

"careful in their religious duties, generous in giving of their means and even of themselves in the work of charity, leaders in ecclesiastical activities, often irreproachable in personal morals, faithful as fathers, neighbors and friends, and yet in the larger relations of life in the commercial, political and industrial realms they seem utterly devoid of conscience—unmoral, perhaps, rather than immoral."

+

Would you understand the method whereby those "white slavers" fleece their victims? It is by playing the hopeless poverty of one person off against the hopeless poverty of another in their bargain driving. Here is an example. A garment worker of the name of Yacullo—a "scab" in the slang of the labor war, which is equivalent to "deserter" or "traitor" in other kinds of war—shot a striker and killed him. Yacullo explained: "I cannot afford to strike; I have a wife and seven hungry children to support."

There is the secret of the power of the oppressive employer. He prates about the right of the worker to work without molestation, whether he gets enough out of it to live on or not. Judges echo these employers. They have perverted the law of injunction to help them out. And preachers garb their greediness in religious masks. What such employers really demand—masks off—is the right to play timid victims of a plundering industrial system against braver ones. Men who cannot afford to strike because they have hungry wives and children to support, and girls who cannot afford to lose work because they have feminine virtue to conserve—these are among the hapless creatures upon whom your gordid strike resisters rely to defeat strikers and to fleece both strikers and "scabs."

+

And those employers wish it so. If you don't believe it, make the experiment of proposing such improvements in social adjustments as would loosen up monopolies. They would resist that too.

Of course they would be virtuous about it. With sickening hypocrisy they would tell you it would be confiscation. Oh, how they do object to confiscating property after it is in the hands of labor exploiters! But they have no objection to confiscating property as it passes through the hands of its producers.

+ + +

Political liberty, when the equal right to land is denied, becomes, as population increases and invention goes on, merely the liberty to compete for employment at starvation wages.—Henry George, "Progress and Poverty."

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE BRITISH SITUATION.

London, Nov. 19, 1910.

On the whole, politically, we have had very quiet times, and yet times of steady and continuous progress. Land reform on the lines of the taxation of land values, is taking a firm hold of the minds and is dominating the thought of the progressives throughout the country. Even reactionaries have had to take refuge in pseudo-schemes of land reform, by which they vainly hope to remove social ills without removing social wrongs.

The land valuation has done and is doing a great work. It was the valuation which prompted the House of Land-Lords to the unprecedented and unconstitutional step of rejecting the Budget last year; and it is the valuation, and all that it foreshadows, which is giving the Liberal party a hold on the country such as it has not enjoyed, nor indeed deserved, since the passing of the last great Reform Bill.

Lloyd George is still guiding the thoughts and voicing the aspirations of the progressives of Great Britain. He does not indulge in what you aptly describe as "weasel words," but speaks straight from the heart and hits straight from the shoulder. His recent broad and philosophic speech on the social problem, at a public meeting held at the City Temple in support of the work of the Liberal-Christian League, attracted general attention, and gained him the praise of some of his most pronounced political opponents. Yet it probed more deeply into the root question than any of his previous speeches. His final counsel to the people—"to enlarge the purpose of their politics, and, having done so, let them adhere to that purpose with unswerving resolve through all difficulties and discouragements until their redemption is accomplished"—is being followed and will bear its fruits in the near future.

Yes, Lloyd George has already done much for his country, more especially for the disinherited landless masses of the people, and may lead them to still greater victories. For the inevitable policy of the Liberal party of the future is now steadily revealing itself.

+

Behind Lloyd George, however, stands the great, powerful, inscrutable personality of Mr. Asquith, a man honored both by friends and opponents, and of all modern British statesmen the most difficult to read. Less democratic, less warm-hearted, and less broad-minded than the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, he may be; but as a politician and as a political leader he is stronger and more forcible; and I am still convinced that without his tacit but loyal support Lloyd George's fire and zeal for the cause of the people would have been far less fruitful. Lloyd George fires the bullets; but, even if not forged, they have been tempered and approved by the man who today rules the Cabinet and the country, and is trusted by the Cabinet and the country as few Liberal leaders ever before.

The following extract from Asquith's fighting speech, delivered at a luncheon at the National Lib-

eral Club yesterday afternoon, seems to me to reveal something of his innermost ideals and aspirations. He said: "To us, as a party, Constitutional changes are but the means to further and greater ends. We have before us great ideals in the social and economic sphere—ideals toward the realization of which we have made some progress during the last five years, mainly because of the financial omnipotence of the lower House. But we find ourselves hampered at every stage on the road by the overriding powers of a chamber overwhelmingly Tory in composition, and the natural champion of threatened interests and privileges. These great causes, of which we are trustees, cannot afford to go on waiting. It is for their sake that we are bringing the matter to an issue."

Great Constitutional changes are indeed pending and will very shortly be accomplished; and it is encouraging and satisfactory to know that they are everywhere being recognized and avowed as merely a means "to further and greater ends."



Another general election now confronts us. It will not be surprising if American readers attentive to British politics may fail to understand why the Liberal ministry, with a sufficient and unimpaired majority in the House of Commons, should have deemed it necessary. Yet here it seems clear enough. We British are a slow-moving, severely practical people, with little taste for abstract arguments, somewhat conservative in our tendencies, well satisfied, therefore, to adhere to "the ancient government of Kings, Lords and Commons," so long as it fairly fulfills its purpose. The evolution of our unwritten Constitution, however, has left it undecided, at all events in the abstract, to which of these three factors, in case of differences, the supreme authority of the nation really accrues.

This was one of the main causes making inevitable our great Civil War of 1642 to 1649, which practically decided that it accrued to the Parliament, including both the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Hence it is that to a very large extent political questions have during the past three centuries been decided by compromise, satisfactory to the logical of neither party. The House of Lords have consistently retarded progressive legislation necessary to the well-being and development of the country, and even when yielding to popular pressure have generally succeeded in getting necessary measures mangled and shaped to suit their own special interests. Up to comparatively recently, however, the landed interests dominated both Houses of Parliament, which minimized the causes of friction between them. This is no longer the case, and the causes of friction have increased proportionately, until what is known here as the House of Lords Question has become ripe, "rotten ripe," for settlement.

During the past twenty-five years the House of Lords have been self revealed, even to the most ignorant "man in the street," as the willing and subservient servant of the Tory party. When the Tory party is in power but little is heard of the House of Lords, as their functions are then limited to promptly passing such measures as their

friends in the other House send up to them. But when the Liberals are in power a different state of things prevails. The House of Lords are then galvanized into activity, and act as becomes a permanent wing of the Tory party, hindering Liberal legislation as far as they dare, and mangling often beyond recognition—rendering harmless as well as useless—such measures as they graciously consent to pass.

For many, many years the House of Lords, to use a popular and expressive phrase, "have made the Liberal leaders eat mud." But their rejection of the Budget of 1909 filled their cup to overflowing, until even the most reactionary Tory has come to realize that some radical, or apparently radical, change in the constitution and legislative powers of the House of Lords is inevitable. Hence the House of Lords have recently manifested a really refreshing zeal for what they call a "reform of the House of Lords," which, as far as it has been revealed, would leave that body as defiantly reactionary as before, and would increase rather than diminish its powers.

On the accession of the present King, a conference was called, consisting of the leading members of both the great political parties, in the hope of finding a solution of the difficulty to which they both could agree. This has come to an end, and the Liberal government has now taken the question up in earnest, has formulated its demands in the shape of a Bill, embodying the well-known Veto resolutions, which has been sent up to the Lords, to be accepted without amendment or rejected. In the latter case, which is more than probable, the Liberals will appeal to the country,* and of the issue there is little doubt. Wisely, they do not propose to tinker with the constitution of the House of Lords, and have contented themselves with formulating such proposals as will assure that the will of the people, as expressed by their representatives in the House of Commons, shall prevail.

As I have said, of the issue there is little doubt; the election campaign will be a hot one and a fighting one; the past record of the House of Lords, which is an astonishingly shameful one, will be used as evidence against them, and will be the main, if not the sole, topic at every Liberal election meeting. Though I make no claim to be a practical politician, I am delighted at the turn things are taking, because it is increasingly being realized, to use Asquith's telling words, that "Constitutional changes are but the means to further and greater ends."

Though we shall probably not be quite so active as we were last time, when the land question was the question before the electors, we shall take care that it is emphasized as much as possible. Since then this question has made remarkable progress, and is becoming daily better understood and consequently better appreciated. The United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, aided by all its constituent Leagues, have distributed tons of leaflets, and are already receiving demands for further supplies for election purposes. The Leagues are better organized than they ever were, and their

*See The Public of last week, page 1159, and of this week, page 1159.

active men are inspired with their cause and the exceptional opportunity of still further advancing it.

LEWIS H. BERENS.

* * *

THE CANADIAN FARMERS' MOVEMENT.

Winnipeg, Can., Nov. 28, 1910.

Arrangements have been completed at Ottawa for the adjournment of the Dominion parliament on December 16 to enable Premier Laurier and his colleagues to receive the monster Grain Growers' deputations which will assemble there on that date to present their demands to the government. It has been stated authoritatively that the Western representatives will number four hundred. These will leave Winnipeg by special train on the night of December 12 and will be joined at Ottawa by two hundred representatives from Ontario and eastern Provinces.

The writer has interviewed R. McKenzie, secretary of the Western Grain Growers' Association, who is preparing the memorials to present to Parliament. Mr. McKenzie, speaking with authority for all agricultural organizations, informed your correspondent that the farmers would ask that the terminal grain elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur be taken over and operated by the government. These elevators must properly be classified as public utilities. In private hands they are a natural monopoly and have been utilized to the benefit and enrichment of the present owners and to the detriment of the public by mixing inferior grades of wheat with the better samples. The demand will also be made that the proposed Hudson Bay Railway be constructed, owned and operated by the government for the benefit of all the people. A determined effort is being made by certain parties to secure a charter, franchise and subsidy for this purpose. The farmers will make it plain that "no railway" is to be preferred to one in the hands of the monopolists that now control Canada's three transcontinental systems.

* *

Speaking in relation to the tariff Mr. McKenzie stated that a demand would be made for an immediate increase of the preference on British goods imported into Canada to fifty per cent, with a stated annual increase (amount not yet determined) until Free Trade with Britain is obtained. Mr. McKenzie made it plain that no reciprocal preference was desired in return; all the Canadian farmer wants is a continuance of the open door for Canadian farm products. He demands an increase of the preference for his own good and as a logical step toward Free Trade as it is in Britain.

The writer was further informed that a request will be made for reciprocity in natural products and timber, and for Free Trade in agricultural implements, with the United States. A general reduction in customs duties will also be asked, especially on woollens, cottons, sugar, cement, iron and leather manufactures.

Mr. McKenzie stated that the farmers would suggest as a means of supplementing a possible decrease in revenue which might ensue as a result of

the freer trade policy, the gradual introduction of the taxation of the values of coal, timber, agricultural and urban lands, with a view to absorbing for public purposes a portion of the enormous unearned increments now enriching speculators.

* *

The associated farmers' organizations in Canada, west of the Great Lakes, now embrace a membership of some thirty thousand. It is a significant fact that so many should undertake an arduous journey of one to two thousand miles at a cost to them of fifty thousand dollars, to place the government in possession of their views.

ROBERT L. SCOTT.

* * *

POLITICAL FLAVORS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Cambridge, Mass., Dec. 3.

Honors are easy, surely, as to personal and official dignity, between Governor-elect Foss and Senator Lodge of Massachusetts. Whether 'tis ignobler for the triumphant Foss, who has been mercilessly snubbed by Lodge for years, even when running as a regular Republican, to seize Lodge by the scruff of the neck and confront him with the plain showing of the overwhelming popular vote of his own rock-ribbed Republican State against his ascendancy; or ignobler still for the repudiated Boss to try to sit tight, in spite of Foss's strangle-hold dragging him into the spot-light of supplementary campaigning to ratify this verdict in the face and eyes of the legislature, is a question which "the gentleman in politics" himself seems to be struggling with in a bewildered, pathetic way. Mr. Foss may be vindictive, may have brought his personal wounds into a public matter; he may have strained the rights of his vantage-ground as victor at the polls and as Governor-elect in demanding the withdrawal of Lodge. But how about Lodge's sense of propriety and public duty in the situation?

In the face of the unmistakable and unquestioned desire of the people of the State to be rid of him and to reverse his policy, is he going to stand upon legal and technical quibbles—to try to pick up, through the still-hunt and gum-shoe methods of his senatorial colleague, enough purchasable Democratic members of the legislature to piece out the ragged edge of the Republican contingent? Whatever may be lacking of courtesy, of conventionality, of Constitutionality, in Foss's grappling with Lodge and holding his crushing humiliation up to a pitiless publicity; as much may be said, must be said, in condemnation and reproof of Lodge's evident determination still to work back, by hook or by crook; to steal a base in the game, to flout and cheat the plain purpose of the great majority of the voters of Massachusetts to retire him. He has made this much of concession to the simple and manifest requirements of decency—he has ostentatiously retired—to New York! It is only five hours away, to be sure, and there are means of communication, at a pinch, that take less time. But it can at least be said that he is not personally running his campaign to re-elect himself according to the forms of law and legislative procedure, no matter how obnoxious