

iquity of ours must be shunted off upon God; but that might sound impious to this pious doctor of divinity, though asked never so reverently. Dr. Mitchell is evidently a type of the kind of pietists Lowell satirized in his "John P. Robinson" of the Mexican war period, of whom he wrote:

We were gittin' on nicely up here to
our village,
With good old idees o' wuts right
and wut aint;
We kind o' thought Christ went agin
war and pillage,
An' that epyplets wornt the best
mark of a saint.
But John P.
Robinson he
Sez this kind o' thing's an ex-
ploded idee.
Parson Wilbur sez he never heerd in
his life
Thet th' Apostles rigged out in
their swallow-tail coats,
An marched round in front of a drum
and a fife,
To git some on 'em office an' some
on 'em votes.
But John P.
Robinson he
Sez they didn't know everythin'
down in Judee.

It is gratifying to learn that Recorder Goff, one of the judges of the criminal court of New York city, has administered a severe and much needed rebuke to the police of that city for inflicting the "sweat-box" outrage upon persons arrested upon charges of crime. But a rebuke from the bench is not enough. This lawless torture process of the police, called the "sweat-box," should be brought to the attention of grand juries by the judges, with explicit instructions. They should be told that it is a crime for the police to lay hands upon an untried prisoner beyond what is necessary to secure his presence for trial; and that no prisoner can lawfully be interrogated by the police to any greater extent than may be necessary for identification, nor even by a magistrate in open court without being warned that he need not answer. That is the law, and every police officer who oversteps it is himself a criminal.

When the oleomargarine bill was before Congress, the argument was

made for it that it was intended to interfere with the oleomargarine operations of the meat trust. But now it appears that the meat trust was directly interested in having the bill become a law, and is indebted to the majority in Congress for passing and the President for signing it. It lessens their competition, in fact gives them the monopoly of the oleomargarine business. This appears in an interview with A. L. Allingham, formerly connected with the meat trust. The interview was published in the New York Commercial of May 9, 1902. Mr. Allingham said in that interview that the big packing houses can pay the ten per cent. tax and still compete with butter makers. But not so with the small oleomargarine manufacturers. Said he:

If the oleomargarine business was in the hands of small independent manufacturers the 10 per cent. tax would kill the business, but the big packing houses handle it in connection with their meat business, their plants are established, they use in the oleomargarine by-products of the packing houses and they know they are free from competition.

Tom L. Johnson's efforts, when he was a Congressman and on the District of Columbia Committee of the House, to secure the taxation of vacant land values, is beginning to bear fruit. The Washington public is coming to appreciate the injustice of allowing these values to escape. This is a matter in which the whole country, as well as Washington, is interested, for Congress pays out of the national treasury 50 per cent. of the local expenditures of the District. In consequence the land owners of Washington are enriched at national expense. Yet those of them who stand in the way of improvements, demanding higher and higher prices for sites, are actually encouraged by the assessors. Of this the Washington Times of the 5th sensibly said:

While no exact figures are at hand, it is safe to say that not less than 25 per cent. of the unimproved land in the entire area of the District contributes practically nothing to the support of the local government. Of this unimproved land a large proportion is in large tracts which are held

for the purpose of speculation. They are assessed as agricultural lands, and, as such, pay merely a nominal tax. Even when subdivided and laid off in streets and lots they pay but two-thirds of the tax levied on improved property. In either case the owners can well afford to wait for the opportune moment when a demand arises for such property. If the same tax levied on improved property were exacted from such land the owners would not only contribute their proper share toward the maintenance of the municipality, but they would improve it as rapidly as possible, and these improvements would, in their turn, add to the income of the local treasury. This increase in the revenue would, in a very few years, amount to a far larger sum than will ever be realized from a personal tax.

It is not quite clear why the Times should be anxious to promote improvements in order to tax them, but in other respects its comment is excellent; and many municipalities besides Washington might consider it to advantage.

Some of the "reorganizing" Democratic papers of the East and the middle West are pointing to the election of the Democratic candidate for governor of Oregon as evidence that the Democratic party can win when it is united. Then why did not the whole Democratic ticket win in Oregon? The party was as much united for the other candidates as for governor, but only the governor won. The other candidates were defeated by thousands of votes. The fact is that the Democratic candidate for governor was a popular non-partisan, while the Republican was unpopular and had angered a powerful faction of his own party. The only "getting together," in the "reorganizing" sense, that took place in the Democratic party in Oregon, consisted in "getting together" with the Republicans upon a platform which was publicly characterized by the Democratic candidate for governor as substantially the same as the Republican platform. If this constitutes "getting together," why not take up the Republican platform itself and abandon the Democratic party? As Gov. Altgeld once said, "there is no neces-