

cottages can seldom be made to pay. A reform of taxation in the direction which we have long advocated and Liberalism is clearly moving will meet the first difficulty. The second can only be surmounted either by a subsidy in aid of building or by such an advance in the wage of farm laborers as will enable them to pay a remunerative rent. The Government has for the time being rejected the first alternative. At the same moment the Chancellor of the Exchequer has said enough to make it clear that his sympathies are actively concerned with the other. His sympathies have a trick of being swiftly translated into action. Such a policy will sweep the country.



Chicago Tribune, July 14. (Cable Letter by T. P. O'Connor, M. P.).—The Tories, already stunned by the loss of their power in the House of Lords by Lloyd George's taxation on their land, and now by the abolition of the plural voter, are receiving a further shock by the clear announcement that the Liberals will put a large scheme of land reform before the constituencies in the next election. This announcement when, two weeks ago, it seemed to be inaugurated under the auspices of the leaders of the Henry George Singletax disciples in England, created last week considerable alarm among the moderate Liberals, but Premier Asquith, by quietly disclaiming all Singletax doctrines but at the same time approving the land reform program, has united the Liberals again and further affrighted the Tories.



The (London) Nation (Lib.), June 8.—The North-West Norfolk election is remarkable because, as we have said, for the second time in recent politics, Tory criticism of Radical Government was successfully met by a counter attack on the whole Conservative position. Mr. Hemmerde fought on the land question, which, be it remembered, has only thrice been raised by a responsible British statesman during the last generation—by Mr. Chamberlain at the election of 1885, by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at the Albert Hall in 1905, and by Mr. Lloyd George in 1909. On each occasion it has swept the field.



The (London) Nation (Lib.), June 29.—The Holmfirth election repeats, with a difference, the moral of the Liberal success in North-West Norfolk. Mr. Arnold, the successful candidate, fought on Mr. Hemmerde's policy of the taxation of land values, and a thorough policy of land reform, as well as on a retrenchment of armaments. Thus he was able to hold his own against two opponents—a Tory attacking the Insurance Act, and a strong local Labor member making play over the miners' discontent with the Minimum Wage Act. It was inevitable that he should lose votes to the miners' candidate, but it is clear that he lost very few indeed to the Conservative. The latter only secured 3,379 votes against 7,944 (4,749 to Mr. Arnold and 3,195 to Mr. Lunn) divided between the two Progressive candidates. This shows that Toryism without a policy, or with Protection as one, is still a hopeless proposi-

tion with the British electorate. And Liberalism again has its clear lead.



(London) Land Values, July.—In the Daily News and Leader of 24th June Mr. H. W. Massingham urges upon the Government and Liberals generally what he conceives to be the "lessons" of North-West Norfolk and Holmfirth. After writing nearly a column of more or less interesting journalistic matter he says: "What is clear is that the land program should include all branches of workers, that it should be based on the transference of the burden of local taxation from improvements to land, and that a great policy of compulsory purchase on the capital valuation and of compulsory building must be inaugurated. With it must go, as an indispensable condition, the raising of the flag of the minimum wage." This is how we are helped by our friends. Those who made the issues both at North-West Norfolk and at Holmfirth will want to know what justification Mr. Massingham has for including in the land programme upon which the campaign was fought "a great policy of compulsory purchase on the capital valuation, compulsory building, and the raising of the flag of the minimum wage." It is absolutely gratuitous. If anything was made clear at those elections it was that the rating and taxation of land values was demanded by the electorate as the road upon which the Government should go forward, instead of embarking on fancy schemes of land purchase, or forcing local authorities to build houses, or attempting to make men free by instituting an arbitrary "minimum wage." Yet Mr. Massingham favors the policy that has been so emphatically condemned, and actually presents it as a part of the approved "land programme." He encourages others to take advantage of the enthusiasm for the taxation of land values in order that something else may be introduced that will have a directly opposite effect. The taxation of land values is advocated as a means to break down land monopoly, to cheapen land, to remove the rates and taxes that burden industry, and to raise wages by giving access to land to those who will use it. But the lavish expenditure of public money for land purchase and house building will only increase the weight of taxation, raise the value of land, and strengthen the powers of monopoly. The two policies will not mix; they are mutually hostile and destructive. There is, we know, a Tory land reform school among Liberals who try to make this compromise, but they are up against a fast growing public opinion that will inevitably denounce and reject them as the enemies of reform.



Bryan.

Dubuque Telegraph-Herald (dem. Dem.) July 2.—When Bryan went to Baltimore nearly everybody thought that he would be the deadlock nominee. Bryan was conscious of what was in the popular mind. If he had put service of self above service of principle, his effort at Baltimore would have been to draw the Eastern element in the party to his support. But he opened fire on the representatives