

\$10,000 from the cemetery, net income.  
 \$1,175 from city park and hall for festivities, net income. (All the above is the property of the city.)  
 \$8,750 from 1 newspaper for publishing city adv'ts.  
 \$750 from advertising boards and pillars.  
 \$375 from electric clock service.  
 \$3,750 from taxes on dogs (\$4 each).  
 \$1,875 from hunting and fishing rights.  
 \$30,000 from keeping record of real estate sales.  
 \$72,000 from tax on provisions, brought into the city.

The city owns \$245,250—a capital "to grow" for 34 different purposes, coming from bequests, collections, gifts, etc.

This was the amount on December 31, 1904.

It grew in the year of 1904 by \$26,750. It grew from January 1, 1890, from \$47,500 by new gifts, bequests and interest, to \$245,250 on December 31, 1904.

The purposes are six monuments and monumental fountains, a big organ for the hall for festivities, one hall of arts, a garden for wild animals, for the people's kitchen, for the people's free library, for increasing the number of open street gutters with clear flowing water, etc.

May 2, 1906.

L. DREIER.

\* \* \*

## THE RUSSIAN LAND QUESTION

Editorial in the New York Globe of June 2, 1906

That the land question so quickly pushed to the front in the Duma is further evidence that the Russian peasant, however inhospitable to new ideas, is tenacious of old ones. The delegates representing the peasants secured the inclusion of expropriation as a principal item of the reform programme. This indicates that the peasants still cling to the notion entertained when serfhood was abolished—that the land belongs to them and not to their masters, and that to keep them out of it is robbery.

With respect to agrarian rights the peasants at emancipation had traditional conceptions antedating and at variance with the written law. According to the decrees of the czar, copying the land system of the west, estates belonged to the proprietors; according to the peasants they belonged to them, and the proprietorial right consisted merely in the personal authority over the serfs which for some inscrutable but not to be questioned reason the czar had conferred on their masters. As Sir Donald Wallace says in his authoritative work, these peasant conceptions were not put into strict legal form, but the peasants often expressed them in their own homely, laconic way by saying to their masters: "We are yours, but the land is ours." When the emancipation came, and the moujik title was not recognized, the notion long prevailed that a part of the decree had been suppressed, or that a second and more important one was to come. Of what use, the peasants asked, is freedom, if we are actually poorer than we were?

With infinite difficulty were many villages—and it is to be remembered that land communism prevails in Russia—induced to accept the so-called liberty on the terms offered. They believed themselves outraged by an arrangement which gave them only half the land and required them to compensate their masters for that half. As late as 1885 the czar was compelled peremptorily to order that settlements should be made which, under the theory of the original decree, were to be by agree-

ment under the direction of arbiters or umpires appointed for the various districts. The peasantry has never ceased to consider as wrong the forty-nine year payments and the reservation of half the land as the private estate of the landlords. So on the first opportunity, as the Duma proceedings show, the demand is renewed for more land and the cessation of land payments.

Progress of time might have dimmed the old conceptions had they not been kept alive by the population increase. In 1861, when the present division was made, the average amount of land set off was 8.62 acres per private male serf, 12.03 acres per crown male serf, and 17.56 acres per state male serf. Now in many districts, especially where the private serfs were the most numerous, the communal division of the land has so gone on that the allotment has dwindled to a mere sliver. "Zemli malo!" ("There is not enough land!") is an exclamation often heard at the village assemblies. Those that look ahead ask anxiously: "What is to become of our children? Already the communal allotment is too small for our wants, and the land outside is doubling and trebling in price! What will it be in the future?" With millions of peasants on the border line of starvation, eager is the gaze at the estates of the proprietors and at what the state and crown still owns. With the pressure of material want a mordant, the tradition that the land is kept from its rightful owners does not fade. The Duma, the new power of which the peasant has heard, is to do what the czar, if his will had not been perverted, long ago would have done.

If some adjustment is not made Russia's rural regions are likely to become afflicted with chronic agrarian disorder. In the cities, where men are massed, the soldiers are able to enforce some sort of order, but in the sparsely settled country the task is beyond achievement.

\* \* \*

## THE TOWN MEETING IN NEW ENGLAND

For The Public.

In these days when the "expressed will of the people" by ballot is being over-ridden with impunity by unscrupulous political machine law makers, and laws are placed upon our statute books in defiance of the spirit and interest of the people's wishes, it is well to study democratic methods wherever we can find them. The town meeting in New England is one of the most democratic institutions which has ever been devised. It rests absolutely upon the aggregation of individual voters in mass meetings assembled. The people en masse first vote viva voce, vote next by show of hands, again by a division of the house, and last a voting list is procured and the votes are checked up, and from this last there is no appeal. This is certainly direct legislation in its broadest and most deliberate form and in effect it is the initiative and referendum. All matters affecting public policy or the credit of the town must be decided by referendum vote. No extension of public debt or credit, or granting franchises for public utilities without a vote. Three to five people can initiate legislation by serving notice