

prevailing there. The percentage of the item to the total income ranges from 20 per cent. in Frankfort down to 12 per cent. in Chemnitz. In England the item of rent is 25 per cent. of the total income and it is probably still higher in the United States.—Johnstown, (Pa.) *Democrat*.

#### BUT THE SINGLE TAX IS NOT A TAX

Taxes are one of the certainties, so Franklin tells us. But who will tell us what is the just and equitable mode of assessing them? No one is wholly satisfied with present methods. Real estate, being visible, is easily assessed, yet injustice is frequently done. An income tax is almost ideal, but unfortunately, when the tax-inquisitor makes his visit, all men are likely to be what the psalmist in his wrath said they were. Putting the tax on land only, as suggested by Henry George, might prove best, but, loathing taxes as they do, men still fear to abandon the good old troubles they have become accustomed to and fly to others they know not of.—Boston, (Mass.) *Globe*.

Mr. Joseph Fels has been saying things of late that have aroused universal attention. In Philadelphia at the City Club he said:

"We can't get rich in a lifetime nowadays," Mr. Fels said, "under the present system of things, unless we do so by robbing the people. I have made my money that way, and my firm is still doing it. You are all doing it. Every one of your self-made millionaires has done it. However, I want to say I have begun to recover my conscience, and I am going to devote my 'swag'—I like to call it that, for that's what it is—to doing away with the cursed system which makes it possible.

"If any of your millionaires feel the same way about it, for God's sake let's cross hands on it. I may be an oddity. It is unusual, though, for a man who has made his money by robbing the people through a monopoly to be called a curiosity. It is also a curiosity to find a man, after nearly fifty years of monopoly-mongering, to admit it and undergo a change of heart. But I am sincere."

#### NEWS—FOREIGN.

##### GREAT BRITAIN.

A DAY BIG WITH HOPE—OUR GREAT DEBT TO THE IRISH PARTY—JOSEPH FELS ACTIVE EVERYWHERE—VISIT OF HON. TOM L. JOHNSON—DEATH OF THE KING.

April 29th, 1910. This is our day of rejoicing, for on it Lloyd George's Finance Bill has received the Royal assent, which gives the force of law to the most Democratic measure ever placed on the Statute Books of Great Britain. To Single Taxers everywhere what a message of hope and encouragement?

Without doubt this is the most effective blow ever aimed at our "Old Man of the Sea"—the landed Aristocracy of these Islands. With the eye of faith we now get a glimpse of "the good time coming" of which our poets have sung and prophets foretold. This success of our Cause brings to mind the song of Thomas Wade:—

"The hoary dotard Aristocracy  
Shakes in its crumbling palace-halls; for  
hark!  
On the broad ocean of Democracy  
Floats Liberty, prepared to disembark  
On her predestin'd strand,  
This English land."

The value of this achievement is to be estimated not so much by what the measure itself gives us as by the possibilities it opens up for the future. For as Mr. Asquith said at Oxford on March 18th: "The Budget represents both in what it does and in what it promises for the future, the longest step in advance that has been taken in our time." As we Single Taxers now celebrate September 2nd, so in the years to come we shall celebrate April 29th. On the former date was born Henry George, the American Prophet, Philosopher and Political Economist. On the latter date Lloyd George, the British statesman, gave us the foundations on which to build an economic system, based on the philosophy of his great namesake.

Usually a Budget passes through all its stages in about three months. Lloyd George's occupied exactly twelve months,

having been introduced on April 29th, 1909, and having received the Royal Assent on April 29th, 1910. It was under discussion in the last Parliament on seventy-two Parliamentary days, during which were several all-night sittings, the Bill ultimately passing by a majority of 230. The 364 days between its introduction and the granting of the Royal Assent were full of incidents of a widely varying character. Periods of high hope to Single Taxers alternated with periods of disappointment and despair. In view of what has already appeared in the REVIEW it is not necessary to do more than briefly recall some of the events of that trying time.

From the moment the Budget statement was made the Landlords scented danger, and it was evident that only by courage, skill, and determination could the Bill be passed through its many stages. Fortunately for the cause of progress the man at the helm possessed the qualities necessary for steering the barque through the troubled waters. The Opposition was both violent and unscrupulous, and ever ready to misrepresent the measure with a view to turning public opinion against it. For instance Lord Rosebery speaking against it in the City Hall, Glasgow, in September last, said: "The Budget seeks to set up an inquisition unknown previously to Great Britain and a tyranny unknown to mankind . . . I think my friends are on the path that leads to Socialism . . . on that path I cannot follow." And again, "It is not in the best interests of the Nation that the Finance Bill should become law."

After this the people naturally expected that the Noble Lord, having realized the dangers of the situation, would head the revolt, but not so, for after having intensified the opposition of the privileged classes against the "inquisition" and "tyranny", he once more displayed those qualities which have invariably characterized his conduct in public life—he backed out of the fight, retired to his tent, and left others to bear the brunt.

At Bradford in 1894, Lord Rosebery dealt with the House of Lords Veto. Among other things he said: "It is the greatest issue that has been put to this Country since your Fathers resisted the

tyranny of Charles 1st. and James 2nd. . . . You are entering upon a great campaign, and it will not be an affair of Rosewater. . . . And I would ask you, if you are prepared to go into this fight, to fight it as your old Puritan forefathers fought—fight with their stubborn, persistent, indomitable will—fight as those Old Ironsides fought in Yorkshire, never knowing when they were beaten. . . . We fling down the gauntlet. It is for you to back us up." His Lordship is now trying to persuade the Lords to reform themselves.

The following verse is a very apt description of the Noble Lord.

"Lord R. was a gallant Captain,  
In battles much delighting.  
He fled full soon on the first of June  
But he bade the rest keep fighting."

Although he had said that the new financial policy would not be in the interests of the Country, Lord Rosebery was one of a few Peers who advised the House of Lords not to take the extreme step of rejecting it. However, other councils prevailed, and, under the specious plea of referring it to the people it was rejected by a majority of 275, the vote being for Lord Lansdowne's Amendment "That this House is not justified in giving its assent to this Bill until it has been submitted to the judgment of the Country." As if any Bill ever were submitted to the judgment of the Country!

This forced the Government to resign and appeal to the Country at least two years before their term of office would have expired. The General Election was fought in January and February on the question of the Budget and the Veto power of the House of Lords. The result of that Election has already been given in your columns. Within a few weeks there were rumors of dissolution and another appeal to the Country. At this time there appeared to be no possibility of the Finance Bill becoming an act of Parliament. At times Mr. Asquith appeared to be very weak and apathetic, and it was generally believed that the Government was riding for a fall. Radical, Labor, and Irish Nationalist M. P.'s had little faith in the members of the Government whilst the

Opposition, confident in its hopes of defeating them on the Budget vote became quite contemptuous and jeered at Ministers across the floor of the House.

There were evidences of dissension in the Cabinet about this time. The Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had no doubt set their hearts upon the carrying of the Budget, and such was the strain upon them in trying to keep their forces together that they were beginning to show signs of exhaustion and weariness. In the early part of April the clouds lifted, and once more our hopes revived, for the press gallery correspondent of the *Daily News* assured us that "the Budget is safe at last." And so it was. There had been some understanding with the Nationalists for, without their support, the Government was helpless. All along there had been divided opinion as to whether the Budget should precede or follow the efforts to abolish the Veto power of the Lords. The Irish Party refused to agree to the former having preference.

On March 29th, Mr. Asquith moved his Lords' Powers Resolutions, the effect of which will be, when embodied in law:

(1) "The House of Lords will have no word at all in the control of the National Finance.

(2) The House of Commons will have the last word in all matters of legislation.

(3) The maximum duration of Parliament will be five instead of seven years."

The opposition moved an amendment which was rejected by 357 to 251, (majority 106) the whole of the resolutions being carried by substantial majorities.

On April 19th, Lloyd George re-introduced the rejected Finance Bill and on the 20th the resolutions imposing the land and mineral duties was carried by a majority of 86. Its second reading was carried by a majority of 86 on April 25th and two days later the third reading was carried by a majority of 93. There being little fight left in the Opposition its second passage through the House of Commons was comparatively calm and speedy.

On the same day (April 27th,) it was re-introduced to the Lords under conditions very different from those which obtained on its introduction last year. The "back-

woods-men' who had been whipped up to reject it in November deemed it unwise to play the same game again. On the following day (April 28th.) it was read a second time and passed through all its stages. And, as, already stated, the final touch was given to it on the following day—April 29th.

Judged by results Mr. Asquith has lived up to his reputation and proved himself a safe, strong man, and a good Democrat withal and, no doubt, he will lead his forces to as successful an issue in the fight for the removal of the Lords' Veto as he has done on the far greater measure now safe on the Statute Books.

The Labor Party never acted better than during these trying times. They have rendered a more valuable service to the cause of the workers than they at present realise, for to them taxing Land Values is only a small thing. John Redmond has placed the Democracy of Great Britain under a special obligation to the Irish and their National cause, and doubtless they will get their reward when the path of progress has been cleared by the destruction of the Veto power of the House of Lords. John Dillon, T. P. O'Connor, and Joseph Devlin amongst other Irish Nationalists have done yeoman service.

With William O'Brien and his 7 or 8 followers it was quite different. He carried his opposition to the length of moving an amendment to the second reading of the Finance Bill and he charged the main body of Nationalists with a betrayal of Irish interests. Mr. Devlin delivered a slashing speech in reply to him and in support of the taxation of Land Values. The well merited castigation Mr. O'Brien got at the hands of Mr. Devlin will never be forgotten by those who heard it.

Now that the valuation of the land is assured the United Committee with the English and Scottish Leagues and their branches are directing their attention more particularly to the question of Rating Land Values. New Leaflets are being prepared and one now to hand contains quotations from Conservative Newspapers, and leading Conservative Speakers. These extracts will place them in a very awkward position if they raise objections later on.

Mr. Fels is just now carrying on a vigorous correspondence with Mr. Pretyma, na Tory M. P., in which our friend is scoring heavily.

Since I wrote you last we have had a visit from Tom L. Johnson and of the visit our monthly paper *Land Values* says:—

"Those of us who have been privileged to meet Tom L. Johnson, those who have looked for his coming to this Country for years have found all the impressions they formed of him more than realized and fulfilled. If they have one disappointment it is expressed in the question, Why did he not come earlier?"

The United Committee gave a Complimentary Dinner to Messrs. Joseph Fels and Tom. L. Johnson at the Trocadero Restaurant, London, on Monday April 11th. An old friend and veteran Land Reformer, Thomas F. Walker of Birmingham (an old friend of Henry George) presided.

The Dinner was a most pleasant affair and passed off as well as its promoters could have wished. I am sending you a newspaper report of which doubtless you will find space. A similar function was held in Glasgow and it was also a great success, the guests at the latter included Mr. John Paul, who is well known to all your readers as Editor of *Land Values* and Joint Secretary (with Mr. Crompton L. Davies) of the United Committee.

King Edward died on Friday night, as all your readers know. He was the most popular Monarch we have ever had in this Country and his death is mourned by all classes. Whether the sad event will have any material effect on the course of legislation is uncertain. Personally, I do not believe the progressive forces will tolerate any slackening of efforts on the part of the Government, and I do not think Mr. Asquith will yield to anything but a sense of duty. To modify the policy of the Government merely because of the accession of a new Sovereign would be to associate the Crown with the responsibility which only lies on His Majesty's advisers. At the most there can only be a few week's postponement of the struggle which has to determine once for all whether the People or the Peers are to govern.

F. SKIRROW.

LONDON, Eng.

## THE EXPLODED DEVIL.

(For the Review.)

Men don't believe in a devil now, as their fathers used to do;  
They have opened the doors of the widest creed to let his Majesty through,  
And there isn't a print of his cloven foot,  
nor a fiery dart from his bow,  
To be found in earth or air today, for the world has voted it so.  
But who is mixing the terrible draught that palsies heart and brain?  
Who loads the bier of each passing year with ten hundred thousand slain?  
The devil is voted not to be, and of course the thing is true;  
But who is doing the terrible work which the devil used to do?  
Won't somebody step to the front forthwith and make his bow and show  
How the frauds and the crimes of a day spring up? We'd greatly like to know.  
The devil is voted not to be, and of course the devil's gone,  
But simple people would like to know who carries his business on.

### THE ANSWER.

Mayhap, though the Devil himself is dead,  
he has left a lusty son,  
To boss the world in his sire's style, and father the crimes that are done.  
For the Devil, you know, with Selfishness wed, and the union was duly blessed  
By Monopoly's birth. Oh, the Devil may go! His son can attend to the rest!

—BOLTON HALL.

David Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, has written to Frederick C. Leubuscher, president Manhattan Single Tax Club, stating that he will not come to America this year, as was reported. The great pressure of public business will keep the Chancellor in England.

Rev. Lathrop Meeker, candidate for Congress, who resigned his pastorate of the Universalist Church at Revere, Mass., to enter politics, announces himself a believer in the taxation of land values and ultimate free trade. He is making a cart tail campaign.