can to defeat him; while the municipal ownership interests, those that believe in municipal ownership and not merely make believe to believe in it, are for the most part supporting him.

—

Mayor Harrison is pledged to two things, upon which he has made his emphasis so strong that there is no mistaking the significance of his declarations. One of these is that there shall be no extension of traction franchises until all claims under the 99-year act are abandoned. This condition is of the utmost importance. An extension of franchises before those claims are abandoned would postpone the whole question, leaving the traction companies in full possession of the club they are wielding now. The other thing to which Harrison is pledged is that there shall be no extension of franchises until the legislature has passed an enabling act empowering the city of Chicago to adopt municipal ownership. Mr. Stewart's pledge to the same effect can count for little. He is vague, while Harrison has committed himself to a definite and acceptable plan. In addition, Mr. Stewart's own party is in control of the legislature and could pass a proper enabling act at once if it intended to do so. The fact that it has hung up the whole matter until after the Chicago election is sufficient evidence that the pledge of the Republican candidate is nothing but a "good enough Morgan" till after election. Nor does Mr. Stewart's eleventh hour appeal to his party in control of the legislature to legislate in some way for municipal ownership before election, help the matter. It only advertises his own weakness and draws attention to his vacillation and to the fact that his pledges are nothing but campaign talk.

—

The single tax vote in the House of Commons on the 27th is an ecouraging tribute to the excellent work that has been done by British single tax men to popularize their cause. They have wasted no energy in trying to establish impossible side parties; they have waged no fights for classes or against classes; they have not made the welkin ring with empty boastings of the all-absorbing progress of their movement. But by working patiently with the Liberal party, and appealing to the sense of justice common to all classes instead of invoking class hatreds, they have one by one secured the favor of hundreds of municipalities toward their policy, and this in turn has secured them the organized support of the Liberal party in parliament for their primary legislative measure—the right of municipalities to adopt land values taxation. Though their measure was not carried, it drew so many of the ministerial party over to the Liberal side that in a House overwhelmingly Conservative its defeat was effected by only 13 majority. The important fact, however, is that the Liberal members of parliament have now by their action on the measure committed their party to it as part of its programme. When that party comes into power, as it is likely to do at the next general election, it will be obliged to secure for this single tax measure the sanction of parliament.

—

The growing popularity of the single tax idea of home rule in taxation and of the taxation of land values, is not confined to Great Britain. A committee of the Bar association of New York recommends the local option feature; and the Tax Commission of the same State has, in its annual report recently made, rather crudely, yet unmistakably, suggested the advisability of land values taxation. Protesting against what it aptly calls fining men for improving their real estate, the report of this commission goes on to say:

> Under our existing law the assessors cannot be fairly criticised, but it is prejudicial to the State, to communities and to civic and individual progress and pride that improvement and advancement should be discouraged by fines. Could unimproved houses and vacant lands be the heavier assessed, sale of material and employment of labor would increase, handsomer communities would materialize, and the State take a long stride forward.

—

And the Boston Post makes an unqualified defense of the single tax idea, simply as a fiscal reform. After commenting editorially upon the inequitable results of attempts at personal property taxation as disclosed by the personal tax scandals of New York, the Post of the 27th closes with these words:

> Could there be any more forcible illustration of the advantage of a system which levies taxes on property which cannot be concealed or sworn off or lied about in any way? The assessment of taxes on the basis of ground rent would put an end at once to the shameful evasion of responsibility of which we have such a vivid example in New York to-day.

—

There is something queer about the action of the Federal judge at St. Louis in conection with the injunction against the Wabash strikers. Judge Adams now holds, after hearing both sides that the officers of the labor organization affected by the injunction did not purpose to order the contemplated strike officiously, but that they were about to order it as the result of a vote of the employes, acting without coercion and directly authorizing it. For this reason the injunction is dissolved. It would not have been granted in the first place, such is the implication, if the judge had not been made to believe that the truth was the reverse of this. Yet the fact which Judge Adams now learns was notorious at the time he granted the injunction. He himself must have known it. Everybody else did.

—

The railroad officials who swore to what Judge Adams now decides to have been false must have known its falsity. Yet they were able to swear hard enough to its truth to mislead him into granting an absurd injunction not only improvidently, but with extreme haste. If the Federal statutes against perjury are of any value, here is an opportunity to prove it. Judge Adams himself should be indignant enough at the fraud that