The Public

Fourth Year. CHICAGO, SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1902. Number 209.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post-office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last column of last page.

Congressman Cannon has vigorously and successfully opposed Congressman Sulzer's motion for an appropriation to keep alight the torch of "Liberty Enlightening the World," the colossal statue in New York harbor. The motion was defeated by 67 votes to 61. This decision was appropriate. The political party which by its world power policy of war and conquest has put out the old light of American liberty enlightening the world by force of example, shows a due regard for the eternal fitness of things when it darkens the torch of the great statue which, with its face turned to the open sea, symbolizes to all the world a true American spirit of peace and gentle conquest.

A remarkable policy of commercial retaliation is outlined this week by the Washington correspondents of administration papers. It is said that the Secretary of Agriculture is about to publish a list of imports from Europe, which, being deleterious to health, may be excluded under the Dingley law. This list is expected to "give Europe something to ponder over." Its publication is proposed as a warning to "all the European nations, especially Germany, of the tremendous power lodged in the hands of the United States government, which can be used to retaliate effectively against any nation which, by unjust discrimination, excludes American products of farm and factory from its markets." Our quotations are from the Chicago Tribune's Washington correspondence of the 30th, published on the 31st. If the correspondent is to be trusted, we have here in contemplation a policy which ought to make Americans ponder much more seriously than Europeans. The listed imports, it will be observed, are deleterious to health —to the health of our own people. Yet they are to be admitted or excluded with reference, not to this fact, but, with this fact serving merely as the excuse, for the purpose of waging a war of markets. Americans may continue to suffer from deleterious food and be blessed accordingly, provided Europe does not shut out American exports; but if Europe does that, then the administration will retaliate by excluding unwholesome goods, which, but for the retaliatory necessity, it would continue to admit.

That was a great victory for the future of good government which was won in Chicago at the municipal election this week. Not the election of good men to office, though several of those elected are good men. Not that, for good men often go wrong if they really were good or get found out if they were not. The real victory was the heavy referendum vote on abstract questions of city government, proving that the people do express themselves on questions referred when they have a chance. And that great victory was made all the greater by the large majority on the right side of the questions submitted. The credit for this day's work belongs chiefly to Allen Ripley Foote, who drafted the advisory referendum law under which it was achieved; to Clayton E. Crafts, who, as a member of the legislature a year ago, secured its passage; to Daniel Cruice, who organized the machinery for securing the huge petition and directed the work to its consummation; and, among the newspapers, to the American, the only Chicago paper that did not either openly or covertly oppose the movement or damn it with faint praise. The American was unceasing in its activity in promoting the work of the referendum league. Great credit belongs to thousands of others, but these can be named without making invidious distinctions. It now behooves the city council and the mayor to go slow, with an exceeding great slowness, in further extending the profitable street privileges of private corporations.

One of the most refreshing legal decisions recently made was rendered last week by Judge Tuley, of Chicago, in a street car franchise tax case. The traction companies of Chicago had applied for an injunction to prevent the collection of the taxes assessed against them for local purposes, which, thanks to the school-teachers' fight (p. 650), were assessed upon full valuations. Two points were made. One was that the legislature has no power to allow a state board to assess corporations in any one county for purely local purposes. Judge Tuley made quick and decisive work of that point, holding that the legislature has full power to invest a state board or any other official body with authority to levy county taxes so long as the taxes are uniform. But it was the other point that excited his judicial indignation. The companies contended that inasmuch as the property of the taxpayer in Cook county is assessed at only 60 per cent. of its value, that of the companies ought to be assessed at no more than 60 per cent. It seems that a new generation of lawyers has grown up with a distorted notion that the law requiring full valuations has no standing in court against this fraudulent 60 per cent. custom of assessors. But Judge Tuley is old enough to know what the law was before corporation lawyers got to twisting it, and he read the lawyers in this case a

lesson. He told them that the attempt of their clients to evade their taxes in this way was "clearly not founded either in good law or in sound morals." Because other taxpayers escape, he explained, is no valid reason why these companies should escape. Their remedy is to take steps to have the other tax dodgers properly assessed. It is to be hoped that the company may act upon that suggestion. If the school-teachers' prosecution of the traction companies for tax dodging should set the traction companies on the trail of the big real estate tax dodgers, a mighty ball would have been set a-rolling, and the Chicago treasury would no longer be empty.

In the course of his opinion on the traction case Judge Tuley directed attention to the anomalous situation in Chicago regarding public revenues. What he said was right to the point and was too compactly expressed to admit of further condensation:

The "net assessed value" of property in Chicago for 1901, with a population of over 2,000,000, was $374,000,000 and the assessed value of property for taxable purposes in Chicago in 1873, when this city was but an infant, with a population of about 300,000, was over $312,000,000, with no limitation as to rate. Between 1873 and 1901 the city has extended its limits and more than doubled the area liable to taxation; and, while it is not shown by the evidence in this case, no one who knew the city in 1873 and knows it now can doubt that the aggregate wealth of its present extended area is more than ten times that of 1873, and that the "net assessed value" of property for taxation should have been more than twice that returned in 1901. It is a notorious fact that much property is assessed too low and that much property in some way or other escapes being listed; also that property in nearly all parts of the city is now paying less taxes than it has in any year for the last 15 years. The consequence is insufficient revenue for both city and county purposes. Our police force, always inadequate, must be reduced; our fire department must be crippled, our schools must be closed, the salaries of the school teachers must be cut and both city and county find themselves in a deplorable situation for want of the necessary revenue to pay ordinary and necessary expenses. Somebody is to blame for this. Aside from "tax-dodging," which has become epidemic, almost the entire responsibility therefor must rest upon the State Board of Equalization, and the boards of assessors and review, whose duty it is to find property that is liable to assessment, assess it and assess it at its "full valuation," upon one-fifth of which only can taxes (limited as to rate) be imposed. If these officials have failed in this duty—as they apparently have, but not with any fraudulent intent so far as shown—the remedy is not in a court of chancery. It is no part of the duty of a court of chancery to raise revenue or defeat the raising of revenue. If there is any remedy for this state of affairs it does not lie with the courts, but with the voters. It is for them to apply the remedy. In conclusion I can only say that from the evidence now before the court this bill to enjoin the payment of taxes assessed against the complainant's property is clearly not founded in good law nor in good morals.

The currency provisions of the Lodge Philippine bill do seem like an attempt with reference to the silver question, to "try it on the dog." Should this bill pass, a mint is to be established at Manila for the free coinage of silver dollars containing 416 grains of standard silver 900 fine, which is about the ratio with gold of 16 to 1. It is explained by friends of the bill that this is not "Bryanism," because these dollars will be estimated in foreign trade at bullion value; as if that would not have been done with Bryan silver dollars, as if it is not always done with all metal money, gold included. The explanation is altogether too gauzy. It explains no more than that the Philippine dollars are not to be good by law beyond the territory where the law is effective, which is a begging of the question. As they are to be legal tender at face value in the Philippines, the plan appears to contemplate "the free and unlimited coinage" of silver in these islands at the ratio of 16 to 1 with gold, "without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation." If that is not "Bryanism" on the money question, it is only because there is no provision for coining gold as well as silver. The motive for this Republican departure on the money question is somewhat obscure; and probably the Chicago Evening Post, a Republican paper, makes a close guess when it suggests that it is a "bribe to the silver States." In other words, the Republicans realize that the silver question is not as dead as they affect to believe, and in dealing with it directly by legislation, even for the far-off Philippines, they are just a bit tenderfooted.

Nevertheless, the proposed Philippine coinage is not a 16 to 1 proposition. It lacks the vital thing noted above. By not providing for gold coinage with silver coinage, and on the same terms at the given ratio, it leaves out the element of "Bryanism." The essence of the whole thing is this, that it is not proposed to coin dollars at all, but half dollars—there or thereabouts—if we regard gold dollars as the dollar unit. For the Philippines are upon a silver basis, pure and simple. When you buy a "dollar's worth" there, you can pay the bill twice over with a gold dollar or its equivalent. A Philippine silver dollar, then, is, with reference to the gold dollar as the unit, only half a dollar; and it is these half dollars that it is proposed to coin, under the name of dollars. Some apologist for the bill explains that the new coinage is intended to displace the worn out, poorly minted and overalloyed Mexican pieces, with nice new American silver of full standard purity. That would be a feat, indeed; for if it were done, what would become of the invariable Gresham law, according to which the poorer money always drives out the better. Wouldn't the inferior Mexican drive out the superior American as fast as it was coined?

The following extract from the Indianapolis Journal probably expresses with brevity and accuracy the prevailing ignorance on the subject of breach of neutrality in connection with the Boer war which this country is permitting at New Orleans:

All the talk against the purchase of supplies by Great Britain in this country as being in violation of international law is due to ignorance or demagogy. Since the beginning of the republic foodstuffs, horses and all prod-