

months now, and jobs are hung up in all directions.—A. G. HUIE, Sydney, N. S. W., Australia.

DENMARK.

MR. FELS HAS A RIVAL IN DENMARK WHO GOES HIM ONE BETTER—GROWTH OF THE HENRY GEORGE SOCIETY.

The Single Tax—or as the Danes have chosen to call it—the Henry George movement in Denmark, dates from about 1904 in which year the Henry George Society was started by a small body of enthusiasts, conspicuous amongst whom were and are Mr. Sophus Berthelsen, a solicitor, and editor of the official organ of the movement, Mr. Jakob Lange, a teacher and the able translator into Danish of Henry George's principal works, and Mr. H. P. Hansen, the secretary of the Society. An energetic campaign was set on foot among the peasantry—mostly, be it noted, the proprietors of their little holdings. Agitation was also carried on in the Press, and two or three journals devoted to the cause sprang into existence. Today I believe every one of the many Peasants' Associations throughout the country supports the taxation of land values, and the circulation of "*Ret*," the Society's monthly journal, which has grown to 4000 copies—a truly remarkable result when one bears in mind the fact that the Danish population is little over 2 1-2 millions. This means one copy for every 625 inhabitants, and if a similar proportion existed in the United Kingdom it would give *Land Values* a circulation of 72,000—a figure that might well make John Paul's pulse beat faster. In the United States a proportionate circulation would be 112,000 for the SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

Early in 1909 Mr. Joseph Fels, at the writer's suggestion, offered the Danish Society £200 a year for five years on condition that a like amount was raised by the Danes themselves. The first year has just closed and I am advised by the Executive that not only has the amount subscribed exceeded the requisite £200, but a wealthy Dane, stimulated by Mr. Fels'

example, has challenged the challenger to put down practically the whole of his five years subscription in one lump sum, when he will double it!

In consequence of Mr. Fels' generosity, the Society has been enabled to adopt various methods of spreading the light and to force the pace of their by no means lethargic propaganda. Largely due to this, the Danish Government have at present under consideration proposals for introducing special valuations of the land apart from improvements in certain districts for experimental purposes. What might be almost described as a fierce lecturing campaign is being carried on throughout the country districts, accompanied by discussions and debate, and special efforts are being made to carry the Socialists' support.

One interesting feature in the internal administration of the Society is the adoption of what is known in Denmark as the principle of "free" suffrage. This reform in the election of representative bodies was introduced by a Danish Solicitor, Mr. Johan Pedersen, of Aarhus in 1905, and is only now beginning to attract attention as a competitor with the system of proportional representation. Under this system, an elector is "free" to elect whomsoever he pleases to represent him, as opposed to the present "restricted" system, under which he has no choice but to vote for the nominee of some party or clique, obedient to party ties, and standing for some particular locality. The vote of the elected representative carries weight in proportion to the number of electors who have elected him, and where payment of members occurs it is made in proportion to the number of votes each representative stands for. In this way those members who most fully represent the will of the electors are made economically independent, and with short intervals (one year) between elections, the people can quickly withdraw their support from members who have failed correctly to interpret their wishes.

Membership of the Danish Society is open to "anyone who will work for the object of the Society and pay the annual subscription" of about 40 cents. The Committee is elected and works on the "free

suffrage" principle outlined above, and appoints its own executive.—C. W. SORENSON, York, England.

GREAT BRITAIN.

A REVIEW OF BRITISH LEGISLATION AS AFFECTING THE POSITION OF THE LORDS—AN UNSCRUPULOUS CAMPAIGN—STATESMANLIKE ATTITUDE OF JOHN REDMOND—SHREWD POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

It is interesting to look back over the past four years and note the changes that have taken place in the political situation in Great Britain as it affects the Land Values movement. For of all the sections which go to make up what is known as the Progressive Forces, Single Taxers, or Land Values men have undoubtedly made the greatest progress.

In Dec. 1905, Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman took office and in the January following Parliament was dissolved. During January and February, a general election took place which showed that Sir Henry had won the confidence of the country, for he was returned not only by a majority of 156 over the Unionists, but by a clear majority over all parties combined. At the end of four years the strength of the Government in the House of Commons was practically unimpaired as will be seen by the figures given below. During these eventful years to the Spring of 1909 the Government passed through the House of Commons a great mass of legislation of a more or less beneficial character, but the Bill of greatest interest to Single Taxers, and most disliked by the opposition, was the Scottish Valuation Bill of 1907. This Bill was rejected by the House of Lords, but was sent back again in 1908, and was then so mutilated by these hereditary legislators as to be quite useless for the purpose for which it had been drafted. It was therefore dropped by the Government. Finding it impossible to introduce the principle of Valuation and Taxation of Land Values by legislative methods the Government undertook to do so through the Finance Bill. Hitherto the rights of the Commons to originate and determine all finan-

cial matters had been assumed. The resolution which had governed these matters since 1678 is as follows: "That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament, are the sole gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint, in such Bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

Here it must be explained that the reason why Finance Bills have to be referred to the Lords is, because according to an unwritten constitution, it is required that to become law "a bill must pass both Houses of Parliament and receive the assent of the Sovereign." So in the ordinary course of events last year's Budget having been passed through the Commons by a large majority it was sent in accordance with precedent to the other House, where it (naturally) received anything but a cordial welcome. Acting on the advice of Lord Milner who had urged their Lordships to reject the Bill "and damn the consequences," Lord Lansdowne's now historic resolution was carried. Thus a financial deadlock was brought about from which we have not yet escaped. In 1860 the Lords rejected the Bill which provided for the repeal of the paper duties, but the following year Lord Palmerston included the proposal in the financial scheme of the year (as Lloyd George did last year with the Valuation) and the Lords were compelled to pass what they had previously rejected. Much as they disliked the Death Duties introduced in Sir Wm. Harcourt's Finance Bill (1894) their Lordships allowed that Bill to pass, being counselled to do so in the following words by the late Lord Salisbury:—

"It is perfectly obvious that this House in point of fact has not for many years interfered by amendment with the finance of the year. The reason why this House cannot do so is that it has not the power of changing the Executive Government, and to reject a Finance Bill and leave the Executive Government in its place means to