

latter is public property and should be taxed to the utmost. For taxing purposes the true distinction of property is not individual and corporate. There is no just reason for taxing the same kind of property more when a corporation owns it than when it is owned by individuals. The true distinction is between different kinds of property. Let the kind of property, however valuable, that enterprise and industry produces be exempt; but tax that which, having value, is vested in individuals or corporations by the public. Exempt the street car, but tax the value of the street franchise; exempt the locomotive, but tax the value of the right of way; exempt the good will of the department store, but tax the valuable lot it monopolizes; exempt the house, but tax the value of its site.

Colorado has adopted an amendment to her constitution which runs in the right direction. It empowers cities to make their own charters. This is a step toward the localization of power in municipalities, which seems to be in some sort a reaction from the centralization policies which followed in the wake of the civil war and have almost obliterated State sovereignty.

As the Colorado amendment is called the "home rule amendment," the announcement of its adoption has led to the supposition, widely published, that the Bucklin amendment (p. 498), which provided for home rule in taxation, had been adopted notwithstanding earlier reports to the contrary. This is a mistake. Beyond all doubt the Bucklin amendment was lost. It was defeated by probably something less than two to one. Exact figures cannot be given until the official count is announced. Only two counties are known to have been carried for it—Teller county, embracing Cripple Creek, where the affirmative vote was 2,593 to 1,620; and Lake county, embracing Leadville, where it was 1,590 to 823. Owing to misrepresentations and rustic prejudice the farming regions

voted strongly against the amendment. This influence defeated it in Bucklin's own county of Mesa. Under the circumstances, however, the Mesa county vote was astonishing. The county is Republican, the Republicans had made a party fight against the amendment, and the farming districts gave a majority of 342 against it. Yet it was defeated in the whole county by only 90 votes. It carried Bucklin's precinct by 29, his ward by 11, his city—Grand Junction—by 115, and the other towns of the county by 252.

Besides the thoughtless farmer vote, several causes operated to defeat the Bucklin amendment, none of which had any reference to its merits. For one thing the land speculators were strong enough in the Democratic party to prevent its adopting the amendment as a party measure. That party thereby lost an opportunity to make general the enthusiasm which Bucklin, campaigning almost alone, produced in limited degree. Had the Democrats not made this blunder, they would have drawn out the "stay-at-home" vote, which was almost wholly Democratic, would have held many Socialists and most of the Populists, and would have carried the election for their candidates instead of suffering defeat. It is evident, also, that in those circumstances the amendment would have carried. For with no political party, with no great daily paper, with no other political leader than Bucklin, with only a little money, and against the largest campaign fund ever raised in Colorado, against all the political leaders of both parties (including Senators Patterson and Teller), against most of the daily press, against the influence and corruption of all the large corporations and the consequent opposition of their dupes in the farming regions, against the impulse of a State reaction to the Republican party, against the political machines of both parties, and against more or less dishonesty in the count—in spite of all these dis-

advantages, fully one-third of the total vote of the State appears to have been cast for the defeated amendment.

In his report the postmaster-general describes the mailing rights of periodical publishers under the law as a subsidy. If this is true, and we agree with the postmaster general that it is, the remedy is not what the postmaster general proposes. He asks for the privilege, practically autocratic, of distributing the subsidy himself. Nothing more dangerous in the way of bureaucracy could be proposed. It is bad enough that Harper's Magazine, for instance, should receive an enormous postal subsidy, amounting to thousands of dollars a month, while the share of the Cross Roads Gazette is only a few cents a week. But if the postmaster general were empowered to pick and choose, allowing a slice of the subsidy to this publisher and denying it to that one, the situation would be infinitely worse. If low rates of postage for periodicals are in effect a subsidy to publishers, the remedy is to abolish them. Publishers have no more right to subsidies than farmers have, or coal miners, or hod carriers. Let a fair estimate be made of the cost of carrying publishers' matter, then let the postage be fixed upon that basis, simply allowing publishers to mail in bulk instead of affixing stamps, and you have a just arrangement, and one which has the merit of curbing the censorship of the American press which the postal department assumes to exercise.

The evil in this matter would not be removed by discriminating between newspapers and magazines, as the postmaster general also proposes, and carrying the former at one cent a pound and the latter at four cents. Such a distinction would enormously increase the power of the postal autocrat to exclude papers he did not like. All he would need do would be to decide that they are not newspapers, but only magazines. Moreover, a newspaper is no more entitled to a