

As far as he knew, hardly any, if any, municipality had made any definite declarations against it. (Cheers.) They hoped the House would trust one of its Standing Committees to deal with the complications which necessarily surrounded so far-reaching a change, and there was only one thing for the House to do to-day. That was to give assent to the two underlying principles—first that in the case of undeveloped property the real selling value of the land should be the basis of taxation, and not the use value at which that land was at present let, and secondly that land values were a proper subject of separate rating from buildings and improvements. (Cheers.) The main features of this Bill and those which the House had previously discussed were the same, but there were several points of difference. The present Bill proposed to tax unoccupied land to the extent of the full current rate on its real value. This would mean a substantial increase of taxation where land was held out of use, as they thought, unsocially. (Cheers.) Another difference was that where land had been considerably developed, and the present assessment was greater than the new land valuation, there would not be any new rate at present. The relief of existing rates on such properties would depend upon the amount of land which was ready to be developed, and which had hitherto escaped taxation in the outskirts of the towns. But although the Bill would apparently make no difference in regard to properties already developed, it would in reality bring about a vital change. There would be a separate land column in the assessment book, and it would thus be possible to compare the taxation upon the proportion of the present assessment which represented land and the remainder which represented buildings. It would be open to Parliament, as in the case of Mr. Macnamara's Bill, to put in the future a higher rate upon the land assessment all over towns. Another feature of the Bill showed the spirit in which it was introduced. At present in arriving at the assessment of a hereditament deductions were made on the assessment for repairs and depreciation. These deductions obviously should be applicable to buildings only.

As showing the value of undeveloped land in large towns, Mr. Trevelyan mentioned the case of Bradford. The mover of a resolution in support of the Bill in the Bradford City Council stated that there were four estates in the neighborhood of the city, the total value of which at a very reasonable calculation amounted to upwards of £2,000,000, but the rates on which at present

amounted to only £761. In an arbitration between the Bradford Corporation and Lord Rosse, it was stated in evidence on behalf of Lord Rosse that he was the owner of 1,300 acres of land in Heaton and Shipley eminently suitable for building upon. At 2s. 6d. a yard the total value of that land for building purposes would be over £780,000. Yet in respect of that estate Lord Rosse contributed only £189 a year towards the upkeep of the city. (Cheers.) The same speaker in the Bradford City Council estimated that there were 4,500 acres of land in the city not built upon, and that if this was rated at its true value, it would bring in £41,000 a year to the city. Another effect of bringing such land under rating would be that landlords would be compelled to bring their land into use the moment it got any real value. That to his (Mr. Trevelyan's) mind was even more important than the increase in rateable value. Dealing with the objections to the Bill, he said it would be urged that gardens and private open spaces, the existence of which was a public advantage, would be forced into the market, but that danger could be avoided by giving the municipality power to regulate the development of land—a power which was already possessed by the great German towns. They were not rushing any proposal to put a large new tax on all land in relief of buildings, but they thought that when they had got a land valuation which would make patent the iniquity of the present system half their battle would be won. Upon houses raised on the outskirts of towns there was a tax often of one-third of their value. That meant a discouragement of the building trade, and one often saw this curious phenomenon in the building trade, while more and more the population was crying out for room to live. (Hear, hear.) All that the municipalities asked was to be allowed to make this great experiment with all the cautious competence with which it was their custom to move. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the Government would not frustrate their hopes. (Opposition cheers.)

#### EQUALITY OF RIGHTS IS ALL THE NEGRO ASKS.

A portion of a long and able article on the subject of Justice for Negroes, written by the Rev. Olympia Brown, of Columbus, Wis., and published in the Chicago Chronicle of Mar. 27, 1904.

"Social equality" is the great bugbear which frightens many people. It is said that we cannot speak to a man in the dining room without inviting him into

the drawing-room; "If you entertain a man socially, how can you resent his aspiration for your daughter?"

But in reality this alarm is needless—it is a figment of the imagination. There is, there can be, no "social indiscriminate equality" among all classes, either North or South. Mr. Dickens described what he saw and no more in his picture of what he called the "sanctuary of New York fashion," where the people were "the very bright particular stars of an exalted New York sphere—there were other fashionable spheres above them and other fashionable spheres below them and none of the stars in any one of these spheres had anything to say to the stars in any other of these spheres;" where Mr. Norris, the father, observed of the people next door that "they entertained religious opinions of which he could not approve and therefore he had not the honor of knowing them," and Mrs. Norris, the mother, said "they were well enough in their way, but they were not genteel."

Not only in New York city but in every country village there are spheres and grades and classes and groups the members of which have little, if any, social intercourse with each other. They are all free people, they do their own business, they respect themselves, the men cast their vote on election day at the same booth, the women do their shopping at the same stores, but socially each individual goes to his own place in the group where he feels most at home.

Social combinations are regulated by taste, by sympathy, by similarity of attainment—no law can adjust them, no determination on the part of any particular class can establish a social equality not warranted by character. Do the members of the old first families of Virginia affiliate with the poor whites of the mountain districts? Certainly not. Do the inhabitants of the slums enter the drawing-rooms of the richer people of our cities? By no means. There is no social equality among the white and black except as it is made by character. When it is said that "all are treated free and equal" or that "all are alike entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" or that "we have a government of the people, and by the people" or that "we, the people, do ordain and establish a constitution" or that "there shall be neither slavery and involuntary servitude" or that "a citizen's right to vote shall not be denied or abridged," no one understands that such statements are a declaration of equality in natural ability, education,

morality or spirituality or that all are on the same social plane. Not at all—only that as human beings all have a right to live and a right to protection, in person and property, from the government to which they render allegiance, and a right to share by their votes in the government which they help to support. Social life, its amenities, its hospitalities, its limitations, its requirements, must depend upon the culture, the taste and spirit of the people.

Each home must be a law unto itself; it is sacred ground to be guarded and watched over by father and mother: they alone must determine what guests shall be invited there and what spirit of peace and good will shall pervade it.

A genial and kindly hospitality will often welcome to share the social pleasures of the home those who are not eligible as lifelong companions or as desirable suitors for the hand of a daughter. Narrow, indeed, would be one's social life and lonely one's home if none could enter there except acceptable matches for one's daughter.

Dr. Ligon says [in Good Housekeeping]:

The greatest wrong ever done civilization was when thousands of beings only two degrees removed from naked barbarism were declared by law to be and taught that they were the social equals of a race which represents the refinement, the chivalry, the bravery of thousands of years of civilization.

#### What law is that?

There is no such law, there can be no such law; it is the inalienable right of everyone to choose his own associates. If the Welsh or the German people choose to associate only with those of their own nationality that is their privilege; if the Jew wishes to keep himself distinct from other people that is his right. On the other hand if Mr. Roosevelt wishes to invite a Negro or an Indian or a Hottentot or an orang-outang to dine with him he has a perfect right to do so, but he cannot require others to do the same. If Dr. Ligon desires to associate only with white people she can make her own choice, if others wish to confine their acquaintance to college professors or to artists or to musicians there is no law either to prevent or to compel them. There is only the divine law of peace and good will to men applicable alike to Jew or Gentile, bond or free.

Equally irrelevant are all discussions of the causes of slavery in this country, of the purposes for which the war was waged, of the influence of carpet-bag politicians or the doctrines maintained by the abolitionists; these things are "ancient history." Nor need we at this

time define the exact limitations of the capabilities of the Negro or speculate as to his future. The present only is ours. The Negro is here; he was born here and he is at home here; he is endowed with the attributes of our common humanity; he is therefore entitled to a fair field, to an opportunity to earn his living, to acquire knowledge and to gain, if he can, the wealth of the world and its prizes. He is a citizen of the United States and therefore entitled to his vote; if he violates the law or is guilty of gross offenses, he must be punished according to law; if white men are guilty, let them be likewise punished.

Justice, and yet more justice, is what we need. As Americans and Christians, north as well as south, we need to rise above narrow prejudices and be willing to allow to others the same rights, opportunities and privileges that we ask for ourselves. Let us have justice for all, special privilege for none. More righteousness among all classes is the need of this hour.

#### BY FEAR AND FAVOR.

Laws are to be enforced without fear or favor and without respect of persons. That is mere commonplacé, baldest of truisms—no room for difference on that proposition. To set up the opposite, that laws should not touch the rich, or should not restrain the good from doing forbidden things, or should not apply alike to all, small and great—to hold such a view of law would make a law no law at all, but mere vehicle of whim. The thing states itself.

Yet in this merger case, this maze of hysteria, the law and its majesty seems hardly involved.

What's Jim Hill's attitude? Why, that they're heaving bricks at the kind gentleman who built the northwest as a personal favor, when they ought to be grateful. The bare question of law does not enter into his head.

What does Van Sant think? Why, that he's vindicated, that he has won a fight by employment of the law as the most handy tool; not that he enforced the law just as he found it there, but that he made it serve some end beyond itself, as though without that end he had not invoked it.

As for the president, silent himself, except as he congratulates Knox on his victory—so etiquette demands—friends speaking for him

tell his intentions to press the law where he thinks good, and let it lapse where he thinks good to carry out good policies; no word of principle. As though law were nothing else than vehicle of whim.

And the supreme court itself which laid down this law as the law of the case, though by an half and half, half and a little more contrary to the law, half and a little less perfectly legal—what does Judge Harlan say with the majority? Why, that this thing was wrong, hurtful and dangerous, therefore against the law, whether 'twas or not illegal. As though they were to decide what's good and what is not, and fit the law to it; as though they had power to make laws as they went along.

And the people, whose servant is Van Sant, likewise the president, who set the court in place who made the law itself—hardly more clear are they than their creations. Halling this syllabus as though laws were but decrees given by their masters, as though courts had right to make laws just to suit themselves and this one time had bent to please the people. Scarcely a thought all through of the law's majesty made by the people's will to carry out their purpose. —Goodhue Co. (Minn.) News.

"Why, see here, you've raised the price of your bananas again!"

"Yes, yes. Me raisa price. Too mucha war."

"What's the war got to do with it?"

"War raisa price. Raisa price of bread. Raisa price of meat. Raisa price of banan'."

"Nonsense! Why should war raise the price of bananas?"

"War raisa price. Russia man, Japa man, buy aplenty banan'. Eata banan', throw skin down so! Long come greata general, step on banan' skin, whoof! He fall and breaka his head. All ze generals fall. Take much banan'. War raisa price."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

#### BOOKS

##### CHESTERTON'S VARIED TYPES.

Some time ago a little volume on Robert Browning was reviewed in The Public. The originality and freshness of the book struck with surprise all readers who had not happened to become acquainted with the author's brief newspaper essays and reviews. Nineteen of these essays and reviews have now been gathered into a volume ("Varied Types," by G. K. Chesterton, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York, \$1.20). It is a clear-type, wide-