

The Public

Third Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1901.

Number 154.

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.

"A true empire-maker spoke on the subject of Cuba," says the tory Pall Mall Gazette in approval of President McKinley's inaugural speech.

Pathetic must have been the sight on the wharf at Manila when the wives, sweethearts and children of exiled Filipinos bade their loved ones good-by. But there was also a grim humor about it all. These exiles were natives, whom a foreign government was deporting for "rebellious" against it!

In the face of the reports of a riot in Puerto Rico in which the house of a school superintendent was besieged by a mob of 1,500 persons, because he had disciplined a schoolgirl, it is difficult to believe that the Puerto Ricans are altogether contented with American rule. This difficulty is increased by the report that the mob's cry was "Down with the Americans!" Such things are unpleasantly suggestive of a feeling among the Puerto Ricans that they are living under carpet-bag government.

Russia's assurance that she intends to recall her troops from Manchuria "as soon as lasting order shall have been established" there and "indispensable measures taken for the protection of railway construction," provided "the action of other powers does not place any obstacle," etc., has a homelike sound to American ears. It is almost an echo of our own assurances regarding Cuba. And we fear that it implies a similar purpose. There is something about its tone

which seems to say: "Manchuria is our meat."

The Cleveland municipal campaign has not yet fairly opened. The speaking campaign did not begin until the 12th. It is, therefore, not yet possible to forecast results with any reasonableness. But the contest promises to be exciting and the result significant. All the vested privileges and corporate interests of the city, all the beneficiaries of schemes for making the public pay tribute, are consolidated against Johnson. What they can do to defeat him they will. Not only does the election involve issues of great importance, but it is to be a great local trial of strength between the forces of monopoly and the forces of genuine democracy.

Some 2,000 out of the 6,000 teachers in the public schools of Chicago have signed a petition to the legislature, protesting against the compulsory pension system. This is a hopeful sign. It is especially hopeful because the petitioners display an awakened moral intelligence by definitely pointing their objection to the compulsory feature of the system. There is no reason, of course, why school-teachers should not maintain a system of voluntary pensions. Any number of teachers who wish to provide for pensions at their own expense should be at perfect liberty to do so. They earn their salaries, earn them richly if they do their duty as teachers, and those salaries are their own. Therefore, if they wish to contribute to a common fund for the purpose of providing pensions, that is their absolute right. But it is equally their right not to contribute to such a purpose. The law which would force them to do so robs them of their property. Such a law has no justification. To violate the eighth commandment

with an act of the legislature does not differ in essential principle from violating it with a loaded pistol.

Colorado has now taken a long stride toward the introduction in that state of a sound fiscal system, which would likewise be the basis for a sound social system. The lower house of the state legislature has passed the Bucklin tax amendment to the constitution. It had already been passed by the senate. The history of this amendment we told at page 729 three weeks ago. It authorizes any county in the state, at any general election, not oftener than once in four years, on petition of 100 resident taxpayers, to vote on the question of exempting personal property and landed improvements from local taxation, and of deriving all local revenue from land values irrespective of improvements. This system of local option has been introduced in New Zealand and some other parts of Australasia. It was recommended by the Bucklin tax commission after Senator Bucklin, chairman of the commission, had personally visited Australasia and investigated its application and effects. As the constitution of Colorado requires the taxation of all kinds of property, the recommendation of the commission could not be adopted without a constitutional amendment, and that is the course the matter has taken. The amendment was adopted by the senate on the 20th of February by a vote of 26 to 6, and by the house on the 12th of the present month by a vote of 50 to 11, being more in each house than the requisite two-thirds. It now goes to the governor for his signature, which it is certain to obtain, since he recommended its adoption in his inaugural message. After that it must be voted upon by the people, only a simple majority of those voting being re-

quired to ratify. This necessitates a campaign over the state of Colorado, which in itself will be well worth while. For its educational effect with reference to the principles and methods of taxation, and to the profound influence that taxing methods have upon industrial and social adjustments, and for that effect alone, the campaign will serve a great purpose.

But there is reason to believe that the Bucklin amendment will receive the necessary popular endorsement. Should that prove to be the case, Colorado will have opened the way for a reform which, while it possesses none of the elements of an emotional and sensational movement, is in the truest sense radical and altogether sane. For that accomplishment full credit will be due Senator Bucklin. He secured the appointment of the commission, he went at his own expense to Australasia, he prepared the instructive and statesmanlike report of the commission, and he has worked without cessation ever since his return, in the most dignified way and with most satisfactory results, to secure favorable legislative action.

A home rule amendment similar in principle to that which the Colorado legislature has just passed under the leadership of Senator Bucklin, is pending before the Texas legislature. Favorable sentiment is strong and growing in Texas, and the committee of one house has reported the amendment back with a recommendation that it be adopted. A vigorous fight for a kindred bill was made in the Delaware lower house. It was defeated, but under circumstances which encourage the hope of its adoption in the early future. By the Elsborg bill before the New York legislature, and the Crafts bill before the legislature of Illinois, the same reform is proposed. A bill of the same character has been brought into the Kansas legislature, and similar bills are pending in other states. Altogether the outlook is promising for

the establishment in this country, at no distant day, of the local option principle of taxation, and for the consequent speedy exemption from tax burdens, of industry, enterprise and thrift, and the taxation exclusively of land monopoly values. By that simple means shall monopoly be undermined, trusts be disintegrated, and all labor be secured abundant opportunity and full and just reward.

After his retirement from the presidency to private life, Benjamin Harrison won a place in the hearts of his fellow citizens which makes his death an occasion for national sorrow in greater degree than the death of an ex-president usually does. His administration was not satisfactory. On one occasion it came near involving us in a jingo war with a South American state, and it was tinged throughout with the worst discolorations of protectionism. This was the administration in which McKinley rose above the surface with his new tariff of abomination, which congress passed and the president signed. Probably no more candidly corrupt misuse of legislative power had ever before in the history of the country been made a party measure. It was so extravagantly corrupt that even James G. Blaine denounced it bitterly. Unfortunately for Mr. Harrison's record as president, that measure, rather than his administrative acts gave character to his administration. He was not at that time clear enough to analyze the fallacious economic doctrines, nor great enough to defy the corrupt and corrupting corporate powers, which were then making his party their own. But from the moment of his return to private life Mr. Harrison began to grow toward that full stature of American manhood and statesmanship to which he had attained when he died. In that interval his real record was made—a record which, for the sake of the democracy and republicanism of the nation, it is to be hoped his countrymen will never cease to honor.

For the voter whose ideas of the responsibilities of citizenship incline him neither to "take to the woods" when confronted with a political dilemma, nor to indulge himself in playing at politics, there is embarrassment enough and to spare in the pending municipal campaign in Chicago. The choice lies between two candidates, Harrison, the democrat, and Hanecy, the republican. One or the other will be elected. And no third candidate has developed strength sufficient to make a vote for him count even as a protest. None has so much as evoked opposition. Aside, therefore, from not voting at all, or from indulging one of several opportunities to play at voting, the Chicago voter's only alternative is Harrison or Hanecy. From partisan considerations, democrats would naturally vote for the former and republicans for the latter. And partisan considerations are not to be ignored. The notion that they have no place in municipal elections is a mistake arising out of the fallacious theory that national affairs are politics while municipal affairs are business. All public affairs, municipal as well as national, are politics; and the same mental tendencies and personal inclinations which separate us into two great camps—one enlisted in support more or less definitely of government by all and for all, and the other in support more or less definitely of government of all and for some—are no more applicable to national than to municipal elections. Moreover, just as our system of government rises from the local unit to the federal aggregation, so, in the nature of things, must our local political parties be as a rule integral parts of corresponding national parties. Partisanship is not necessarily reprehensible. Good partisanship is good citizenship. But partisan considerations are not always properly controlling, and this is most frequently the case in municipal elections. There are times, also, when a conscientious partisan may best serve party purposes in the higher sense by opposing his party. Such is the sit-