riam and democratic Democrats for Dunne. After the primaries—well, we shall see what we shall see.

✣ ✣

The Police "Sweat Box."

When a Congressional committee appointed to investigate the fact and the uses of the police "sweat box" (vol. xiii, pp. 435, 444, 587, 724, 750), had entered upon its duties, it was blandly assured by the veracious police authorities that there is no such thing at all as a police "sweat box." We beg, therefore, to call the attention of that committee to the Chicago newspapers of the 5th. The committee will find—in the "Tribune," for instance,—that "Leslie Carlson, 12 years old, after defying Inspector of Police P. D. O'Brien, Capt. John McWeeney, and Lieut. Patrick McCauley for two days, last night confessed," etc., etc. "The confession came after a series of conflicting stories told by young Leslie, in which he stoutly maintained his innocence," and "it was not until near midnight that he finally broke down."

✣

Some such inquisitional proceeding ought, it may be, to be authorized by law. Possibly a due administration of justice demands it. But we are not considering that question just now. The question we have to ask is, Where did those policemen get their authority in the law for "bullyragging" a twelve-year-old boy, a prisoner in their custody, for two days and far into the night? A judicially protected course of legal procedure for the examination of persons under arrest upon accusations of crime, is favored by the public policy of the continent of Europe; the public policy of the English speaking peoples, has long opposed even that. But whether that policy be sound or not, who can justify such examinations by irresponsible policemen, with no protection for the prisoner through judicial supervision, and *absolutely in defiance of the existing law?*

✣ ✣

Governor Deneen on Trial.

Whether Gov. Deneen knew it or not when he wrote his message, he should know now, that in dealing with the Initiative and Referendum he advises precisely the kind of Initiative and Referendum that is desired by the plundering business interests and their politicians—those who make legislative "jackpots" and those who divide them. They want the provisions of the measure adapted, to quote the Governor's proposal, "to the concentration of public opinion upon an important public measure rather than to dissipate and confuse it in the consideration of many measures of minor importance." By the constitutional restrictions necessary to secure that concentration, the Initiative and Referendum, as a people's power agent, would be strangled, and this is what the rascals want. Is it Gov. Deneen's ambition to please the rascals, or is he only their dupe? Has he set out to play the same game with the Initiative and Referendum that he played so long with the direct primary movement? We shall see when the Illinois legislature gets down to the business of carrying out the mandate of the people of Illinois. The Republican party of Illinois is pledged to the Initiative and Referendum, in reasonably available form for the people's use, and not deformed by "concentration:" the Democratic party of Illinois is pledged to the same kind of Initiative and Referendum; and the people have voted 447,908 to 128,398 (vol xiii, p. 1186), not for a "concentrated" Initiative and Referendum, but for one allowing the people to Initiate any legislation on an 8 per cent petition, and to veto any legislation on a 5 per cent petition. Governor Deneen has an opportunity now to recover somewhat of the public confidence his "running with the hares and hunting with the hounds" has cost him; but his message on the question of Direct Legislation reads like the "same old" juggling.

✣ ✣

An Argument That May Work Either Way.

Having spent nearly four years in expanding the salaries of the fancy grades of office holders, the Busse administration of Chicago is now proposing to economize on civil service employes. In this it is encouraged by every labor sweater in the city. One of the sweaters is sure that the civil service employes get from 30 to 40 per cent more than similar employes of private corporations, which is to say, he observes, that the city civil service employe is getting "more than he ought to get." But why is it not rather to say that the corporation employe is getting "less than he ought to get"?

✣ ✣

Locating the Trouble.

When the land value tax was applied in Vancouver, B. C., a year ago the building record began to increase by leaps and bounds. That tax encouraged building and discouraged land speculation. Now comes the Philadelphia Inquirer, saying that the building record of its city in 1910 was several millions below that of 1909. Why? Arthur E. Buchholz, chief of the tenement house

division of the Department of Health of Philadelphia, has just made statements in his annual report in which he puts his finger on the sore spot in Philadelphia. And every American city has the same sore spot. Speaking of the development of wholesome surroundings and proper home conditions, and of the legislation necessary to carry out the objects of the Philadelphia Housing Commission, Chief Buchholz says:

Without subscribing to the single tax theory, it must be obvious to every one that land values in a city are mainly created by society itself. It is inevitable that society will give more and more to demand for all the people an increasing share of these values which the people have produced. The ultimate effects of speculative land values prove that the individual who is allowed to enjoy an excessive private profit is virtually permitted to monoplize somewhat the light and air, which are supposed to be free. Excessive land values mean that little children and comparatively resourceless families shall be unable to have about their dwellings the land spaces designated to proper light and ventilation.

Land is the principal base of the whole housing problem. Land is not made by labor. There is nothing in the nature of an unimproved piece of ground to indicate that it should belong to one man rather than to another or to the State. Private possession of it has simply been considered the method by which the ultimate good of the whole community is best assured. Dwellings, unlike their building sites, are the products of human toil. The community should interfere as little as may be with their full enjoyment by the man who made them.

It is land, then, rather than the house built upon it, which should bear the heaviest burden of taxation. If vacant land is treated on this principle, if it is taxed upon its full selling value, there will be less vacant land and more houses. For it will be more profitable to erect rentable buildings on the land than to merely hold it for a speculative rise in value. In other words, in its treatment of unoccupied ground the community should collect through taxation a larger share of the rising value which it is itself creating.

That covers the so-called "housing problem" as completely as a haystack covers a nest of mice. It, at the same time, exposes that alleged problem as thoroughly as removal of the hay stack exposes the mice.

✣

There is more of the same kind in Chief Buchholz' report, for he says: "The policy of controlling railroads and other public utility corporations will be undoubtedly extended in time to the control of speculative land values, which cause more injury to the people than any other form of the unlimited private ownership of public necessities. Already we find European cities have established a system of land supervision based upon the principles by which the Interstate Commerce Commission controls railroads. The injustice and the social unwisdom of thus giving advantage and encouragement to the holders of vacant land, rather than to him who makes it beneficial to the community by erecting a residence upon it, is appreciated in Germany."

✣ ✣

Trying to Make Bricks Without Straw.

Cincinnati pays from $60 to $72 a year for each electric arc street light. Covington, just across the Ohio river from Cincinnati, pays $55 a year for each light of the kind used in Cincinnati. And the private corporations that light the two cities are practically one. Covington's lighting contract is for one year; the Cincinnati contract is for ten years. The present City Council of Cincinnati is considering the renewal of the contract for ten years after June 1, 1913, which will be five months after the terms of the present city officials expire! So, according to the Cincinnati Post, "to prevent a renewal for a 10-year period at an exorbitant rate civic organizations have demanded a public hearing on the specifications which Council had refused to require of service director Sundmaker"! If Cincinnati had a commission government, like that of Des Moines, of Cedar Rapids, of Colorado City, of Grand Junction, of Berkeley it would not be necessary for civic organizations to worry about public meetings over a proposed lighting contract. The real governing body of the city would then be the people, instead of the misgoverning body that now misrepresents the people of Cincinnati.

✣

This is quite a typical case. A political machine called the City Council seriously considers the making of a 10-year contract that will not go into effect until five months after the present Council has ceased to exist. Legally it has the power to hand the people of the city over to a private corporation for private taxation; for rates and charges of public service corporations are taxes. Should not the people who are to pay the taxes have the legal power to veto such a contract? The public service corporations claim that this legal right to tax the people is a "property right". If it is, then the civic bodies of Cincinnati are interfering with or attacking a "property right," are they not? Why should Cincinnati permit private corporations to take dividends out of the city's streets when the city is getting dividends out of its steam railroad, the Cincinnati Southern?