States should so conduct its purchase of the lands now for sale as to restore their benefits in perpetuity to the people themselves. That is to say, the government of the United States should honestly and lawfully acquire the fee to the lands offered for sale, and continue to hold the fee until it is transferred honestly and lawfully to the government of the Philippine islands in whatever form that government shall be constitutionally organized hereafter. It is at least possible that after trying us for a time the people will prefer to remain permanently as citizens of the United States under our flag. Should this be their choice the American people will not cast them off.

Land tenure has had a long and diverse history. Originally the land of every civilized country belonged to the people. Its ownership by individuals was unthought.

Use of land, not proprietorship, was individual. While population did not press for subsistence use of land for tillage or pasture was free. Private inclosure did not originate until the baronial power asserted itself in Europe.

The best epitome of the results of forcible private inclosure of land can be seen in England. During the early part of the reign of Queen Victoria England produced three-fourths of its food and imported only one-fourth. The system of land tenure inaugurated by forcible private inclosure of common lands has reduced England to the necessity of importing more than three-fourths of her food, while millions of her rich acres have lapsed into waste because the laws exact of the soil two returns, a living for the working tenant and revenue for the idle owner. . . . . .

If the lands we are to buy in the Philippines be not safeguarded against these dangers we shall transplant an ancient curse to our new trust estate. The tillers of the soil should live by their labor and the surplus revenue which the land produces beyond that should accrue to the entire people and ought not to be private wealth. If the Philippine lands shall be let down to speculators providing for the time real or fraudulent occupiers all the evils of the middleman of India, chronic impoverishment of the soil, known in Ireland as subletting, will be established in the archipelago and will become a perennial plague, robbing simultaneously both the tenants and the government.

If the government of the United States buys lands in those islands it should retain the fee. Use of the lands should be leased to actual occupiers within reasonable areas. There should be no middlemen and no subletting. Revaluation at prescribed periods upon a basis of practical arbitration should be the bond between the fee holder and the occupiers.—Editorial in Chicago Chronicle of Feb. 4.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

CLEVELAND TRACTION PROBLEMS FROM A CHICAGO POINT OF VIEW.

Cleveland has a street railway problem that presents many points of similarity to the traction question with which Chicago is wrestling. The grants in Cleveland begin to run out in 1904 and 1905, and expire at varying dates thereafter until 1912 and 1914. The chief difference between the situation in Chicago and that in Cleveland seems to be that the companies in Cleveland do not assume that the near expiration of their grants is any warrant for allowing their service to deteriorate. Plant and equipment in Cleveland are maintained in first-class condition and the management is progressive and awake to the needs of the public.

The legislature of Ohio in 1896 passed a law making 50 years instead of 25

Digitized by Google

years the time limit of street railway grants and otherwise favoring seekers after franchise privileges. Senator Foraker was the chief lobbyist for this measure, which was taken as the model for the Allen law passed by the Illinois legislature a year later. In Cincinnati, Senator Foraker's home town, the companies succeeded in securing the coveted 50-year grants authorized by law. But in Cleveland the popular outcry against 50-year renewals was so great that the companies could not get the necessary ordinances through the council.

The succeeding legislature repealed the odious law, just as the Illinois legislature was obliged by public sentiment to repeal the Allen law. Mayor Farley, of Cleveland, went into office three years ago on a definite pledge not to permit renewals during his term. A year ago Tom L. Johnson succeeded Farley as mayor.

Mayor Johnson at once took the aggressive. His pet ideas in the street railway line are three-cent fares and municipal ownership. His administration has formulated and sent to Columbus bills authorizing Ohio cities to own and manage their public utilities. In addition Mayor Johnson has formulated and had approved by the city council an ordinance providing for several new street railway lines.

The ordinance provides that the company offering to carry passengers for the lowest rate of fare shall have the franchise, but no bid will be accepted that specifies a higher rate of fare than three cents. There must also be universal transfers on the lines of the company. The ordinance calls for grooved rails. It stipulates that the men shall not work more than ten hours a day and binds the company to arbitrate with its employes disputes that threaten to interfere with the operation of the road. The grant runs for a period of 20 years, but there is a reservation to the city of the right to buy at any time the entire plant and property of the company at its valuation—excluding all franchise values—but with an allowance of ten per cent. additional as compensation for the compulsory sale. After ten years from the passage of the ordinance all net earnings of the company over eight per cent. are to be shared equally with the city. The right is reserved to the council to authorize any other party or parties to use jointly with the grantee not to exceed ten per cent. of the total trackage granted. There are provisions for publicity.

Mayor Johnson says he is sure that there will be at least one bid for the franchise and he hopes for several. If that be the case the only thing that can block his plan for a road with a three-cent fare in Cleveland is the frontage-consent law. Mayor Johnson has had introduced in the legislature a bill repealing the law requiring frontage consents as a prerequisite to the construction of a street railway. He also has city employes out circulating petitions to get the consent of property owners under the law as it stands. He seems to be succeeding fairly well in this, but under the Ohio law consents once given may be revoked.

It seemed to me at first thought that the plan to invite a competing company into the field, unless absolutely necessary as a last resort, was a move in the wrong direction. So I asked Mayor Johnson if his effort to introduce competition into what should be treated as a monopoly business was not contrary to the best trend of thought among municipal reforms. He replied that he did not believe in competition in such business, but that the Ohio law required it if the grant was to be made at all as he desired to make it. He insisted that the new lines he was planning were actually needed. Cleveland, he said, was a rapidly growing city and no new lines had been built for several years. He preferred that the companies already in the field should take the lines, if they would, on the terms offered. If not, he thought, under the circumstances, a new company should be permitted to enter the field.

Another reason, apparently, why Mayor Johnson is pushing this plan is that he hopes to make use of it to bring about early municipalization in Cleveland. Mayor Johnson believes in municipal ownership and operation of street railways just as soon as it can be brought about. I fancy it is his ambition to make Cleveland the first city in the country to manage its own street railway lines. Under the ordinance as proposed the city may buy the property at any time. If legislation authorizing municipalization shall be secured before the existing grants of the old companies expire, and if the city shall have taken over and shall be operating the lines of the new company, the city, with very good grace, may refuse to renew the expiring grants at all, but instead will be in a position to ask the old companies to sell to the city all of their tangible property and go out of business. I have no authority for saying that what I have just outlined is Mayor Johnson's plan, but I strongly suspect that is just what he has in mind.

Mayor Johnson is not confining his activities to Cleveland. He is also taking a hand in matters at the state capital. Last fall Johnson gave special attention to the selection of legislators from his county—Cuyahoga. He used his influence to secure the nomination of strong men and then made a fight for their election, the taxation question being the chief issue. Johnson is making a fight to secure a system of taxation that will bring more revenue from the railroads and other corporations of the same general nature, which, he asserts, do not now bear a fair share of the burdens of taxation. As a result of the contest made every member of the present Ohio legislature from Cuyahoga county is a Democrat, and the entire delegation —four senators and ten representatives—is friendly to Johnson. In other words, Senator Hanna, the fellow-townsman of Mayor Johnson, has not a single representative from his home county in the state legislature.

Johnson does not stop with having helped to send to the legislature a delegation to his liking. He spends three or four days of every week at Columbus, taking charge of the fight his delegation is making for tax reform and municipal ownership legislation. It will thus be seen that Johnson is in an excellent position to raise issues that he and his friends doubtless hope will enable them to secure control of the state government at the next election. There probably will be interesting developments at the state capital of Ohio during the present winter.—George C. Sikes, secretary committee on local transportation in Chicago, in Chicago Daily News of Feb. 4.

CONSENTS FOR THE NEW THREE-CENT LINES.

According to those members of the city administration who have watched the progress of Mayor Johnson's low fare project with the greatest care, the ordinance which was authorized by the council Monday night, providing for the establishment of lines of railway by John B. Hoefgen along the routes already laid out by the mayor, will surely be presented at the council at its next meeting, Monday night. These same men are equally positive that the ordinance will pass the council without opposition.

"The matter of securing the consents of the property owners along the routes proposed is all that re-

Digitized by Google