

The Public

Sixth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 1903.

Number 270.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

British imperialism has now worked its way to the surface in England herself, with an amazing eruption. The people there are informed by Mr. Chamberlain, in an enthusiastic outburst of jingo patriotism, that the interests of the empire as a whole demand the sacrifice of free trade at home.

Mr. Chamberlain's argument rests upon the imperial idea. He declares that preferential duties must be adjusted reciprocally between England and her colonies, or the colonies will fall away and the empire disintegrate. So he would have England reestablish the bread tax, with a rebate to her colonies, in order that colonial producers may have an advantage in the English food market, and in return would demand an advantage in their markets for British manufactures.

But Mr. Balfour, the premier, supplements this political motive with an economic one. He argues that the markets of the rest of the world are closing against British exports, while her markets are free to foreign imports, and that the time is near when she cannot pay for the food she imports except at a great disadvantage in the disposal of her exports. He, therefore, would tax foreign breadstuffs in order to hold Great Britain in commercial equilibrium.

Back of both these motives is one that has as yet not attracted general notice. This new departure of the Conservative party, with Chamber-

lain in the lead and the Premier a good second, is expected to receive the support of the agricultural landed interests of Great Britain, which it would certainly serve.

It would serve those interests in one respect by increasing the value of British farm land. If the products of foreign farms were taxed, as Chamberlain and Balfour propose, and a rebate of duties were allowed the British colonies, as they also propose tentatively, the products of British farms would sell upon the British market at considerably higher prices than now. This would enhance the demand for British farming land, and by increasing agricultural rents would fatten up the great landlord interests most agreeably.

But it would serve these landed interests even more vitally in another respect. Since neither colonial farms nor English farms altogether could fully supply the great manufacturing and commercial centers of Great Britain with foodstuffs, foreign products would come in. Under the tariff they would yield, at the expense principally of British workingmen, greatly increased public revenues; and this would postpone for another season the issue in Great Britain of taxing land values for the benefit of the general exchequer. The ministry has long realized that it must soon meet the issue of a tariff tax on bread versus an ad valorem tax on land, all other sources of taxation being practically exhausted.

Thus the question Mr. Chamberlain raises is not only an imperial question; it is a land question. It is good policy to mix it up with questions that admit of appeals to pride of empire, but the land question is the real issue. And the agitation may

reach very deep down into the roots of that question by the time the fight the ministry is now courting has been fought to the finish. Cobden warned the British landlords that if they did not promptly concede tariff free trade, the struggle to gain it would culminate in a free trade that would shake the unearned increment of their estates out of their pockets. They yielded in time then, but their unearned increment will be in just as much danger now, even in greater danger, if the issue of protection or free trade is revived. The benefits of tariff free trade have been largely diverted from the people of Great Britain by the urban landlord interests, which have absorbed them. A new agitation of the subject, such as that which Chamberlain has precipitated, will cut deeper and hew closer to the line than the half-hearted free trade with which Sir Robert Peel prematurely stopped the democratic agitation that Richard Cobden had begun.

The election for Illinois judges in Cook county, which came off on the 1st (p. 81), has resulted on the whole quite satisfactorily. It is to be regretted that Capt. Black and ex-Judge Barnum were defeated. Both are pronounced democratic-Democrats. But with these exceptions and one other, every Democratic candidate for the Circuit bench, all competent and some of them highly so, was elected. Of the successful ones, at least four among the ablest are well known for their democratic-Democracy—Murray F. Tuley, Edward F. Dunne, Thomas G. Windes and Edward Osgood Brown. Judge Brown is moreover a single tax man of long standing and national repute.

The result was a distinct set-back for the Republican machine under