

trouble that many who, by enjoying property rights which drain the life-blood of the community, directly promote it, join hands unreproved in the work of far-sighted social reformers.



#### Discouraging Speculators.

Johnstown (Pa.), Democrat, December 16.—The vacant lot industry is not flourishing in Pueblo as it did in the good old days before the adoption of the singletax. Speculators find that no one cares just now to take the chance of buying for a future rise. Of course, those who want to use the land are not alarmed at the prospect of paying a tax on the value of their holdings only. It is the fellow who doesn't intend to use the land that has a bad case of cold feet.



#### For a Senate Closure Rule.

William J. Bryan in The Commoner, January.—One by one the outposts of the predatory interests have been taken by the people. First, came the change in the rules of the House which enabled a majority to rule. For years the Speaker had been able to throttle legislation through power of appointment. Second, came the change in the rules of the Senate, which made them more democratic, if possible, than the rules of the House, thus assuring the control of that body by the majority. Third, and most important, came the change in the method of election of United States Senators—election by popular vote being substituted for election by legislatures. . . . Here are three great steps in advance, each one bringing us nearer to government of the people, by the people, and for the people. But there is one more reform necessary before the voice of the people will be supreme in national legislation, namely, the adoption of a cloture rule which will permit the majority to close debate and vote on a proposition. We hear a great deal about the advantage of thorough discussion, but that is not the question to be considered. Cloture does not mean that there shall not be all the time necessary for discussion; cloture simply means that there shall be a process within reach of the majority for the closing of debate and for the securing of a vote; and now is the time to make the change. We have a reform administration, and reform means affirmative action. . . . Under the rules as they now stand, it is impossible to pass a resolution, even though every member of the Senate may favor it, if for any reason a minority of the Senate desire to debate the resolution indefinitely in order to prevent action upon some other measure. A treaty, for instance, although approved by the necessary two-thirds, cannot be presented when any important measure is under consideration, because it opens the door to endless debate. . . . Why permit an obstructive minority to shorten the democratic program or to obstruct the passage of laws for which the people have voted. Care will, of course, be taken to safeguard legitimate discussion, but when sufficient time has been allowed for the expression of every shade of opinion and for the consideration of every objection that may be offered, there is no possible excuse for further delay. . . . The hour is ripe for the completion of the work

which the voters have undertaken—"let the people rule."

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### LONDON CHILDREN'S HYMN.\*

The fathers built this city  
In ages long ago,  
And busy in the busy streets,  
They hurried to and fro;  
The children played around them  
And sang the songs of yore,  
Till, one by one, they fell asleep,  
To work and play no more.

Yet still the city standeth,  
A hive of toiling men,  
And mother's love makes happy home  
For children now as then;  
O God of ages, help us  
Such citizens to be  
That children's children here may sing  
The songs of liberty.

Let all the people praise Thee,  
Give all Thy saving health,  
Or vain the laborer's strong right arm  
And vain the merchant's wealth;  
Send forth Thy light to banish  
The shadows of the shame,  
Till all the civic virtues shine  
Around our city's name.

A commonweal of brothers  
United, great and small,  
Upon our banner blazoned be  
The Charter, "Each for all!"  
Nor let us cease from battle,  
Nor weary sheathe the sword,  
Until this city is become  
The city of the Lord.

—William George Tarrant.



#### LAND AND PEOPLE.

Mather Smith in The Worker, the South African Labor Organ, as Reprinted in the Grain Growers' Guide of June 18, 1913.

The requisites of production being labor, capital and land, it has been seen that the impediments to the increase of production do not arise from the first of these elements. On the side of labor there is no obstacle to an increase of production indefinite in extent and of unslackening rapidity.—J. Stuart Mill.



"What we want is capital and labor," said General Botha, in the House of Assembly, two or three weeks ago.

"What we want is land," answer Capital and

\*As printed in The Survey of January 3, 1914.

Labor. Mr. Brittlebank suggested in "The Worker" that Trade Unions should buy land near the towns, on which their members might live and work when out of work at their trade. This idea, if practicable, would give the white workingmen the same option that the native already has—that of refusing work on slavery terms without fear of starvation to themselves and families.

One so often hears workingmen say, "These niggers have a jolly fine time; why don't they tax them more and force them out to work? Why should they be able to loaf half their time, whilst we have to keep on working or starve?" When the workingman begins to say to himself, "How is it that we, with all the resources of science at our command, have to scramble for work all our lives, many of us for less than a decent wage, whilst the natives are quite independent? Surely their social system must be better than ours"—then there may be some hope for the realization of Mr. Brittlebank's suggestion.

Why are the natives more independent than we are? Because they have an option; because they have free access to tribal lands and can always make a living there if the terms offered by employers do not suit them.

Then, as Mr. Brittlebank suggests, let us get the same option. Yes, but how are we to do it? At present it is impossible to get land on anything like reasonable terms, as its selling price is always much above its real value.

How can that be when it is sold on the open market? Because it always has a double value—real, plus speculative; because the supply is strictly limited whilst the demand is incessant; for without it we cannot live. There is nothing to force the owner to sell; his land eats nothing and costs nothing if idle; therefore, the Government, Trade Unions, or individuals, if they want land, must pay the owner's own price for it or go without. If it were made unprofitable for the landowner to keep his land from the best use he would either have to work it himself, sell it to some one who would, or lose money on it.

Our votes can do this by the taxation of land values.

Yes, but how does this concern us? We are miners, bank-clerks, amalgamators, fitters, etc., and many of us do not wish to go farming and could not if we would. Others who were competent to work on farms would find a demand for their services and would leave the mines. Instead of a steady flow of white men from the country into the towns, the flow would start from the towns to the country. There would then be a scarcity of and consequent demand for labor which would force wages up, whilst cost of living—rent and food—would go down. We would then hear no more about the number of white men the Town Councils should employ on relief work, as there would then be no men seeking employment on

charity terms. Mines which are now shut down waiting for better conditions (cheaper labor) would have to start work. And we would ultimately take for the people what in justice belongs to the people, as without their presence it would be non-existent—the value of land.



## SOME FRIENDS OF OURS.

### No. 3. The Sack of Flour.

#### For The Public.

There was once an Englishman who had been tremendously well brought-up and, coming to America, he married him a pretty and wide-awake Western girl, and began to raise cattle in the Californian mountains. He was loyal to high purposes, and very stubbornly straightforward, without humor or the power of seeing two sides of anything on earth. These gifts belonged to that wife of his.

In the course of time he traded in different local products and, as he dealt much with the Indians, he became known far and wide among them as an honest man of few and plain words.

One winter morning an Indian came to him with three baskets:

"You buy; him cheap. Five dollars for all." (And this was really a bargain.) The Englishman was working out of baskets, however, but he did not explain—as he ought. Instead of this, he said, "No can buy; too poor; got no money."

"Dat so? You heap poor dis year?"

"Yes, me busted; no got money; go hungry heap long time."

The Indian looked at his friend, the big white man with the cattle; he could not understand, but he believed it. "Me sorry," he said, and went away, down the ridge, over another ridge, to his own home.

The Englishman told his wife, but she did not laugh. Instead of that she said: "You broke out in a new place, Phillip, and of course you meant it as a joke, but if the Indian could look into our store-room and see our ten sacks of flour, our case of bacon, and so on, he would think you were an awful liar."

The next day but one, as the Englishman and his wife were working in the garden, the Indian came along the trail with a forlorn old blear-eyed pack-horse, and it carried a sack of flour. He came up to the Englishman:

"Me sorry you busted. Me give you sack flour. No matter give back. You good man. You me friend. Me sheep shear while back; ketch two sack. Me give you one."

The wife sprang to the rescue of the stuttering Englishman, thanked the Indian with great sweetness of manner, had him lay the flour on the kitchen floor, gave him a book with colored pictures of animals "for all the Indian people to see." Her