members of the majority, while voting the charges "not proven," strongly criticise and condemn the methods which were used in the Stephenson campaign. [See vol. xii, p. 253.]

PRESS OPINIONS

Herbert S. Bigelow.

The Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat (dem.-Dem.) Feb. 9.—Herbert S. Bigelow is the bete noir of Big Business. He has got on the nerves of the standpatters of high and low degree, and in every move he makes they see portents of a Dark and Deadly Plot. Thus the press dispatch tells us that "delegates to the constitutional convention manifest a determination to defeat the proposition of President Bigelow to shorten the convention's work by limiting it to certain specific proposals" named in a resolution about to be brought in. . . . If the gentlemen fighting President Bigelow so savagely have any faith in their own estimate of public opinion they should welcome any plan which would bring the tax business to a final issue. But they show conclusively that they have no confidence in that estimate, and they mean in the Constitution so to throttle public opinion in regard to taxation that an expression in favor of the Singletax will be practically impossible. As far as President Bigelow is concerned it may be said confidently that he has no intention of writing the Singletax or perhaps any other tax into the fundamental law of the State. But that he will seek to embody in that law provisions whereunder the people may alter, amend or abolish present methods of taxation at pleasure and in the light of larger experience, may be taken for granted. The Singletax issue is sprung at this stage of Constitution making, not because it has any proper place there and not because those who raise it have any fear that it will be written into the organic law, but because they hope to excite irrational prejudices and defeat the whole propaganda of the People's Power. It is of this that they are in greatest dread.

"Excess Condemnation."

The (Ottawa, Ont., daily) Citizen (conservative), Feb. 6.—And now the newspapers are talking of a scheme which has been carried out in Toronto, to the advantage of the city and the delight of certain believers in reform. Needing to open a new street, the city of Toronto gained control of the property immediately affected, and then when the street was made, behold, the increased value of the land paid for the expense of opening the street. Now, isn't that just as reasonable an idea as anybody ever heard of? Why, in the name of common sense and business judgment, should a city spend its money on public improvements, and then let a lot of speculators run away with nearly all the financial benefit resulting from those improvements? Good for Toronto! This plan that she has devised is certain to be used in every growing city in Canada. And, as it is more extensively used, it will be improved. [A Constitutional amendment permitting this practice in the cities of New York was defeated at the election in that State last November by the people on a small vote.—Editors of the Public.]

Boston and the Singletax.

Christian Science Monitor (religious), Feb. 7.—In discussing the point of new sources of revenue for the municipality, Mayor Fitzgerald, in his address to the City Council, has brought forward a matter that seems certain to become a subject of serious comment among observant and thinking people in this community at an early day. The Mayor may doubtless be considered in this instance as the spokesman of a large class of people just beginning to feel that there must be some good in the Henry George system of taxation and yet uncertain whether anything so generally untried, so seemingly revolutionary in an economic sense, even though successfully experimented with elsewhere, may be safely adopted by themselves. In his apparent open-mindedness on the subject the Mayor is also fairly representative of this class. We believe he is right in asking that the Singletax be investigated by the legislature and that he is right in predicting that the eastern United States is on the eve of a campaign of education in relation to the Singletax system.

The Boston Common (ind.), Feb. 10.—So cautiously phrased is the Mayor's inaugural reference to the taxing of land values, popularly known as the Singletax, that it has taken time to recognize how really startling the proposal is. That it should actually be admitted, by the Mayor of a city east of Cleveland, that the taxation of land values might become an issue within a twelve-month, may, to some people, make the millennium appear delusively near. A word of warning, however, to the over-enthusiastic. Two years ago, Mayor Gaynor appointed a Commission on Congestion, made up of men and women of pronounced radical views. They recommended a gradual increase of the tax rate on land; and for a while the press, the politicians and even the Mayor spoke with some enthusiasm of this novel legislative remedy. Recent reports from New York show that the land owners are bestirring themselves mightily in defense of their privileges. They have determined that the people must come to their senses; and that, if they will not, the politicians who rule them must. Mayor Gaynor is consequently reported as belittling the report and personnel of the committee, and there are evidences of a vigorous press campaign from a source well financed. The chances that the legislature will stand out against the land owners are becoming fainter. The lesson, which here in Massachusetts, with our polite traditions and able lobbyists, must be rammed down, is that when a strong, wealthy, privileged class determines to withstand the common welfare, its evil influence upon the legislature is almost certain to overstrain representative principles; and that direct legislation, used intelligently by the people for the public welfare, is an effective and perhaps essential tool of social progress.

Digitized by Google