

The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana
LINCOLN STEPPENS, Massachusetts
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island
HENRY F. RING, Texas
WILLIAM H. FLEMING, Georgia
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
ROBERT BAKER, New York
BOLTON HALL, New York
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware
HERBERT QUICK, Iowa
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
LEWIS H. BERRENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FEWLES, New Zealand
W. G. BEECHER, California

Vol. XIII.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1910.

No. 618

Published by LOUIS F. POST

Elsworth Building, 257 Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents

Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898 at the Post Office at
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879

EDITORIAL

Control of Water-Power Sites.

To what end is the war of words over the question of State versus Federal control of water-power sites? Unless the monopoly value, or the land value, is taxed it makes little difference whether monopolists take those sites from the Federal Government or from the States. It is said by some thinking men, with much reason, that the sooner these water-power sites are grabbed and monopolized, the better for the people and for real progress, for when they are monopolized the people will awaken the sooner to the necessity for the land-value tax. As to the question now at issue, the people could easily and quickly settle it if the question were submitted to them directly at the ballot box. But President Taft and his friends in Congress don't trust the people to settle their own questions for themselves.

+ +

President Taft as a Party Servant.

William Allen White, in his Emporia Gazette—and may he and it have more influence—says of President Taft's message that the people are behind these demands, but that the bourbons are against them, "and the bourbons will fight"; yet "if the President will stand firm, let party solidarity go to grass and be a public and not a party servant, he will give the Republican party a lease of life that will carry it far into the century. But if he serves his party rather than his

CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:

Control of Water Power Sites.....	97
President Taft as a Party Servant.....	97
Democracy, Privilege, and Judge Lurton.....	98
"The Third Degree" Once More.....	99
Faking Stupidities in Regard to Mr. Bryan.....	100
Democracy is Not on Trial (H. H. Hardinge).....	100
\$2.25 (Arthur H. Dodge).....	100

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:

The Parliamentary Elections and the British Electoral System (L. F. P.).....	101
--	-----

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:

The Alaska Coal Lands (Morrison I. Swift).....	105
--	-----

NEWS NARRATIVE:

The Parliamentary Elections in Great Britain (cartoon)	106
The Floods in France Subsiding.....	107
The Increased Cost of Living.....	108
The Ballinger Investigation.....	108
The Cost of Second-Class Mail Matter.....	109
The Democratic League of the State of New York.....	110
The Shirtwaist Makers' Strike.....	110
More Three-Cent Fares in Cleveland.....	110
Illinois Schools Blighted by Landlordism.....	111
Independent Cuba	111
News Notes	111
Press Opinions	112

RELATED THINGS.

The Stake of Battle (Jas. Blackhall).....	114
"The Hungry Forties".....	114
"Our Fathers Have Told Us".....	115
Raking Up Old History.....	116
The Money Trust.....	116

BOOKS:

War as an Economic Problem.....	117
Pamphlets	118
Periodicals	118

country, his party will suffer by the service." It is evident, however, that President Taft is less a public servant than a party servant; he is at once a party boss and a party servant. Perhaps that is less his fault than that of our unscientific system of government. Mr. White's language carries the idea, which is correct, that our Government is not a government of, for and by the people, but one of bourgeois representatives if they can muster the votes in Congress; not a government by representatives of the people, but of representatives of the Plunderbund. It is not a matter of votes at the ballot box, but of votes in Congress; not self-government, but government by Congress. But is it not evident that President Taft and the members of Congress would be public servants if the people had the initiative and referendum, to which President Taft is opposed? He frequently refers to himself, since he went into the White House, as the "titular head of the Republican party," thus giving evidence that he regards himself as a party boss and servant first, and a public servant when he can be that without interfering with his titular party service. The officeholder who regards himself as a party servant is opposed to "more power for the people." So we find the President opposing the initiative and referendum, which will enable the people to control their public servants.



Democracy, Privilege, and Judge Lurton.

The recent promotion of Judge Horace H. Lurton to the Supreme Bench (vol. xii, p. 1211), is a fact of somewhat sinister significance. Doubtless President Taft was influenced chiefly by a kindly personal feeling toward a man with whom he had associated intimately as a Federal judge in the lower courts and whose aristocratic tendencies of mind are congenial to him. It may not have occurred to Mr. Taft very clearly that in this appointment he was adding another important link to a chain with which the judiciary of this country has for nearly a century been shackling popular rights in behalf of special privileges. But that is precisely what he has probably done.



To appreciate the sinister significance of Mr. Taft's promotion of Judge Lurton, one should read three thoughtful articles which appeared in the New York Independent months before Judge Lurton's promotion—one of them in the issue of April 16, 1908, and the other two in the issues of August 19 and 26, 1909, respectively. The first of these articles, by no less distinguished a citizen than President Hadley of Yale, rightly

divided the Constitutional powers of the United States government, not into the usual nominal one of legislative, executive and judicial, but into the more fundamental classification of the power of the voters on the one hand, represented by legislative and executive authority, and that of property owners on the other, with the judiciary as arbiter between them. The statement would have been more accurate, we surmise, had President Hadley classified according to interests instead of persons. The division he must have had in mind is not between voters and property owners, since many voters are property owners and most property owners are voters; but between human interests and property interests—between those interests of men which attach to them in society simply because they are men, and those interests of men as property owners, which attach to them not because they are men but because they possess proprietary titles. This distinction is brought out elaborately in the other two articles (noted above as appearing in the Independent of August 19 and 26, of last year), which are by a lawyer of evident ability, Jesse F. Orton of New York. They distinguish acutely with a great wealth of historical testimony, and convincingly, between those property rights which, flowing from the original producers of the thing possessed, are justly in the same category with human rights, and those property rights which, flowing only from franchises, are in the opposing category of special privileges. Taking these three articles together, an invincible case is made out. They show that under our system of government, property rights are held more sacred than human rights, and that property rights include franchise privileges. It is franchise privileges, indeed, that are the prime objects of this governmental solicitude. In every controversy between human rights and property rights, the property right at issue is for the most part and perhaps altogether a mere legal privilege.



Over the issue, then, of man versus privilege, the judiciary is, as President Hadley says, the arbiter. In the last resort it is the Supreme Court of the United States that decides between what he calls, "the forces of democracy on one side" and "the forces of property on the other side." Under these circumstances, the bias of Supreme Court judges on that fundamental political point is of the utmost importance to the public welfare. It is this that gives to Judge Lurton's appointment a sinister significance which we hope he may believe should the case of Democracy *versus* Privilege

come before the Supreme Court for adjudication while he is one of its members. For Judge Lurton was reported by a special investigator for the Cleveland Press of December 9 last, just after his nomination by President Taft, to be one of that class of judges who prefer rights of property to rights of man. It may be useful to quote from the Press's investigator, Gilson Gardner. Writing from Nashville, Tenn., he said:

I came here to see what kind of reputation his neighbors give to Judge Horace H. Lurton, who has been picked by President Taft to succeed Justice Peckham on the United States Supreme bench. "The railroads and the corporations of Tennessee will be entirely satisfied with Judge Lurton's appointment," said the first man I asked. "He has served them here in Tennessee long and faithfully, and they will be glad to see him promoted to the larger field." . . . Judge Lurton owed his first judicial appointment to President Cleveland. A leading member of the Nashville bar and himself a corporation lawyer is John J. Vertrees. What he had to say of Judge Lurton takes on added significance from the fact that he is personally and professionally the Judge's friend. "In these days," said Vertrees, "judges and lawyers are apt to be classified under two heads; those who place the emphasis on property rights and those who place the emphasis on personal rights. To the former class belongs Judge Lurton." The attorney went on to argue that this position is the correct one, and that stability of property should be made paramount. . . . Judge Lurton, as a member of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, found technical grounds for declaring the Employers' Liability act unconstitutional. In the application of J. K. Keen for an injunction against voting certain railway stocks, Judge Lurton found the Sherman anti-trust law not to be binding upon him or his railroads, much to the satisfaction of E. H. Harriman, whose consolidation program was thus made easy. As far back as the early '70s Judge Lurton was known as a partisan of the corporations as against the people, defending the claims of turnpike and early railway companies to the subsidies voted them by the State before the Civil War. It is recalled that when he was a member of the Chancellor's court he read a paper before the Bar association arguing the entire sufficiency of the courts to curb trusts and monopolies, and deprecating legislation of this character.

+ +

"The Third Degree" Once More.

When Charles Klein's "Third Degree" (vol. xii, p. 625) was played recently in Detroit, Captain McDonnell, chief of the Detroit detectives, according to the Detroit News of December 28, sternly repudiated any such "third degree" practice for Detroit.

There's nothing to it, none of that. No. There's nothing like that here. We treat them right, no brutality. Nobody does anything like that here. Of course if a man is guilty of a murder, and we are sure about it, we try to get him to confess. But we

don't starve him, nor work on him till he is physically exhausted. They are fed and treated just like other suspects.

Then this gentle police person naively described the illegal police practices of Detroit:

I am a police officer, not a lawyer. We've got to make laws of our own. If we suspect a man we see that he doesn't get a lawyer near him until we get through with him. We question him, and corner him up until he confesses. There was that young fellow who murdered the old woman, and who was acquitted by the jury though he confessed. We used no brutality. He said he wanted to confess, after some facts were shown to him. If a man has committed a murder, we are going to get that man to confess if we can. They break down. But, brutality, naw, none of that. Mind, I ain't saying anything about the play, but that's all wrong. We kept at Hamburger day after day. He was a well-dressed, good-looking fellow. I knew it would be hard to put it on him. But after some days he would hold his hands about his waist as if in pain, and say, "I feel so bad. I feel so bad. I want to tell you all. But I cannot, I cannot." We saw that we had him goin'. He finally broke down. They usually break down. And, in spite of his confession we had a hard time convicting him.

In regard to this Mr. Hamburger, a well-known Detroit business man, writes:

The Hamburger the Captain refers to was convicted on the sweat box confession, otherwise there was no case. To the public Hamburger appeared to be an imbecile; he was a wreck at the time of the trial, both physically and mentally, could not talk and did not appear conscious of his surroundings, and physically would not even sit up. Before his arrest he was an ordinary young fellow about town.

But we are not through with Captain McDonnell. He is evidently not aware of the identity of American and Canadian and English common law in regard to the rights of suspected persons, for he continues:

I always make sure that the suspect is asked if the confession he signs was not made voluntary, if I promised him anything, and if he wasn't used right by the police. I take care to have them make that statement. Now, in Canada the police are obliged to tell the arrested one that all that he may say to the police will be used against him. We don't tell them that here. We don't have to. Why, they'd never talk if we were to warn them in that way. But there's no third degree, no brutality, nothing like that.

To crown this hideous situation comes this paragraph in regard to the new police quarters at Center and Broome Streets, New York, as described in the New York World of November 30:

The latest thing in accommodations at the new building is what the police term the "roast or freeze third degree rooms." There are two rooms in the basement to be devoted entirely to this work. They are absolutely bare and forbidding, with steel walls

and pipes for quick changes of temperature. Above the grated ceilings electric lights are so arranged as to light the rooms instantly or else throw them into complete darkness. The temperature of the rooms can be lowered or increased in a few minutes, which means a real "sweating" or a "freeze out" for the unfortunates made to submit to the process.

Fortunately a Mayor with a reputation for justice, decency and humanity has been installed in the New York City hall since the above paragraph was printed. It is to be hoped that some humanitarian uses will be found for those hellish basement rooms, before mobs rise and subject policemen to their own tortures.

+ +

Faking Stupidities in Regard to Mr. Bryan.

That Daniel Kiefer was right when he asserted to the Cincinnati Times-Star his disbelief in the authenticity of an announcement of Mr. Bryan's candidacy for the Presidency in 1912 (p. 75), purporting to come from Richard L. Metcalfe, associate editor of The Commoner, is shown by the unequivocal denial of the announcement which appears in The Commoner of January 28. Mr. Metcalfe quotes the candidacy announcement as it appeared in "The Cincinnati Enquirer and other newspapers," and says: "There is no truth whatever in this statement. It is a raw, unadulterated fake."

+ + +

DEMOCRACY IS NOT ON TRIAL.

There is a current phrase that "democracy is on trial" in this country, but it is a fallacy based upon a misconception. Democracy is not on trial, has not been on trial, and will not be on trial until it is tried.

Democracy has never been tried, but every other form of social organization has been tried, and all have failed.

Monarchy has been tried and has developed but one virtue—efficiency. Its vices neutralize that.

Absolutism has been tried and its crimes and injustices cry to heaven.

Aristocracy has been tried and its intolerable tyrannies have been the cause always of its undoing.

Plutocracy is now being tried in America; its net result in political, commercial and social rotteness is everywhere in evidence.

There is but one form of social organization left to try, and that is democracy. The universal trend is toward it now, and there is nothing so irresistible as a tendency. Fiscal necessity, economic pressure, and the logic of political and social events seem to be among the main factors

in our social regeneration. Add to them the steadily awakening and expanding conscience of mankind, and we have today an aggregate of social forces, superb in their power and unmistakable in their trend toward democracy.

HENRY H. HARDINGE.

+ + +

"\$2.25."

Real estate men in San Francisco do not agree as to when the Panama canal will be completed, but they do agree that when it is completed land values on that little wind-swept peninsula will take a mighty jump forwards.

+

Ask a real estate dealer why improvements being made thousands of miles distant should benefit San Francisco landlords, and he will inform you that he is a Business Man and not a theorist.

Not long ago one of the theorists wished to purchase a lot adjoining his own, with the intention of building on it and generally improving the land. The lot was one of those we all have seen in the suburbs of cities, which is worth more to the person owning the adjoining lot than to anyone else. The theorist made the Business Man a fair offer which was flatly declined, and then the following conversation occurred:

"But you will have to hold this lot several years before it will be worth as much as I am willing to give; and in the meantime you will have to pay taxes on it."

"Well, you know how it is; taxes don't amount to much on unimproved land. Last year we paid only \$2.25; so we can easily hold the lot until the Panama canal is finished, when it will be worth double what you are willing to pay for it now."

+

"Two dollars and twenty-five cents"!

"Two dollars and twenty-five cents" tells a story of "fenced-up" opportunities.

It explains the hidden power of landlords to prevent carpenters from building houses which people need. It explains why dwellings are built so close together in the suburbs of San Francisco, while well within the city limits are thousands of acres which no one is using and which no one will use for years to come. It explains why farmers are forced to till land a hundred miles from a market, thus making them the prey of express and transportation companies.

"Two dollars and twenty-five cents" also explains why young men say good-bye to their sweet-

hearts and then seek opportunities in the wilds of new countries, although leagues and leagues of land need them at home.

And lastly it explains why one of the "disemployed," as reported recently in the San Francisco press, footsore and discouraged, ashamed of going home night after night and telling his wife that no work could be found, took a revolver and went out to Golden Gate Park.

ARTHUR H. DODGE.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS, AND THE BRITISH ELECTORAL SYSTEM.

London, January 18, 1910.

It would be presumptuous in a foreigner, at this stage of the Parliamentary voting in England, to venture a prediction as to final results; but now that 178 seats out of 670 have been voted for, the current opinion appears to be that the Liberals will return to power with a working majority of their own over the Tories, and with the Labor and the Irish parties (with both of which they have been by the present Parliamentary elections and the preceding circumstances drawn into close relations on the principal issues), an overwhelming majority.

Neither the Liberal majority, nor the majority of Liberal, Labor and Irish in conjunction, will be as large as in the Parliament which was officially dissolved on the 10th; for that was immense. The Liberals had 376, to 157 Tories; and Liberals, Labor and Irish together had 513 to 157. It was a "record majority" as they call it here—due to special and temporary circumstances surrounding the elections of 1906. All expectation of a return of so large a majority at the present elections has been disclaimed by the Liberals throughout the campaign. But they are now claiming a larger majority than they hoped for last week, before the early elections were held.

+

For purposes of estimate and prophecy, these early elections are to the British politician what early returns are to the American politician. But with a tremendous difference. Whereas the American can calculate only upon what the other results already recorded may turn out to be when reported, the Briton may calculate upon them in advance of their being cast.

Elections here drag along from the fifth day after election writs are issued, to the fifteenth day or there about. And so it has happened that elections were held in some constituencies on the 15th of January and in others on the 17th. More are to be held today, while the final ones of importance will not come off until the 25th, though many others will intervene.

It is to be said, however, that notwithstanding the opportunities which would be afforded our politicians by such excellent vehicles of advance information as early elections, the early elections do furnish a "probability" clue to the results at the later ones:

So true is it that there is some kind of psychological rhythm to which humanity in the mass responds.

Yet one would hardly look for "probabilities" in the election returns here, whether with reference to results already recorded but not yet known, or to results yet to be secured. The election laws would seem to knock averages into a cocked hat. Some constituencies with 30,000 voters or more, return a solitary member to the House of Commons, while others, with only 5,000 or 10,000 voters or less, may return two or three members. To base probabilities therefore, upon returns of members, without a comparison of the popular vote of the past with that of the present in each district, would seem to be a poor method of calculation. Yet this is the common method, and apparently it works out.

+

But questions of calculation and estimate are minor ones with reference to the British election laws. Those laws are an abomination in many ways; and as they invariably tell against the common voter and common rights and in favor of the privileged, the aristocratic classes—through the Tory party—stand in the way of electoral reform just as those classes stood in the way of the reform of the "rotten borough" system eighty years ago, and for similar reasons. Not only are the common voters overwhelmed with heavy Parliamentary representation from small constituencies, where they are as a rule not in the majority, and left in the lurch with light representation from large constituencies, where they are in a majority, but the voting right is hedged in with restrictions which bother the poor but not the rich. In addition there is the absurd and antiquated plural vote. T. P. O'Connor is not far wrong when he says that it is easier for one rich man in this country to cast 20 votes than for 20 poor men to cast 1 vote. The same thing is true, of course, in our own country; but there the employer does it through economic coercion, whereas here it is done by law.

Nominally equal, the registration laws here are in fact unequal. No one can vote unless he is registered by a court of magistrates who pass upon his qualifications. Not infrequently the applicant must be represented by a lawyer, and lawyers in England seldom if ever "volunteer" professional services. To get upon the registry the applicant must prove that he has resided one year in the particular constituency where he wants to vote, and they are numbered by the hundred and are near together. As his application can be made only at a stated sitting of the court, which may be months after his year's residence is complete, he may actually have to reside in the constituency fifteen or twenty months or longer before he gets upon the voting list. Meanwhile, between the completion of his year's residence and his registration, an election may intervene. For elections here are not at set times as with us. They come off whenever Parliament happens to dissolve, and may occur a couple of months apart, or a couple of years apart, or seven years apart, and at any time of the year. With such a registration law it is evident that the "latch-key vote" (roomers whose rooms are worth \$50 a year or more, unfurnished), and the householder vote (tenants whose holdings are worth \$50 a year or more), must be disfran-

chised in large numbers. On the other hand, men of easy fortune, well known and well-fixed in the several constituencies in which they own or rent real estate, are put upon the voting list in all those constituencies almost as matter of course, without trouble and without expense. Would it be strange if one rich voter could get 20 votes easier than 20 poor ones get one?

Those facts about the voting franchise are especially important at elections in which, like the present ones, the privileges of the privileged classes are drawn in question. They give so great an advantage to the privileged that one wonders how the progressive elements can make any headway at the ballot box. Probably they could make none, if it were not for the co-operation in leadership and campaigning of men who, big enough to rise above their accidents of birth and fortune, raise the flag of common rights and moral principle in place of the ensign of privilege.

+

This co-operation of all the progressives is especially notable in these elections, and altogether encouraging. The Labor party was unable to carry it out on their part as completely as could have been desired, owing to local stubbornness here and there and to the pertinacity of the impossibilist element among Socialists. Consequently several constituencies which normally belong to the Liberals by moderate majorities, and where the Liberals are stronger than the Labors, are contested by Labor candidates. The resulting three cornered fights have already given some of these, and will doubtless give some more, to the party of Privilege, against the Progressives of the other three parties—Liberal, Irish and Labor—by sending to the House of Commons a partisan of modern protectionism and ancient feudalism.

Mr. H. M. Hyndman is distinctly responsible for one of these results. But Ben Tillett, who has faced two three-cornered contests has fortunately failed to help out the House of Lords by his narrow partisanship as Mr. Hyndman, to the extent of one member of the Commons they are not entitled to by the sentiment of the constituency, has helped out by his.

The fairness and good faith of the Liberals in avoiding triangular contests has been in gratifying contrast with the course of impossibilists in British socialism. They have yielded some of their own best men to bring all the progressive forces together. In Manchester, for instance, one of the best political organizers in Great Britain, a single tax Liberal as we might call him, who had long been regarded as a candidate for one of the constituencies, withdrew in favor of the Labor candidate rather than make a three-cornered fight. The local Labor party were as public spirited, for they withdrew their candidate in another Manchester district. Both districts were consequently carried—one for a progressive Liberal and the other for the Labor candidate in whose favor Mr. Zimmermann (the single tax Liberal) had withdrawn.

To what extent Socialists have "scratched" Liberal candidates where there was no socialist candidate, and whig Liberals have scratched Labor candidates where there was no Liberal, it is of course impossible to say. We only know that in the districts where triangular contests were avoided by pre-ar-

rangement, the Labor leaders and speakers have worked for the Liberal and the Liberal leaders and speakers have worked for the Labor.

In Halifax, for instance, where the election occurred on the 15th, there is a double-headed constituency; that is, the borough elects two members by general vote. It is a Liberal and a Labor town; but a split among the progressives would have jeopardized both seats, and an arrangement was made under which the Liberals and the Labors each made only one nomination. In a scrutiny of the vote, the only evidence of lack of co-operation was, on one side, 20 ballots marked "socialism," and thereby "spoiled," indicating socialist impossibilism, and a falling of the Labor candidate behind the Liberal by about 400 votes, indicating Liberal whiggism.

The campaign, however, while separately made, was co-operative in spirit. The leaders and speakers on both sides—Labor and Liberal—advised and urged their followers to vote for both candidates; and both were elected by majorities exceeding that of the record vote of 1906. The feeling between progressive Liberals and progressive Labors in Halifax is reciprocally friendly, and this election is likely to enhance that co-operative sentiment.

+

The Halifax Liberal who was re-elected along with the Halifax Labor candidate, is J. H. Whitley.* He is second Liberal "whip" in the House of Commons.

"Whips" are those officials of a party whose duty it is to keep the members of their party in the House informed as to when their attendance is desired. If a member wishes to be away, he gets permission of the "whip;" if his vote is needed the party "whip" warns him. If a "division" is to occur and every vote is needed either to make a majority or to make a showing, the "whip" whips up the members and gets them into the voting lobby. Of course a "division" is simply a vote, but here, instead of being got by roll call or "ayes" and "noes," it is got by turning the "ayes" out of the chamber and into one lobby and the "noes" out of the chamber and into another lobby. As they withdraw they are counted by the "whips" on each side.

Mr. Whitley has been one of these "whips" of the Liberals, and owing to his prominent position in the party the yellow press (protectionist) assailed him viciously and without warrant. This attack excited great indignation in Halifax, and although Mr. Whitley was in Italy with his sick wife throughout the campaign, his neighbors piled up an increased vote for him.

Single tax readers of *The Public* will be interested to know that Mr. Whitley is what we call a single taxer or disciple of Henry George; and that it is his devotion to that cause, and this motive alone, that has brought him into politics and keeps him there.

+

It was in Mr. Whitley's town, Halifax, that I personally observed the British method of conducting elections. Through the courtesy of C. H. Smithson, a town councillor who, like Mr. Whitley, is in politics only because of his devotion to the cause that Henry George set agoing, and who was elected to the Council last summer unopposed because the sitting mem-

*Election noted in *Public*, January 21, p. 58.

ber withdrew from the contest when Mr. Smithson entered it, I was shown the entire machinery in actual operation, part of which is visible only as matter of favor.

The preliminary work is highly systematic. The Liberal party (for instance, for it is the same with all) holds one ward meeting a year. It is a mass meeting, and everybody attending may participate provided he declares his affiliation with the party. These meetings elect what we should call the central committee, consisting of leaders and workers, and numbering for Halifax nearly 500. It is called "the Four Hundred."

Under salaried employment by the committee is an "agent," who is charged with responsibility for all the executive work of the party, and who must be an acute politician and a thorough specialist in the complicated and highly technical election laws.

As an example of the technical character of these laws, the use of a hired vehicle to take voters to or from the polls is illegal, although owners may lend their vehicles freely; and the carrying of one voter in a hired vehicle to or from the polls, however innocently done (as if the worker using the vehicle honestly and reasonably thought it there as a loan from the owner and not on hire), would nullify, not only the one vote nor even the whole vote of the ward, but the entire election in that city.

Coming back to the party "agent," one of his duties is to have the registry list canvassed by volunteer workers, to get "promises" of votes for the Liberal candidates. The workers get the names and addresses on cards, on which they report, a "promise" if they get it, or "doubtful," or other appropriate remark if the "promise" is refused. As a rule no attention is thereafter paid to any but those who "promise"; but the cards identifying these "promises" are so pigeon-holed as to show, by card index and instantly upon reference at any minute up to the closing of the poll, just who among them has not voted.

All the paraphernalia of the workers is kept in an open room in the ward club house of the party, and there nearly all the workers are assembled. Some workers are stationed outside of the poll not far away, and these send messages to the club house announcing the name of each voter as he votes. At the club house the whole printed registry list is conveniently arranged for reference, and as reports of voters having voted come in a red line is drawn across the name. Then the pigeon hole of promises is searched for that name. If a card bearing it be found there, this voter is of no further present interest to the worker and they destroy the card.

Constantly during the day the remaining "promise" cards are now and then examined, and if some "promiser" appears to be slow his card is turned over to an election day worker, often a woman, who calls upon the voter and reports on the card whatever the fact may be regarding him: He has gone to the poll, he went to the poll long ago, he will go at such an hour, he refuses to go unless motored, he is too feeble to walk, etc., etc. According to these reports further action is taken; and as before, whenever the man is reported as having voted, his card is destroyed. Toward the end of the day, the pigeon holes of "promise" cards are pretty well emptied, but if any are left a hustle is made for the dilatory voters.

How well this method works may be inferred from the fact that out of a total voting population of 15,000 in Halifax, the Liberals had 9,419 "promises" and their candidate, Mr. Whitley, polled 9,504 votes. The extra votes were probably from "doubtfuls," who for business reasons did not wish to have their votes identified.

While that work is going on openly and busily in the party club of the ward—and in Halifax the Liberal party has a fine club house of its own, with billiard hall and table, skating rink, committee rooms, assembly rooms, etc., in every ward—the voting is taking place in a "board" school room.

The "board" school in England is our "public" school, the "public" school here being a pay school not restricted to children of the upper classes.

In one of the large rooms of the school house, the entire voting for that ward is done. But not with one ballot box nor one set of booths. Several tables appear, with a ballot box on each, and ten feet or so in front of it a row of uncurtained booths. There are as many of these tables as there are arbitrary divisions of the ward with reference to number of voters. About 500 voters are assigned to each of the divisions, and when a voter appears he is asked where he lives and is conducted to the table for that division.

Here he gets a ballot, torn from a perforated book of ballots, and carries it into one of the booths in front of the table. As he marks his ballot in the booth his whole back is exposed, and not merely his legs or none of him as with us.

Our voters would not think that this was secret. The Englishman does, and he is probably right.

Having marked his ballot, a sheet about four or five inches by three or four, he folds it and returns it to the clerk at the table, who puts it into the ballot box.

There is no glass about the ballot box here, as with us. It is a japanned tin box with a slit in the top and resembles a large bread box for the pantry.

At 8 o'clock in the evening, after 14 hours, the polls are closed, and the ballot box is carried to the town hall. This is Halifax, however, where the voting is at large. In a division I suppose it would be carried to a convenient official point, but the proceeding would be the same.

At the town hall, the number of ballots is first ascertained to correspond with the number of electors who have voted. This is the only opportunity for scrutinizing the ballots unfairly, and it is availed of. In agricultural regions the landlords' agent watches closely, for the officials may turn the ballots face up if they choose. In that way the landlord gets to know how many anti-Tory votes are recorded in his little voting place, and the rest may be matter of guess work and shrewd questioning, but the tenant or farm hand who falls under suspicion is likely to have a "rocky" time.

Having verified the number of ballots in each box, the officials dump all the boxes upon a table, throwing the ballots for the entire constituency into one heap indiscriminately. All possibility of distinguishing one from another then disappears; but wouldn't it make the mouth of any of our ward "heelers" water to see such a chance for "counting in" or "counting out" go to waste?

Other features of the British elections would make

our experts water at the mouth, but there is a sort of automatic honesty in politics over here (within conventional limits) which the American manipulator of elections could no more understand than the average Englishman can understand our automatic dishonesty in such matters.

When the great pile of ballots are counted—there were nearly 15,000 in Halifax, but there were only four names on each and in many places there are only two—the result is officially proclaimed, and the telegraph does the rest.

+

It has been my good fortune to fall in with Henry George, Jr., over here and to campaign with him, upon the earnest requisition of Liberal managers and in spite of our protests that there would be danger in bringing forward foreigners when war scares and protection humbug were being exploited by the other side. But there seems to be no such prejudice against foreigners over here. The audiences really did seem to wish to hear what we had to say about the United States as a protected country.

For the protectionists here have been asserting that wages in the United States are high and there is no unemployment there among them. This protection red herring is probably the only thing that has prevented a Liberal sweep like that of four years ago. Working men of narrow insular experience, have been caught up with the false statements that protection makes high wages, cheap food, cheap rent, steady employment, and no foreigner can take his job away. Workingmen who have been to the United States and Germany know better; but they cannot get the ear of all the rest.

It was upon these points, therefore, that Mr. George and I dwelt,—plus considerable emphasis on the land question, since all the meetings were joyfully singing, "God made the land for the people," to the air of "Marching Through Georgia."

Our first meeting was at Newcastle-under-Lyme, (near Stoke-on-Trent) where Josiah C. Wedgwood, one of the Liberal government's best supporters in the last House on the Budget, was running for re-election. We had an audience of close to 2,500, packed solid in the town hall, with no aisles except at the sides, and they and the door-ways and corridors were crowded with standers.

Whoever imagines that an English audience is stolid let him charge it up to the fact that he has had nothing to tell them that they cared to hear. More enthusiastic audiences I have never seen—not enthusiastic merely for a candidate's name, nor in the "whooperup" style, nothing like applauding and cheering to see how long you can do it,—but hearty and intelligent appreciation of points in controversy. They are "hair trigger" audiences.

At Tunstall, in the same constituency (Tunstall the birthplace of primitive Methodism) I spoke at a similar meeting which Mr. George's engagements prevented his attending. There were about 1,500 there, but this was because the hall was much smaller, for our overflow meeting crowded another hall with 1,000 more.

When I came into the overflow meeting, Mr. Wedgwood was making to an intensely interested audience a simple exposition of the land question. Its character may be inferred from the fact that he is a thorough going disciple of Henry George, and has

been for many years. This is his reason, too, for being in politics. Descendant of a great Radical, he is himself a Radical—a democratic Liberal. The original Josiah Wedgwood, founder of the Wedgwood potteries, friend of Priestley and Franklin, and radical to the core, is four removes back from this Liberal leader. The latter is the great great grandson of that original potter in whose establishment he has inherited an interest, where he is also a manager, and whose democracy as well as an interest in the potteries he has inherited. Mr. Wedgwood was re-elected by 5,613 to 4,245.* The constituency went Tory in 1900 by 3,750 to 3,658, and Wedgwood carried it in 1906, the "record" year, by 5,155 to 2,948.

Another place in which Mr. George and I have spoken together was Halifax, and we are about to leave for Stockport in England and Glasgow in Scotland, where we are to keep several speaking engagements.

+

As the returns came in from the first day's pollings on Saturday night, they indicated some falling off from the vote of 1906, and notwithstanding the known impossibility of getting so great a result, they had an unmistakably dampening effect. But consideration of the localities modified this, for most if not all the changes back to Tory were in constituencies that were Tory normally. This reviving influence was justified by the returns of Monday's pollings.

The number of constituencies in which elections were held on Saturday, January 15, the first polling day, was 12 in London and 54 outside. Some had two seats. The Liberals had expected a crushing defeat in London, which in politics is largely of the penniless plute cockney type, but they saved 9 seats out of the 12. The net result of the two days, including unopposed seats and doublets (unopposed seats being those for which no contestant appears within the statutory time and which are therefore awarded to the only candidate, without an election) was as follows:

	Liberal	Tory	Labor	Irish	Gain	Loss
Jan. 15.....	37	43	6	5	Liberal, 3 Labor, 2 Tory, 18 Irish, 0	Liberal, 18 Labor, 2 Tory, 3 Irish, 0
Jan. 17.....	42	49	8	8	Liberal, 5 Labor, 1 Tory, 19	Liberal, 16 Labor, 4 Tory, 5
Totals.....	79	92	14	13	Liberal, 8 Labor, 3 Tory, 37	Liberal, 34 Labor, 6 Tory, 8

Some explanation of these changes may be of interest.

At Burnley on the 15th there were three candidates for one seat—Tory, Labor and Socialist, the latter being Mr. Hyndman. Following was the vote:

Arbuthnot (Tory)	5,776
Maddison (Lab.)	5,681
Hyndman (Soc.)	4,948

Tory plurality 55

In 1906, the Labor plurality was 324, the vote being 5,288 Labor, 4,964 Tory, and 4,932 Socialist.

At Derby, on the 15th, where two seats were contested, the Liberals won one without Labor opposi-

*Election noted in Public of January 21, page 58.

tion by 10,343, and the Labor candidate won the other without Liberal opposition by 10,189; the Tory candidates received respectively 8,038 and 7,953.

In one Division of Manchester on the 15th the Tory won by a plurality of 107 in a triangular contest in which the Tory got 3,111, the Liberal 3,004, and the Labor only 1,218, thereby changing the representation in the House of Commons from anti-Lords to Lords. In another division of Manchester the Liberals did not oppose the Labor candidates, and he was elected, taking a Liberal seat but counting against the Lords as before.

At Shoreditch on the 17th the Liberal was elected to a Tory seat by 3,041 to 2,585 for the Tory and 701 for a Socialist, although the Tory had carried the seat at a by election two years ago by 2,867 to 1,724 for the Liberal and 986 for the Socialist.

At Blackburn on the 17th a Liberal and a Labor—the latter being Philip Snowden—were elected by 12,065 and 11,896 respectively, to 9,307 and 9,111 for the Tories, there being no Socialist opposition to the Liberal and no Liberal opposition to Snowden. These two seats were Tory and Labor (the latter being Snowden) in the last Parliament.

A triangular contest at Gateshead was won by the Liberal by 6,800, to 6,323 for the Tory, and 3,572 for the Labor. The seat had been held in the last Parliament by Labor because the Liberals did not contest the Labors. On the same day at Portsmouth two progressive seats were lost in a triangular contest though not for that reason. The Tories got 16,777 and 15,592 respectively, to 12,397 for one Liberal, 9,965 for another and 3,529 for Labor.

A Labor gain at Wigan was due to the Liberals making no contest and giving the Labor candidate their vote. The vote was Labor 4,803 and Tory 4,293.

The only Wales (the country of Lloyd-George) constituency that has voted yet, Swansea Town, gives the Liberal 6,020 to 5,535 in 1906, the Tory 4,375 to 4,081 in 1906, and Labor (Ben Tillett) 1,451.

L. F. P.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE ALASKA COAL LANDS.

Concord, N. H., January 26, 1910.

Why at this time cannot a popular movement of such magnitude be organized that the United States government will neither lease nor sell its priceless coal fields in Alaska but will retain them entire to be ultimately worked by the nation for the equal benefit of the whole people? No other method of conservation as applied to them conserves. Coal is being rapidly exhausted; its value is certain to rise by leaps as the supply diminishes; the methods of private mining are cruelly and criminally wasteful, utterly neglectful of the next and after generations; nothing is gained by parting with these rich deposits, while the tragic popular loss from the operation is that it will pass over more power to the rich who are already more than threatening the nation's life. If these lands are retained by the people the popular gain through the act will not be merely the huge wealth which they contain, but will be the power

conferred by their possession to curb the piratical plans of other combines.

Now is the time to act. To-day's Washington (D. C.) dispatches state: "John E. Ballaine of Seattle, said to be the largest individual property owner in Alaska, to-day made a proposition in writing to the Senate Committee of Territories, of which Senator Beveridge of Indiana is chairman, offering to the government a royalty of 50 cents a ton for coal mined, for the lease of 5,000 acres of some of the choicest coal lands in Alaska, in the Katalla and Matanuska districts. Such a tonnage-royalty would net to the government, Mr. Ballaine claimed, as much as \$2,000,000 per 100 acres." Why should not the people have not only this sum but the tremendous additional amount that Mr. Ballaine will place in his pockets in excess of it?

Another proposition from the old line capitalists who want to get everything for absolutely nothing, is "embodied in a bill which has been prepared, but not yet introduced, designed to permit the sale or lease of such lands at a rate of \$10 per acre."

Can something be done? By acting quickly these people's possessions can be saved from alienation by Congress, and if not saved such a protest can be registered as will amount to a popular referendum rendering their cession to private parties on any terms morally void and making them recoverable by the next Congress. Senator Beveridge is standing with the people and showers of private letters and signed petitions sent to him will have their effect. The same work done to every man's congressman and senators will increase that effect, while clubs, meetings and papers taking the matter up can spread the agitation far.

We have reached the psychological moment, for this private monopoly of public resources is a vital factor in the high prices of necessities against which the people are revolting in their great meat boycott. And let us not forget the lessons of the last coal strike, the hardships of the miners disclosed, the greedy inhumanity of the coal barons, the sufferings of the people for want of fuel, and the powerlessness of the whole nation and its government to do anything against those mighty lords of coal. All would have been changed if there had been mines publicly owned ready for use. The same situation will recur—should we not be prepared? We have such mines in Alaska, let the people issue their mandate to keep them.

MORRISON I. SWIFT.

✦ ✦ ✦

When wilt thou save the people?

O God of mercy! when?

Not kings and lords, but nations!

Not thrones and crowns, but men!

—The Corn-law Rhymer.

✦ ✦ ✦

Twenty thousand thieves landed at Hastings. These founders of the House of Lords were greedy and ferocious dragoons, sons of greedy and ferocious pirates. Such, however, is the illusion of antiquity and wealth, that decent and dignified men now existing, actually boast their descent from these filthy thieves.—Ralph Waldo Emerson, in "English Traits."

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, February 1, 1910.

The Parliamentary Elections in Great Britain.

During the week since our last report (p. 81) the Liberals have partly recovered lost ground, and on the 1st the results stood:

Ministerialists.	
Liberals	274
Laborites	40
Nationalists	82
Total	396

Opposition.	
Unionists	273
Still to be elected	1

Although all the Irish Nationalists are entered here in the Ministerial group, twelve of them, under the leadership of William O'Brien, are not expected to vote with the Ministry.

+

T. P. O'Connor, cabling under date of the 29th to the Chicago Tribune, says:

It is now admitted by Harmsworth in the Times, who is usually the first to sniff a coming change in popular whim, that it is impossible to pass protection by the votes of sleepy, idle, and poverty stricken rural England, which alone has rallied to the Tories against such a decisive vote of all England which is robust, industrial and wealthy.

Nevertheless "Tay Pay" believes that—

—whatever advance the Tories have made they have made by the cry of protection. A number of manufacturers, seeing in it an increase of their profits, have gone in its favor, though the overwhelming majority of cotton manufacturers in Lancashire are against it.

The strength of the Ministerialists has lain, he believes, in the land provisions of the Budget. This new principle of taxing the unearned increment, it is that "has had the effect of sending the large landlords into spasms of rage and despair; and, on the other hand, has enthused the working people to more violent delight than they have shown in any previous election for a generation."

+

From mail sources we learn of some of the protectionists' efforts. Lord Curzon is reported as having made at Manchester this boomerang argument:

Thus, you see that these benighted Protectionist

countries (Germany, France, United States) are building up their manufactures, and are actually becoming independent of the products of your Lancashire spindles and looms. Your competitors can buy as cheaply as you, they pay less wages, they work longer hours.

To show the results of tariff duties on food products the London Daily News publishes this little table in its issue of January 18:

Saturday's Wheat Prices Compared. (Official Market Prices.)

	Per Quarter.
Berlin	52s. 9d.
London	40s. 6d.

The German import duty is 11s. 6d.

On the same page appears this amusing letter:

Tariff Reformers' Dilemma. A Paris Dialogue.

Sir—I have just returned from Paris (where there happens to be a tax on corn); where I had a rather interesting experience.

On Monday night, in the hotel I was staying at, were two enthusiastic English "Protectionists." The conversation turned on to the cost of living under Protection. One of them said he was going to take back from Paris some bread as an object lesson, to show that the cost of bread is no more than in England, in spite of the tax. "They won't be able to get over that," he said.

The head waiter was called, and the following dialogue ensued:

"William, I am going to buy some bread in Paris to take home with me, and I want it very cheap. What price shall I have to pay?"

"What sort of bread?"

"Oh, the cheapest I can possibly get. What the French working man gets."

"Ah, yes, I understand. Well, you will have to pay 5d. or 6d. per kilo."

"Per kilo! Why, that's 2½d. per lb. You don't understand. I am going to buy absolutely the cheapest bread to be had in Paris. Not what you use here."

"I understand perfectly," said William, "but you cannot possibly buy it in Paris less than 2½d. per lb."

"Don't you have bread here such as we get in England made up in square loaves?"

"Oh, yes. We get that, and we call it 'toast bread.'"

"That's what I want. I'm going to take some of that back with me."

"Yes, that costs about 1d. per lb. more than the other bread. (Collapse of Protectionist.) Come into the pantry, and I will show you what I mean."

They went into the pantry, and in a few minutes returned.

"It's no good," said one Protectionist to the other, "we can't take that back with us."

William then went away and his assistant was called. "I'll see if he says different to William."

The assistant, however, gave the same figures as William, so the Protectionists said no more about it. They simply dare not take that bread back to Eng-

land. The truth would kill their case, so they prefer to leave it alone.—Yours, etc.,

WILFRID S. TAYLOR.

Caithness Drive Liscard, Ches., Jan. 13.



Cartoon From the London Daily News of January 19.

The question of which party could claim credit for old age pensions, and make good on them, has been tossed back and forth. Speaking at Trowbridge on the 17th, Mr. Balfour is thus reported:

"Old age pensions, first suggested by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—(loud cheers)—are now, as far as they go, on the Statute Book of the country. They cannot be diminished without a new Act of Parliament, and let me tell you that no new Act of Parliament for which either party is going to be responsible connected with old age pensions is going to do anything but extend the benefits which old age pensions give. I do not pretend that we have the monopoly of anxiety to improve the existing systems. I do not deny that our opponents are as anxious as we to make the system as good as it can be, but I do protest in the name of political honor against this misuse of political insinuation, political calumny, political whispering behind doors intended to prejudice the minds of electors when they have great national and imperial interests to decide upon." (Hear, hear.)

It now appeared, continued Mr. Balfour, as far as he could understand it, that it was the present government, and not tariff reform, which was going to fail to get the money. (Cheers.) There was every indication that the taxes which the present Budget imposed would not produce either the revenue which was anticipated by the Minister who put on the taxes, or the revenue to meet our national and imperial responsibilities. (Cheers.)

At Newtown on the 18th, Mr. Lloyd George commented—

Mr. Balfour had claimed credit for old age pensions. Really, of all the cool things said in this election that took the first prize. Mr. Balfour when in office had never lifted a little finger to give these pensions. Mr. Asquith never promised them, but he was the man who granted them. (Cheers.) Opponents were always inviting Liberals to copy Germany in its worst habits and never in its best. And every land had got its best. Germany had got a good side—its splendid educational system, and its great ideas of organization, and its magnificent system for looking after the sick. But the Tories said, "Why don't you copy the Protection of Germany?" which meant black bread and horseflesh. They also said, "Why don't you copy the conscription of Germany and its great military expenditure?" He replied, "No, let us copy Germany in all that is right and best, as in her great scheme to provide against the evils which befall a household when the breadwinner is ill—a great scheme of national insurance." (Cheers.)

+

Mr. Philip Snowden, re-elected at Blackburn by an increased majority (p. 58), wrote thus of the character of this campaign in *The Christian Commonwealth* of the 19th:

This is the fourth Parliamentary contest I have fought. Three of them have been in Blackburn. I fought my first election during the Boer war, but I have never had a contest like this which is now drawing to a close. In former elections I have had to work up the enthusiasm and to rouse the opposition. But on this occasion it was there ready made at the very beginning of the contest. Men who have seen fifty years of political life in this borough tell me that they have never seen the people so stirred as they have been these last few weeks. I think this is accounted for by the action of the House of Lords. It has deeply stirred the thinking part of the electorate. There is everywhere a vast mass of political ignorance, and I do not believe that anything could move that. But the votes which are going against the Peers at this general election are the votes of men who are feeling deeply on the grave issues at stake. The votes given against the Peers may be reckoned as the enumeration of the number of electors who have so far developed morally as to put national welfare before selfish interests.

The Labor Leader gives this lively little heckling story:

Mr. Douglas Vickers (of Vickers, Maxim and Co.), Tory candidate for Brightside, Sheffield, was asked at one of his meetings how old he was. "My age has nothing to do with my candidature," he replied, "but I don't mind telling you. I am 45."

"That will do for me," the questioner replied; "I axed for a job at your works t'other day, and was told I am too old at 42. You are too old for my vote!"

+

The Floods in France Subsiding.

The devastating floods in France which when reported last week (p. 85) were still rising in

Paris and her environs, continued to rise in that city until the 29th, when they became stationary at a greater flood height than ever before recorded there, even surpassing the record flood of 1615. Subsidence began, but very slowly, so that by the 1st the fall was less than four feet, and the Seine was still over twenty-seven feet above normal level. Weakened sewers continued to burst, and but slight improvement in general conditions could be noted; but at least, the beloved city had not suffered a cataclysm. The situation in the provinces began to improve a little earlier than in Paris. The condition in which Paris is left by the receding waters, many of which have come through the sewers to submerge the streets and fill cellars and first stories, naturally brings fear of epidemics of disease, and the work of disinfection has been promptly undertaken in the streets and squares. Very strict orders, both in regard to the disinfection of houses, and to the restoration of weakened foundations, are being promulgated. The Assembly has extended the time of business notes for one month, in consideration of the demoralized condition of business. The suffering has been very great. The magnificent and usually perfectly equipped city has been almost without transportation and light, except for lamps and candles; largely without heat and food; and even without drinking water in great sections, especially in those inhabited by the very poor. All this in addition to the actual homelessness of thousands—Parisians as well as refugees.

+ +

The Increased Cost of Living.

Results of the widely scattered boycotts on meats because of the prevailing high prices (p. 82), have been reported from both East and West, and curiously enough, not only meats, but butter, eggs, milk and even vegetables, have fallen in widely separated localities.

+

At the recommendation of the President, both houses of Congress have been discussing the question of the increased cost of living. According to the Chicago Record-Herald in speeches on this subject on the 28th,—

—the exodus from the farms to the cities and the increased supply of gold were the two principal causes advanced for the high price of foods. The automobile and other developments of the last few years have lured the youth from the farms, according to Republican congressmen, and the boys are no longer content to remain at the old fireside, receiving for their labor \$20 a month, when by going to the cities and towns they may earn \$60. The speeches placed no responsibility upon the tariff. Violations of the anti-trust law, however, were suggested as contributing to the high prices of meat products.

A committee appointed by the Chicago Federation of Labor to investigate the high cost of living, began its work on the 25th. The committee is

composed of Professor R. F. Hoxie of the University of Chicago, Luke Grant of the Carpenters' Union, Miss Margaret Haley of the Teachers' Federation, Secretary John C. Harding of the Chicago Typographical Union, B. C. Dillon of the Musicians' Union, Edward N. Nockels, secretary of the Federation of Labor, and H. L. Bliss, the statistician. The committee will devote special attention to showing what relation, if any, the union wage scales have to the present high cost of food products and other commodities. Comparisons will be made between the wage scales of 1908 and 1909 and of the present in several of the principal crafts, and similar treatment will be given to the figures reported by workmen on the cost of living in the corresponding years.

+

The Liberal Club of Los Angeles has petitioned the President and Congress to indefinitely suspend the operation of the clauses of the Payne-Aldrich tariff law which relate to meats and meat products, and that—

—the ports of the United States be thrown open to the free entry of the meats and meat products of the whole world, to the end that, in so far as the tariff protects the criminal and unlawful combinations of the trusts in food-products, this protection which acts as an associate helper in their crimes, may be removed.

John H. Hanan, president of the National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association, says, according to the New York Journal of Commerce:

Rent is primarily responsible for whatever increase there has been in the cost of shoes and other commodities. This applies not only to the retail stores in cities and towns, but to land of every kind all over the country. For example, fewer cattle are raised now because of the mounting rent of land and the cost of cereals. This affects the price of beef, shoes and all commodities that are derived originally from cattle.

Byron W. Holt pithily epitomizes the situation in saying:

Prices go up the elevator; wages climb the stairway.

+ +

The Ballinger Investigation.

On the 24th by special vote in the lower house the resignation of James T. Lloyd of Missouri from the joint Congressional committee for the investigation of the Interior Department and the Bureau of Forestry, which was originally refused (p. 83), was accepted, and James M. Graham of Illinois was elected in his place. The committee began its sessions on the 26th, with Louis R. Glavis (vol. xii, p. 1156) as its first witness. In response to an unexpected question as to the purport of the witness's charges, Mr. Glavis's lawyer, Louis D. Brandeis, was able to give a telling summary of what Mr. Glavis expected to be

able to prove. Briefly condensed from Walter Wellman's report in the Chicago Record-Herald, Mr. Glavis's story is that he "was a special agent of the land office in charge of a division. His work took him to Seattle. At that time so-called Alaska coal land frauds, in which prominent men were involved, were much discussed in that city." That he and Special Agent Jones discussed these frauds and reported to Washington. They were ordered to do more investigating. "Jones went to Alaska to do his work. Immediately upon his return he was instructed to report to Mr. Ballinger, then commissioner of the land office and then in Seattle. He did so. Ballinger instructed Jones to modify his report; to make only a partial report instead of a complete one; to omit many affidavits. It was believed then that Ballinger wanted to so manipulate matters as to be able to get through legislation under which the Cunningham claims could be patented, though he had been advised by his special agent that these claims were probably fraudulent." Months passed and nothing was done. Mr. Glavis was ordered to do some more investigating. "Took all papers with him, prepared for hard campaign. Immediately ex-Governor Moore, representing claimants, came to Washington. Friend of Ballinger's. Saw Ballinger. Soon afterward it appeared that Cunningham claimants were in full possession of all the facts contained in the Jones-Glavis report. As soon as Glavis heard opposition camp had all his information he telegraphed Washington that he would report all claims as probably fraudulent, and that he did not like to have his information given to the other side; it interfered with his work." "After Ballinger became Secretary of the Interior Glavis was ordered to make a final report, and to make it within sixty days, something that was physically impossible. Glavis was willing to do all he could, but wanted final report postponed till snow was off the ground, so that thorough examination could be made of the lands in dispute. Appealed to the Forestry Bureau for help in getting this postponement," and it was not until the Secretary of Agriculture asked for a postponement, that it was granted. Mr. Wellman then gives the following colloquy between Mr. Brandeis and members of the Committee:

"What definite charges do you make against the Department of the Interior?" asked Mr. Olmsted, Republican committeeman.

"It appears from the testimony which Mr. Glavis will give," replied the lawyer, "that Mr. Ballinger as commissioner of the land office took an active part in the controversy about these claims. He was always favorable to the claimants rather than to the government. His activity was continued after he left the government service and while he was a private citizen, acting as counsel for some of the claimants."

"You do not say that he acted corruptly, only that he used information obtained as a government official to help his clients?"

"More than that. He not only used such information, but his conduct was inconsistent with the high duties of an officer of the United States government. He acted without due regard to the interests of the government and of the people as commissioner of the general land office, after he left the land office and after he became Secretary of the Interior."

"But what definite action of his do you charge was improper?" asked Senator Sutherland of Utah.

"First, his failure to make a thorough investigation of the charges of fraud.

"Second, as Secretary of the Interior, ordering the Cunningham claims to proceed to patent without awaiting the outcome of the investigation. Mr. Ballinger personally ordered those claims clear-listed for patent and wanted it done expeditiously, sending a telegram of instructions to the land office at Juneau. Glavis heard of it and it was the action of the witness which led to the Secretary of the Interior's interpretation of the law being reviewed by the Department of Justice and reversed by Attorney General Wickersham."

"Do you mean that the Secretary of the Interior, knowing these claims to be attacked as fraudulent and that an investigation of his own ordering had not been completed, still tried to have patents issued?" asked Ollie James, Democratic member of the committee.

"Yes, that is what the testimony shows."

Mr. Glavis's testimony was continued on the 28th, 29th and 31st.

+ +

The Cost of Second-Class Mail Matter.

Twenty-five leading magazine publishers appeared before the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, on the 26th, to protest against proposed higher mail rates for magazines and periodicals. Frank H. Scott, President of the Century Company, is reported as telling the committee that any raise in the rates on second-class matter would affect not only the publishers, who themselves, he said, were by no means wealthy, but also the printers, paper manufacturers, advertisers, authors, artists and many millions of readers of magazines. Other publishers testified, and a pamphlet entitled, "The Answer of the Magazines," was put in the hands of the committee. According to this pamphlet, as summarized in the reports there is not a deficit in the Postoffice Department of \$17,000,000, as the department alleges, but actually a surplus of over \$10,000,000 when the specific loss on free rural delivery is taken into consideration. Moreover, the department's figures of \$64,000,000 loss on second-class matter is wrong by over \$60,000,000. "The weight of second-class mail has been figured as 792,580,967 pounds. It should be 694,865,884 pounds. Also \$13,821,000 of the loss on free rural delivery has been wrongly charged to second-class matter after being charged to free rural delivery." Expenses for railway mail service to the amount of over \$4,000,000 for postoffice car service in amount of nearly \$2,500,000, and for overcharges on city de-

livery, compensation to postmasters, clerks, carriers, rentals and miscellaneous in amount of \$16,000,000, is also erroneously charged against second-class matter, according to the statement. The hearing of the publishers was continued on the 28th, and the committee is reported as being angered at the publishers' charges, and at editorials appearing generally in the press, sympathetic with the position of the publishers. From the dispatches we quote:

"The American Republic can't stand forever with this sort of thing being rung in the people's ears—these anarchistic statements," angrily declared Representative Smith of California, addressing Herbert Myrick, representative of the Agricultural Press League, a witness before the committee. He was referring to an editorial which Mr. Myrick acknowledged came from one of the publications which he represented.

"I protest that the farmers of this country are not anarchists, and I protest that I am not a traitor," hotly retorted Mr. Myrick, who shortly before had been further alluded to as being responsible for traitorous utterances.

The question of second-class rates came up also in the Senate on the 27th, when Senator Thomas P. Gore offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be directed to ascertain and report to the Senate the comparative cost in the United States of transporting publications designated as second-class mail matter by mail, express, and fast freight.

Second, That the said committee be directed to ascertain and report to the Senate the comparative rates paid by the United States Government and by the express companies to the principal railroad companies in the United States for similar services in transporting publications designated as second-class mail matter.

Third, That the committee be further directed to ascertain and report to the Senate the comparative postal rates for transporting periodicals designated as second-class mail matter in the United States, in the Dominion of Canada, and other foreign countries.

Fourth, That the committee be directed to ascertain and report to the Senate the comparative rates paid to the leading railroad companies for transporting the several classes of mail by the governments of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, and Germany in their respective jurisdictions.

+

In the meantime the news dispatches of the week have related that Canada closed its fiscal year with a surplus in its postal revenues of \$293,700, notwithstanding the fact that it gives a public letter a rate of 2 cents an ounce, a drop letter a rate of 1 cent an ounce in cities, a second class rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ cent a pound over the entire Dominion, and free transportation of second class matter over a radius of forty miles.

+ +

The Democratic League of the State of New York.

The general committee of the Democratic

League of the State of New York (vol. xii, p. 794) was formally organized on the 27th by the election of Thomas M. Osborne as chairman. Every Assembly district in the State has a representative on the committee, the membership of which includes such men as Alton B. Parker, Edward M. Shepard, Augustus Van Wyck, Herman A. Metz, Morgan J. O'Brien, Herman Ridder, R. Cady Herrick, and William T. Jerome.

+ +

The Shirtwaist Makers' Strike.

The National Co-Operative Shirtwaist and Neckwear company (p. 85), with an authorized capital of \$100,000, was incorporated at Trenton, N. J., on the 29th by friends of the striking shirtwaist makers of New York and Philadelphia. The par value of the shares of stock is \$1.00 each.

+

Philadelphia is getting college graduate experience as well as New York (p. 85). Miss Martha Gruening, graduate of Smith college, and post-graduate student at Bryn Mawr, after being arrested while doing picket duty, and spending the night in the police station, was sent to Moyamensing on the morning of the 30th, on a charge of inciting to riot. After ten hours' imprisonment she was bailed out, having spent her time in making suffrage speeches to the prison employees.

+ +

More Three-Cent Fares in Cleveland.

Seven Cleveland street car lines, the franchises of which expired on the evening of the 26th, began automatically to operate Thursday morning with three-cent fares, under the temporary three-cent franchises passed December 21 (vol. xii, p. 1256). Three cents extra was charged for a transfer, with a cent rebate when used. Some immediate rerouting of the lines by the receiver, Warren Bicknell, gave dissatisfaction, but changes back in many cases have been ordered. According to the Cleveland Press this change to three-cent fare has reversed the fare situation. On the 26th 37 per cent of the people were being carried on three-cent lines, and 63 per cent were paying five-cent fare. According to Mr. Bicknell's figures, this was changed on the 27th to 65 per cent riding for three cents, and 35 per cent for five cents. That the lines can afford the lower rate may be inferred by the receiver's statement that under the conditions that held until the 27th, the traction company was clearing on an average \$100,000 a month, and the balance on hand at the time of change was \$705,000. It had been as high as \$1,250,000.

+

The tentative ordinance passed by the city council December 18 (vol. xii, p. 1231), which was designed to close the whole traction question, comes

to referendum the 17th. This franchise agreement was ratified by the Cleveland Railway company at its annual meeting on the 26th. At this meeting the Forest City faction elected one director—Thomas P. Schmidt—in the place of S. T. Everett, who represented the Forest City last year.

+ +

Illinois Schools Blighted by Landlordism.

"The tenant system of farming, the buying up by wealthy men of great tracts of land and leasing them in small lots to the former owners, is raising havoc with the country schools of Illinois," was asserted by Francis G. Blair, State Superintendent of Education, at the monthly meeting of the Chicago Head Assistants on the 15th, according to the Chicago Record-Herald's report. Mr. Blair said, according to this report, he had found conditions so deplorable that after he had drafted, with much labor, a report on educational conditions in Illinois for a Boston educator he refused to send it because it would bring disgrace on the State. Mr. Blair claimed that the wealthy men evaded the payment of just taxes, and that consequently rural school districts had not enough money to hire competent teachers. He said that there were at least 500 schoolrooms in the State that might just as well be closed, on account of the incompetency of the teachers. In one case, he said, he had found a girl teaching in a country school for \$10 a month. He declared that pupils of a teacher worth no more than that could hope to receive little benefit from her instruction. Mr. Blair's statements were corroborated by Henry C. Cox, a district school superintendent of Chicago, according to the Tribune's report. "The farmers of Illinois are the slaves of the landlords," he declared. "A man who owns thousands of acres will insist on paying \$25 a month for a teacher when the better judgment of every farmer tells him no able instructor can be secured for such a pittance. The curse of the country schools is the fact that the farmers cannot be their own masters when it is a question of determining the amount of taxes to be levied. The country schools never will reach a high plane until the farmers own their farms and hire their own teachers."

+ +

Independent Cuba.

The first year of Cuba's independence closed on the 28th (vol. xii, pp. 130, 253, 325). The only instance of armed resistance to authority was the little uprising of the rural guards in Santa Clara province last winter (vol. xii, p. 300). Congressional elections are to be held in July. In the general election conducted under the administration of Gov. Magoon (vol. xi, p. 802) the whole Congress, representing eighty-two districts, was elected, and then lots were drawn to determine which congressmen should remain in for four

years and which for the short term of two years. The places of these forty-one outgoing congressmen are to be filled in the July elections.

NEWS NOTES

—Moses Harman, editor of *Lucifer* and later of *Eugenics*, died on the 30th at Los Angeles, in his 80th year.

—Dr. William Symington Brown, an oldtime physician and single tax man, died at his home in Stoneham, Mass., on January 6.

—José Santos Zelaya, the recent President of Nicaragua, who took refuge in Mexico (vol. xii, p. 1255; vol. xiii, p. 10) in December, sails on the 4th from Vera Cruz for Belgium.

—The first hotel aviation station in the world is to be built on the top of the Blackstone hotel in Chicago, now under process of erection. The station will be called "Drome No. 1" (p. 86).

—A draft of proposed reforms in the Prussian suffrage (p. 61) has been signed by Emperor William as King of Prussia. The bill will probably soon be introduced in the Prussian Diet.

—At the regular meeting of the New York Liberal Club on the 9th, at the Club Rooms, 19 East 26th St., Lincoln Steffens will uphold the thesis: "There Is Good in Good People," after which there will be discussion.

—The new Imperial Legislative Council of India, through which the natives are to obtain a larger share in the administration of the government of India, met for the first time in Calcutta on the 25th (vol. xii, p. 1252).

—By a terrific explosion in the coal mine of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company at Primero, Colo., on the 31st, somewhere from eighty to one hundred and fifty miners were killed. Most of the dead miners were Slavs and Hungarians.

—A Pan-American bank is said to be receiving the approval of the Federal State department. The money interests reported as being behind it are the banking houses of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the First National bank and the National City bank of New York.

—The Friday evening meetings of the Chicago Single Tax Club have been shifted from the club's headquarters at 508 Schiller Bldg., to Hall 302 in the same building. Women guests are welcome. On the evening of the 4th John Weller is to speak on "Race Suicide and Economics."

—Hearing that a neighbor had built an aeroplane, a justice of the peace at Cedar Grove, N. J., a Mr. Kammelhor, has posted the following notice, according to the news dispatches: "All aviators are hereby warned not to fly their machines over this property under penalty of imprisonment."

—In analyzing the municipal waterworks system of Springfield, Ill., before the Springfield Chamber of Commerce on the 26th, Willis J. Spaulding, the superintendent of waterworks, whose efficiency in ferreting out coal graft in connection with the system has already been noted in these columns (vol. xii, p.

1035), showed that it is the small consumers who really support the Springfield plant, while eleven large consumers, consisting mostly of big corporations, receive their water at \$5,000 per year less than cost.

—The Convention of the Unemployed, which opened in Chicago on the 24th (p. 85), held sessions to the 27th inclusive. On the 25th Alexander Law of New York, Henry H. Hardinge of Chicago, and Mrs. Georgia Ferguson of Washington, appealed to the convention with the cry of "Back to the Land!"

—Representatives of the new Chinese Provincial Assemblies (p. 37) are reported to have been asking the Imperial Government of China for a hastening of the promised parliament and full constitutional government. This has been denied, the Government adhering to the original plan of an imperial assembly now, and the establishment of a parliament at the end of nine years, according to the constitutional scheme.

—The indictment against the Press Publishing Company, publishers of the New York World, charging Joseph Pulitzer and others with criminal libel against Theodore Roosevelt, President Taft and others (vol. xii, p. 339), was quashed on the 26th in the United States District Court in New York. Judge Hough ruled that the statute upon which the indictment rested was not sufficient in authority, or, in other words, that the court had no jurisdiction.

—Mr. Lloyd George received a record number of nominations for the district of Carnarvon, namely, "sixteen nomination papers, divided between the six Associated Boroughs," according to the London Daily News. The News continues in regard to the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which in "Who's Who" is given as "David Lloyd-George": "It was noticed that the Chancellor's name, which formerly appeared with a hyphen and Lloyd-George as the surname, the Christian name being David only, in these 'nomination papers was given with the surname as 'George.'"

—Ben Hanford, candidate for the Vice-Presidency on the Socialist ticket in 1904 and 1908, died after prolonged illness at his home at Flatbush, N. Y., on the 24th. Mr. Hanford was born in Cleveland in 1861. For thirty-one years of his life he was a member of the International Typographical Union. He became a Socialist in the early 90's. In 1898 he was candidate for Governor of New York on the ticket of the Socialist Labor party. In 1900 he was again candidate for Governor, this time heading the State ticket of the Social Democratic party, as the Socialist party was then called. He made a thorough agitation tour of the State and polled 13,493 votes. In 1903 Hanford was selected as the Socialist candidate for Mayor of New York City.

—In the Imperial German Parliament Herr von Oldenburg, a Conservative Agrarian, on the 29th made the extraordinary statement that "the German Emperor as King of Prussia must have the right at any moment to order a Prussian lieutenant to come here and with ten men close the Reichstag." The Leftists made violent protest, but the Conservatives greeted von Oldenburg's words with thundering applause. According to the dispatch which related the incident, Prince Von Hohenlohe, who was presiding,

admitted that he had heard the words objected to, but said he understood the speaker as meaning only to indicate the degree to which military discipline must be carried. Oldenburg immediately confirmed this interpretation of his statement, and added that he wished to show how in extreme cases discipline would be required of the army without regard to the constitution.

PRESS OPINIONS

The British Elections.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Jan. 30.—One thing is clear. The country has not sustained the House of Lords in its attitude toward the Budget. The Budget will be adopted. There may be a trace of desire to fight the land taxes, but the leaders of the upper house realize that the electors have spoken, and that the Lords must obey this mandate. It seems probable that the point at issue about the relationship of the Lords to a finance measure is settled for all time, and that the Lords will recognize this fact without further fighting.

+

The Christian Work and The Evangelist (continuing The Arena, Bible House, New York), Jan. 29.—The result of the recent elections in Great Britain is that in the third Parliament of King Edward's reign the Ministerialists will have a majority of more than one hundred. The Liberals, flushed with victory, are already planning their program for the next Parliament. The declaration of Premier Asquith, in which he said, "I promise that no legislation of any kind will be considered by the next Parliament until we have settled conclusions with the House of Lords," leaves no room for doubt that the Peers are far from the end of their troubles. Lloyd-George says if the Peers dare again to reject the land tax budget, still another bill will be pressed and sent direct to the throne. The Lords on November 30 last rejected the Lloyd-George budget by a vote of 350 to 75, declaring that they were not justified in consenting to the bill until it had been submitted to the judgment of the country. By the elections just concluded, the people of England have demanded the passage of the budget. After that, what?

+ +

The Meaning of the British Budget.

(London) Daily News (Lib.), Jan. 18.—The Budget provides the money for old age pensions, and it provides it without placing a single new tax on food or necessities. The people have a right to the Budget because their House of Commons has passed it. And why have the Lords thrown it out? Because it hit their pockets instead of hitting the people's pockets. Because instead of merciless food taxes or merciless additions to the income tax on small incomes it puts a super tax on gigantic incomes, taxes on unearned increments of urban land value, and taxes on the monopoly of the brewers. Above all, perhaps, because it involves the valuation of land. But all these things, whatever they are for the Peers and their allies among the more selfish section of the rich, are excellent busi-

ness for the people. They not only mean a just and merciful way of raising current revenue and paying for old age pensions, but they mean the certainty of an increasing revenue from year to year.

+ +

Lloyd George's Eloquence.

The (London) Nation (Lib.), Jan. 15.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer has delivered a series of speeches in the racy, defiant, unshrinking style which makes him at once the best loved and the best hated man in the country. The theory and practice of hereditary legislation have never been so trenchantly attacked since Mr. Chamberlain exchanged Radicalism for reaction. Woven in with the rhetoric and sarcasm have been bits of true eloquence. Thus at Cannock: "Do not put your liberty in pawn to the House of Lords; you will never get it back." And of the elector who would vote for the Lords—"It is your own sword that you ungird."

+ +

Why We Interfered in Nicaragua.

Puck, Jan. 26.—Now comes the inside story. It seems the Nicaraguan mess was simply another case where the financial geniuses of the United States put their heads together and said: "Let Uncle Sam do it," and Uncle Sam did. Our gallant expedition was prompted, not by Benevolence, but by Bananas; bananas grown on American plantations in Nicaragua! We imagined we sent our gallant boys to save oppressed American traveling men; it turns out that we sent them to keep saddle-colored governments from poaching on a few select fruit orchards. We thought we heard the peel of the Liberty Bell of Nicaragua; it turns out that the only peels on the horizon are the peels on the banana trees. And the souls of the victims, let us hope, will go marching on till all the Christian gentlemen of New York, to whom God in His infinite wisdom has entrusted the banana lands of Nicaragua, are enabled to sell their shares at a reasonable profit.

+ +

The Meats Boycott.

New Haven (Conn.) Union (Dem.), Jan. 27.—It certainly is a peculiar feature of this boycott that in trying to punish certain wrongdoers it first hits hardest those who are in no way to blame for the evils that have occasioned the onslaught. If there is anything artificial about meat prices the retailers, scattered, numbering thousands and rivaling one another in trade, are surely not responsible. It is notorious that the so-called beef trust holds them quite as tightly in its grip as anybody else. It is said the boycott will stop high meat prices. But will it not close our butcher shops, also, throw blameless men out of work and sacrifice an honest industry? As a matter of fact will the boycott really have any permanent effect on meat prices? At the end of 30 days or the boycott period, we will assume, for the sake of argument, that prices have been greatly lowered. What then? Everybody will buy more meat than before because it is cheaper, and then, because of the increased demand, prices will soon soar to the old figure again. And in the interim, who will have been hit? The beef trust? No! Be-

cause, if there is such a combination regulating meat prices, and if it is true that the demand for meat exceeds the supply, an assertion often made in the interests of the packers and middlemen, it is plain that the consumers' boycott will not alarm or perplex such a combination. In fact, one of the most remarkable phases of the boycott is the absolute air of indifference with which the big packers have received it. . . . In the last analysis the people have nobody to scold for present conditions as much as themselves. They have the ballot and live under a democratic form of government. If they persist in placing men in their legislative halls and other public offices who represent some other interest than that of the people then they must put up with the result and not do the cry-baby act. In 1908 the people had an opportunity to elect a man to the presidency and place a Congress behind him that would have grappled with this exorbitant price iniquity and fought it in an effective way. At least under Bryan and a Democratic Congress the tariff would not have been revised upward in the interest of the beef and other trusts. But the people chose Taft and the same old stand-pat crowd. Let them squeal. It serves them right, and may bring them to a realizing sense of the mistakes they have made. What the people need to learn is how to use the ballot, not misuse the boycott.

+ +

A Man Who Posed Two Ways.

Life, Jan. 27.—We suspect the country is getting the idea that Mr. Taft is an old-fashioned Republican, whereas it elected him as a new-fashioned Republican and wants that kind.

+ +

"Authorized" Statements from the White House.

(San Francisco) Star, Jan. 22.—Got any salt? If you have, just put a handful on that "authorized statement" that the President is really a friend of La Follette, Bristow and the other "Insurgents." We had some "authorized" statements that he was for "downward" revision of the tariff, didn't we? And then he praised the "upward" revision, didn't he? Never did fair, fresh egg need salt more than the good, "authorized" statements from the White House, Taft is writing some scalding epitaphs for himself.

+ +

Sugared Politics.

Puck, December 15.—When a Republican Congress makes an unsparing investigation of the Sugar Trust scandal, self-preservation will have ceased to be the first law of Nature.

+ +

A Practical Printer.

The Suburban (Whiting, Ind.), December.—Public Printer Samuel B. Donnelly has not only been able to administer the Government printing office within the appropriation made by Congress for the last fiscal year, but has been able to turn back into the Treasury \$400,000 of the appropriation, which he found to be in excess of his needs. If memory serves, this is the first time in the history of the

great plant that such a happening can be recorded. It is the usual thing to wind up the fiscal year with a deficiency. Public Printer Donnelly is a member and former president of the International Typographical Union.

+ +

What is the Matter with Spokane?

The Sacramento Bee, Dec. 18.—That there may be no mistake upon this subject, this paper desires to declare that it has no sympathy with the Industrial Workers of the World as an organization. It does not believe in many of the principles they enunciate, and it has no faith in the tenets they put forth. . . . It is not, therefore, from any fellow feeling that The Bee took up the cudgels in behalf of the rights of each and every man and each and every woman belonging to that organization. It did so simply and solely because it believes thoroughly in freedom of speech and in the liberty of the press. This paper holds that the Industrial Workers of the World, through their journals, have the same right to demand justice, have the same privilege and authority to appeal for the principles which they consider just, as has the New York World, the San Francisco Chronicle or The Sacramento Bee to battle for those tenets and to exploit those doctrines to which it attaches its faith. It is not a question at all of the Industrial Workers of the World; it is one of eternal right—of the same justice being granted to all men alike. It is a fight along the line of the basic principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence and sanctified by the Constitution of the United States. . . . If the Industrial Workers of the World write or preach the propaganda of murder, it is righteous, it is just, and it is within the law that they be suppressed. But so far they have preached nothing of the kind. They have bitterly denounced the county authorities of Spokane, and they were thoroughly justified in such denunciation. They did not denounce them severely enough. . . . There is absolutely not one shadow of right, under the law or even in common decency, to seize the newspaper organ of these men and these women solely because it printed certain startling accusations against the jail authorities at Spokane. And surely, as a matter of public policy, if these accusations are not provable the authorities acted in a most foolish manner. For the method they took to meet their accusers adds strong circumstantial evidence that these accusers told nothing but the eternal truth in the beauty of its nakedness. . . . The Bee will ever battle for the rights of men—for the rights of every man—no matter who he is. It will fight just as strongly for justice and right to the Industrial Workers of the World, in whose doctrines it does not believe, as it would for justice and right to William J. Bryan, or Senator La Follette, or Theodore Roosevelt, if the Government of the United States dared to seize the Commoner, La Follette's Weekly or the Outlook, in which the editorials of these men are prominent. And the Government of the United States has just the same right, exactly, to suppress those organs of public opinion, if the Administration does not like their editorial tone, as the authorities at Spokane had to suppress the organ of the Industrial Workers of the World—and that right is absolutely no right whatever.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE STAKE OF BATTLE.

Jas. Blackhall in the London Daily News of January 18, 1910.

I saw a land, fair set, and pillared fast
Amid the seas of God;
Atlantis, lifted to the sun at last;
Where men as angels trod.

And in her streets the music of her toil,
In sweeter songs than strife,
And fearless men at one upon her soil,
As gods returned to life!

And ancient castles mid her pastures stood,
Unhid of wild or waste,
Where lord and tenant vied in brotherhood,
And envy stood disgraced.

It was a land magnificent in might,
Of tyrant wrongs undone;
Well-homed in town and plain and rugged height
With God, and man, and sun.

Free-fronting all the world, as if to keep
Brave habit with her shores,
Forever challenging the baffled leap
Of oceans at her doors!

While nations, larger limbed, but lesser souled,
Stood as a panting flock
To see this miracle of Earth unfold,
Too strong to hate or mock!

So be my native land! if for the years,
We fight this battle day;
So freemen, strike! and spring the tyrant's tears
O'er Dagon's shattered clay!

Today! for such a land! and years unborn
To fame and victory!
Strike as ye smote before! with freemen's scorn
Of shame and tyranny.

+ + +

"THE HUNGRY FORTIES."

A Welsh Campaign Meeting: Condensed from a Report Made for the London Daily News of Jan. 18, by E. Morgan Humphreys.

The little village is hemmed in by the mountains. The one straggling street was unlit, save for the oil lamps outside the local post office and the principal draper's shop. . . . The lighted windows are the windows of the Calvinistic Methodist chapel schoolroom. The village does not possess a public hall, and all meetings, whether political, social, or competitive, must be held either in the Council school or in some of the buildings belonging to the

various chapels. It is election time, the Liberal candidate is being opposed, for the first time in fifteen years, and the electoral fever is already high. . . . Everything, of course, is in Welsh, and an Englishman could sit the meeting out without hearing a word of English from beginning to end.

The speeches are numerous, and some of them vary considerably, but all of them sound the same note—loyalty to the flag Wales has upheld so long, and deadly enmity to the House of Lords. At last the chairman calls a name which is received with loud cheers, and an old farmer stands up by the reading desk. He has often stood there before, to open a prayer meeting or a "seiat" with prayer, but he is quite at home, too, when it comes to making a speech. His clothes are rough and worn; he is white-haired, and his face is wrinkled and weather-beaten. There is a twinkle in his eye as he looks from under bushy eyebrows at the expectant audience. And then, in a deep, penetrating voice, he starts. It is not easy to convey all the quaintness and effect of that speech in English. It is quite impossible to transmit the various turns of phrase, but this was the gist of what he said:

"You mustn't expect me to be short, Mr. Chairman," he said with a glance at the chairman, and another look at the clock. "I am going to talk about these Lords. They tell me there are six hundred of them, but I don't like their name. (Laughter.) I have another name for them—I call them blackthorn bushes. (Loud laughter.) Now, boys, can you tell me what grows on blackthorn bushes?"

The audience shouts the Welsh name for sloes, which literally rendered means "choking plums."

"Yes," continued the orator, "that is the fruit. Now what are the fruits of these Lords? What did they do with the Education Bill?"

"Choked it!" shouts the audience, roaring with laughter.

"What did they do with the Licensing Bill?"

"Choked it!" came the reply again, from every throat in the room.

"And what have they done with the Budget, if you happen to know?"

"Choked it!"

"Ah, there you make your mistake!" said the speaker, with a gleam of laughter in his eyes. "You know the blackthorn looks very fine, and white, and soft in the spring. It is in full blossom then, and you would think you could sit down on it comfortably. But if you did—if you did, you would soon feel the thorns. (Laughter.) The Lords have thrown the Budget to the country, and they are trying to delude you and me, but the thorns are there under the flowers, you may be very certain." (Loud applause.)

Then the speaker's voice deepened, and all at once the meeting seemed to become more serious.

"I am going to tell you a little of my own history," he said: "I remember when bread was taxed in this country. We were a large family—father, mother, and eight children—there was no work to be had, and there was no food for any of us. And one day my father had had a job at nine-pence a day. He got up very early to go to his work, and mother put a big pot on the fire to boil him some potatoes before starting. That was all we had to give him—potatoes, and a bit of onion, and some salt. I remember it as well as if it was yesterday—and afterwards mother put some potatoes in his little box for him to eat during the day.

"When he had gone, mother started out to try and get two shillings' worth of flour. She walked all day—there wasn't a bit of bread, or a piece of meat, or a dust of flour in the house—but she got no flour. I remember her coming home and sitting down in the chair and crying, and we hungry children gathered round her and cried too."

The old farmer's voice was deep and penetrating. There was complete silence as he went on with his speech, but when he paused, another old man broke out, the tears rolling down his face, saying, "Yes, yes, Morris bach, it's quite true. That's how it used to be—it's quite true!"

The speaker went on. "If mother had had flour, do you know, boys, how much she would have had for two shillings? I'll tell you. You could only get two pounds of flour for a shilling then. And so when my father came back in the evening potatoes and salt was all we had for him. I never had any schooling. I was working on the fields at a penny a day as soon as I was big enough. That is how things were then." . . .

Thus ended a typical Welsh speech and a typical Welsh meeting. It was at such meetings and with such speakers that the Chancellor of the Exchequer started his career.

+ + +

"OUR FATHERS HAVE TOLD US."

From the London Nation of January 15, 1910.

We have forgotten, else it would be impossible they should try to befool us. We have forgotten the terrible years when England lay cold and starving under the clutch of the landlords and their taxes on food. Terror is soon forgotten, for otherwise life could not endure. Not seventy years have gone since that clutch was loosened, but the iron which entered into the souls of our fathers is no more remembered. How many old laborers, old operatives, or miners are now left to recall the wretchedness of that toiling and starving childhood before the corn-tax was removed? Few are remaining now, and they speak little and will soon be gone. The horror of it is scattered like the night, and we think no more of it, nor imagine its reality. It seems very long ago, like Waterloo or

the coach to York—so long ago that we can almost hope it was not true.

And yet our fathers have told us of it. They and their fathers lived through it at its worst. Only six years have passed since Mrs. Cobden Unwin collected the evidence of aged laborers up and down the country, and issued their piteous memories in the book called "The Hungry Forties." Ill-spelt, full of mistakes, the letters are stronger documents than the historian's eloquence. In almost every detail of misery, one agrees with the other. In one after another we read of the quartern loaf ranging from 7d. to 11½d., and heavy, sticky, stringy bread at that; or we read of the bean porridge or grated potato that was their chief food; or, if they were rather better off, they told of oatmeal and a dash of red herring—one red herring among three people was thought a luxury. And then there was the tea—sixpence an ounce, and one ounce to last a family for a week, eked out with the scrapings of burnt crusts to give the water a color. One man told how his parents went to eat raw snails in the fields. Another said the look of a butcher's shop was all the meat they ever got. "A ungly belly makes a man desprit," wrote one, but for poaching a pheasant the hungry man was imprisoned fourteen years. Seven shillings to nine shillings a week was the farm laborer's wage, and it took twenty-six shillings then to buy the food that seven would buy now. What a vivid and heart-rending picture of cottage life under the landlord's tax is given in one old man's memory of his childish hunger and his mother's pitiful self-denial! "We was not allowed free speech," he writes, "so I would just pull mother's face when at meals, and then she would say, 'Boy, I can't eat this crust,' and O! the joy it would bring my little heart."

We have forgotten it. Wretched as is the daily life of a large part of our working people—the only people who really count in a country's prosperity—we can no longer realize what it was when wages were so low and food so dear that the struggle with starvation never ceased.

+ + +

RAKING UP OLD HISTORY.

From the London Chronicle of January 7, 1910.

The Royal Commission on the Housing of the Poor, which sat as long ago as 1885, made the following recommendations in favor of taxing vacant land, which are forty times more drastic than the proposals in the Budget. And these revolutionary proposals were recommended by the King (then prince of Wales), Earl Brownlow, Cardinal Manning, Bishop Walsham How, Mr. Jesse Collings, and other Commissioners, Liberal and Conservative.

The recommendations were as follows:

At present, land available for building in the

neighborhood of our populous centres, though its capital value is very great, is probably producing a small yearly return until it is let for building. The owners of this land are not rated in relation to real value but to actual annual income. They can thus afford to keep their land out of the market, and to part with only small quantities so as to raise the price beyond the natural monopoly price which the land would command by its advantages of position.

Meantime, the general expenditure of the town on improvements is increasing the value of their property. If this land were rated at, say, 4 per cent on its selling value, the owners would have a more direct incentive to part with it to those who are desirous of building, and a two-fold advantage would result to the community. First, all the valuable property would contribute to the rates, and thus the burden on the occupiers would be diminished by the increase in the ratable property.

Secondly, the owners of the building land would be forced to offer their land for sale, and thus their competition with one another would bring down the price of building land, and so diminish the tax in the shape of ground rent, or price paid for land which is now levied on urban enterprise by the adjacent land owners, a tax, be it remembered, which is no recompense for any industry or expenditure on their part, but is the natural result of the industry and activity of the townspeople themselves.

Your Majesty's Commissioners would recommend that these matters should be included in legislation when the law of rating comes to be dealt with by Parliament.

These recommendations have never been carried out when the law of rating was before Parliament. And now, when Mr. Lloyd George proposes a tax of one halfpenny in the pound on undeveloped land—instead of 4 per cent, or 10d., as recommended by the King, Cardinal Manning, Earl Brownlow and others, including such practical men connected with land as Lord Carrington, the late W. T. Torrens, who gave his name to Housing Acts, the late George Godwin, architect, and Sir George Harrison—the Conservative party raise the cry of "Revolution!"

What would they have said if the Chancellor had embodied in his Budget the recommendations which we have quoted?

+ + +

THE MONEY TRUST.

John Moody in Moody's Magazine for January.

The steady and increasing concentration of wealth in all lines of activity is becoming more and more a matter of discussion in all walks of life. Figures are being produced showing that the control of great corporate and other activities is passing more and more into the hands of a powerful group of capitalists whose headquarters are in Wall street, and whose methods are being scrutinized more closely by the press and by legislative enactments from year to year. The recent developments in New York city in the direc-

tion of concentration of banking power are manifestations, in one sense, of this growth toward centralization. It has been lately announced that the Morgan interests have acquired control and are planning to consolidate several of the largest trust companies in New York city. In addition to these trust companies, it is already known that four of the most important national banks in New York are under the same control. A recent article published in the "Wall Street Journal" presents figures which show a total of nearly \$10,000,000,000 in capital as representing the industrial, insurance and banking enterprises in which the single firm of J. P. Morgan & Company are dominant. This total is equivalent to nearly 10 per cent of the entire estimated wealth of the United States at the present time.

But, as a matter of fact, this exhibit does not really give any fair indication of the extent of control in business and banking lines by the big Wall Street groups. It is a well known fact that in railroads, industrial concerns and in public utility enterprises the so-called Rockefeller interests represent a larger aggregate of capital than do the Morgan interests. And, further than this, these two big interests are themselves quite directly allied and are becoming more closely cemented in both their plans and motives, as the years go by. And outside of these two great groups are half a dozen other smaller groups of capitalists which between them represent in corporate control easily fifteen billions more of capitalized values. These outside groups are identified, both in interest and other important ways, with either the Morgan or Rockefeller groups, and thus we may, in presenting an exhibit of concentrated control of corporate undertakings, fairly state that a capitalized valuation of probably thirty-five billions of dollars is concentrated in the hands and under the control of not more than a dozen men.

Now, what do these figures, if analyzed, signify? Instead of merely signifying that one-tenth of the estimated wealth of the nation is under Wall Street control, we find that about 35 per cent is under such control. And as all of this great mass of capital is represented by corporate forms, it is worth while to ascertain what percentage of the total corporate capitalization of the country is represented by this \$35,000,000,000.

A careful estimate of the corporate capitalization now existing in the United States, including railroads, industrial and commercial corporations, public utility companies, banking, insurance and trust companies, indicates that, outside of small, close business corporations owned by individuals, the total corporate capitalization in par value in the United States at present is not over \$43,000,000,000. The wealth of the United States, according to last reports, was in the neighborhood of \$110,000,000,000, of which about 50 per cent was represented by realty values, the balance being

tangible property of thousands of different kinds. So that we see after all that the trend toward concentration in corporate control has now extended so far that approximately 80 per cent of all the vital corporate capital of the country is under the domination or control of this powerful group of Wall Street interests which we have referred to.

BOOKS

WAR AS AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

War, and the World-strife of Money (Krigen och Pengarnes Världskamp). By Johan Hansson. Published by A. B. Ljus, Stockholm, Sweden.

It is to be regretted that this little book, written in Swedish, is not available in the English language, because its clear reasoning and terse manner of expressing its truths make it one of the most valuable additions to present day peace literature. Its motto is these words by Ellen Key, in which this clear-visioned woman gives a description of the present situation: "The question of peace is very closely connected with the question of social regeneration, because today it is especially economic interests which cause war."

This, as a matter of fact, is the text of Mr. Hansson's book. He shows first how impossible of realization is the dream of peace between nations as long as the cause is left undisturbed, and he then proceeds to show what the cause fundamentally is. He points out how the so-called peace societies, with all their earnestness of purpose and loftiness of sentiment, are working along fruitless lines as long as they do not attack the cause of commercial wars. This cause the author logically and ably proves to be monopoly in land. Using England as an example, he shows how the people constantly are forced from the land into the factories, until England has become the "workshop of the world." This has under prevailing economical conditions, brought with it poverty and inability to buy and consume even a comparatively small percentage of the manufactured goods, and a country like England, therefore, finds foreign markets absolutely necessary. Other countries, by tariff walls, exclude her products; she then must find colonies which, while they are themselves exploited by English accumulated capital, can take some part of her "over-production" off her hands. Finally, when the whole world is colonized, war must be called upon to decide who is to have the markets of half-civilized independent nations.

With the earth restored to all its children, this feverish hunting for new markets would to a great extent cease. Markets would be created at home. And even with full free trade between nations, each nation would be its own customer to a very

large degree. A taxation of land values along the lines advocated by Henry George, would restore the balance between agriculture and manufacturing industries, and would do away with the last cause of war between nations. No movement looking towards peace, can accomplish anything of permanent value, if this, the fundamental economic cause of war, is not removed with its roots.

ERIK OBERG.

PAMPHLETS

Land Value Taxation in New Zealand.

"Land Value Reform in New Zealand" (Jordvärdereform pa Nya Zeeland, by Johan Hansson. Published by Ekon. Frihetsförbundet, Filipstad, Sweden,) is a little pamphlet of not more than 30 pages, written in Swedish, and containing a great deal of interesting information relating to the land value tax reform in New Zealand, based upon the author's personal observations. The most interesting and, in general, the most valuable part of the little book, is the chapter dealing with the results of the local land value tax. Towns and cities that have adopted the reform have grown at a much more rapid rate than those that have retained the old system of taxation. The statistics relating to the growth of the towns which have adopted a land value tax and those which have not, is especially illuminating. In towns not applying a tax to land values exclusively for local purposes, the increase in population from 1901 to 1906 was 15.5 per cent; in those that had adopted the land value tax the increase was 29 per cent. The value of the improvements increased 36 per cent in the former towns and 82.3 per cent in the latter; and most remarkable of all, the value of the land, which the land value tax "robs of its value," increased only 51.9 per cent in the town with the old form of taxation, as compared with 105.2 per cent in the town where the land value was taxed. This is one of the best practical arguments for the land value tax available. By taxing land values only, the source from which taxation is derived has increased at so rapid a rate that the revenue of the towns has been more than doubled in five years with

only a 29 per cent increase in population. And, at the same time, no industry, no private enterprise, no individual earnings, have been called upon to contribute to the common fund. If New Zealand has been able to accomplish so much in so short a time, comparatively undeveloped as it is, what could not be accomplished in a country well established.

R. O.

PERIODICALS

"How to Secure Majority Rule," by Karl A. Bickel, in *La Follette's* for January 29, is a careful explanation of the preferential system of voting as carried out last November in Grand Junction, Colorado, when that city held its first election under the new charter (vol. xli, p. 1088).

A. L. G.

The Bulletin of the Chicago Department of Health for the week of January 15, contains sensible advice for avoiding the "impure-air diseases"—pneumonia, tuberculosis, etc. Its summing up of counsel, "Breathe good, pure air all the time," is irreproachable and for all of us smoke-eating, steam half-heated Chicagoans, rich and poor alike, utterly impossible.

A. L. G.

"Why do the heathen rage?" Because they have a Candied, or Preserved or Pickled Friend who provokes them to rage by such brainstorm as this: "In fifty years from now America will be ruled by its millionaires, not as now by indirection and scheming, but positively and without disguise." Neuralgia, said a famous physician many years ago, "is the call of the nerves for more blood." So, much that passes current for philosophy is the wild shout of a liver for a searching pill. Paradoxical as it may seem, a pill will sometimes clear the brain.—*San Francisco Star*.

"A bas Paulhan!" With great deliberation we say, "Conspuez Paulhan!" He took William Randolph Hearst up in a flying machine and didn't make him

Are You a Monopolist?

What greater pleasure than to reproduce in a friend the satisfaction one enjoys; and how many times this is compounded if the satisfaction represents an IDEAL!

Are you not depriving yourself of this great privilege, in not thinking of your neighbor when you read *THE PUBLIC*, and in not giving him the chance to subscribe through you?

Don't be selfish; let your friends in with you.

530 Walnut Street
Cincinnati,
January 31, 1910.

Daniel Kiefer

walk back. Again we say, emphatically, "A bas et conspuez Monsieur Paulhan!"—San Francisco Star.

+ + +

He: "We'd have won the football game if our captain hadn't lost his head."

She: "Mercy! Was it so bad as that? I heard it was only an ear."—Boston Transcript.

+ + +

Chancellor Day of Syracuse, who "values the lives of his students too highly to sacrifice one at the

hands of football," recalls the orator who described sylvan solitudes where "the hand of man had never set its devastating foot."—New York World.

+ + +

"A bachelor," says a Chicago school child's composition, "is a man that smokes cigarets, drinks, and stays out nights."

J. J. S.

+ + +

Which are the things which men have a right to force on one another? I know but one thing and

TOM L. JOHNSON

WRITES THIS OF "SOCIAL SERVICE" THE NEW BOOK
BY LOUIS F. POST:

"I am inclined to think it is destined to make more converts than any other book on political economy yet written except 'Progress and Poverty.'"

PUBLISHED BY

A. WESSELS, New York

SOLD BY

A. C. McCLURG & CO., Chicago

ALSO BY

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Building, Chicago

Price, One Dollar, Postpaid

3 SUBSCRIPTIONS

for

2 DOLLARS

Your own and two new ones for a year

TO HELP US GROW

EMIL SCHMIED, Manager

The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, and, though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, based upon the principles of fundamental democracy, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 357 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

Terms of Subscription

Yearly	\$1.00
Half yearly50
Quarterly25
Single copies05
Trial subscription—4 weeks10

Extra copies in quantity, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 and upward; if addressed to individuals, \$3.50 per 100.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts, postoffice money orders and express money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders or Chicago, or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

Advertising Rates

One page, each insertion	\$20.00
Half-page, each insertion	10.00
Quarter-page, each insertion	5.00
One inch, each insertion	1.20
Half-inch, each insertion60

Two columns to the page; length of column, 8¼ inches; width of column, 3 inches.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication

that is justice. I have no right to force anyone to be religious, benevolent, cultured or industrious. But

I have a right to force him to be just.—Frédéric Bastiat.

"THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION."

Swedenborg's Great Work, containing "The Universal Theology of The New Church Signified by the New Jerusalem." Cloth, 982 pages. Postpaid for only Eighty-Seven Cents. Stamps taken. REV. L. G. LANDENBERGER, 3741 Windsor Place, St. Louis, Mo.

The Tariff:

**What it is:
How it Works:
Whom it Benefits.**

**Protection:
Revenue:
Free Trade.**

By Lee Francis Lybarger, of the Philadelphia Bar. Author of "Land, Labor, Wealth."

Sold by The Public's Book Department for 30 cents, postpaid.

Real Estate For Sale and Exchange
EDWARD POLAK
4030 Third Ave. New York City

Safety Razor Blades ^{21c} Made Sharper Than New ^{25c}

Dull razor blades resharpened by Keenedge Electric Process ("the only way"), 30c the dozen. 80,000 repeating customers. Send address for convenient mailing wrapper. KEENEDGE CO., 816 Keenedge Building, CHICAGO.

NOTICE

I wish to announce that I now have an office at 28 Jackson Blvd, in Suite 701, where I will be pleased to see my friends and patients. C. L. LOGAN, Osteopath.

Tel. Harrison 6298

Economic Literature FREE

Abstracts of the Lectures of John Z. White,
and other Literature on

**Single Tax,
Public Ownership and
Direct Legislation,**
mailed free on request.

F. H. Monroe, President Henry George Lecture Assn.
Palos Park, Ill.

Our Five Cent Books.

The Mission of a Liberal Church	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	By Herbert S. Bigelow
A Syllabus of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty"	✓	By Louis F. Post
The Open Shop and the Closed Shop	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	By Louis F. Post
Success in Life	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	By Louis F. Post.
Marriage as a Present Day Problem	✓ ✓ ✓	By Alice Thacher Post
The Single Tax—What It Is, and What It Will Accomplish		By Judson Grenell.
A 1909 Single Tax Catechism	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	By C. B. Fillebrown.
Direct Legislation—The Initiative and Referendum	✓	By John Z. White.
Smaller Profits, Reduced Salaries and Lower Wages—The Condition, The Cause, The Cure	✓ ✓ ✓	By George L. Rusby.
Thomas Jefferson	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	By Sterling E. Edmunds.

A single copy of any one of the above titles will be sent to any address for **FIVE CENTS.**
A dozen copies of one title will be sent for **FIFTY CENTS.**
One copy of each of the ten titles will be sent for **FORTY CENTS.**
Prices include Postage **Address The Public, Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg, Chicago.**

Our readers are asked to mention THE PUBLIC when writing to Advertisers.