

the conclusions of a paper on particular subjects than for the principles to which it yields allegiance—people to whom even just conclusions mistakenly made from vicious principles are not attractive, while mistaken conclusions from sound principles are not offensive.

Such are the men and women all over this country and from other English speaking lands, who gladden the heart and strengthen the elbow of *The Public* with their assurances that they read it from title page to cartoon, and, though not agreeing with all it says, recognize its loyalty to principle and swear by its sincerity.

These five years of *The Public's* life have been momentous years in the history of the world. To look over its indexes is to pass in review a succession of events that are big with possibilities. It is a period upon which the philosophical historian of the future will be forced to dwell. To some the evil portent of this period is overshadowing. To others it is ablaze with gold and glory. But to us all it is what we as a whole decide to make it. Its evils have no power over us unless we adopt them. They may even be turned to good use as bad examples to be rejected.

The fight between public right and wrong is still on, and *The Public* will be in the fight so long as its service is in demand. Neither an optimist of the happy-go-lucky variety, nor a pessimist of the hopeless type, but a thorough believer in tearing down the bad in order to build up the good, yet with no malice toward persons, it will continue to fight wicked institutions and tendencies and to stimulate righteous possibilities with all the vigor it can command.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

New Orleans, March 30.—Lincoln's greatest strength in his famous debates with Douglas lay in his insistence that the real issue was whether slavery was right or wrong. "That is the issue," he said, "that will continue in this country when these poor tongues of Judge Douglas and myself shall be silent. It is the eternal struggle between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles which have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of

humanity, and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle, in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, 'You work and toil and earn bread, and I'll eat it.' No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of a king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor, or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle." It was this boiling down of the question to the eternal struggle between right and wrong which gave his speeches strength to withstand all the fiery darts of his keen adversary.

Underlying the best speeches in the recent woman suffrage meeting in New Orleans—and there were many very able speeches during that meeting—there was the same insistence that the reform proposed is at bottom a question of right and wrong. This appeal to ultimate principles gave to these speeches, as it always does in any cause, an earnestness, an elevation of tone, a spirit of unselfishness and of devotion to humanity such as are rarely found in similar gatherings. Even opponents of the doctrine of woman suffrage could not fail to feel the fine enthusiasm that pervaded the meetings. No one could leave without having received new impulses to stand up and do something in this or in some other good cause, "in honor of the helpers of mankind."

We do not mean to say that there were lacking speeches which met definite arguments with definite arguments. There were old, familiar arguments in old familiar words and old arguments in new words and some new thoughts infused into old words; but, as I have said, back of all special arguments and back of all the details of facts there was the assurance of faith that the cause was right and just. I do not believe I should be wrong in saying that the keynote of the convention was the right of each human soul to self-government and self-development, and that this right depends upon equal rights.

J. H. DILLARD.

NEWS

An extraordinary vote in favor of land values taxation was cast on the 27th in the British House of Commons, upon the second reading of a bill empowering municipalities to

adopt the single tax method of raising local revenues.

The bill in question had been introduced by Dr. Macnamara, the Liberal member for North Camberwell. It was backed also by the influence of such members as John Dillon, Mr. Burns, Dr. Douglas, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Robson, J. H. Whitley and Mr. Trevelyan, who, more than a month ago, assisted Dr. Macnamara in having his bill made a special order for March 27th. In an explanatory interview, published at that time in the *New Age of London*, Dr. Macnamara said:

Nothing is more urgent than the taxation of land values. At present the burden of communal expenditure is grievously heavy upon the occupying tenant; and it is bound to grow heavier and heavier. Meantime the ground landlord is the residuary legatee of the value of our rate-expenditure [local, as distinguished from imperial, expenditures]. We must tax him to find new revenues for our housing and other schemes. . . . Every municipal council, whether it be Tory or Liberal, is keen on the problem. It daily sees the glaring injustices of the present system. If social reformers on every municipal Council would put down a resolution for their next Council meeting in favor of the principle of my bill, the result would surprise many people. Then there are two or three associations for the reform of the land system. They too ought to lend a strong hand. We have a month. Wonders can be worked in that time.

Wonders were worked. When Dr. Macnamara's bill came forward on the 27th, pursuant to the order made by the House a month before, the leader of the Liberal party, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and all his lieutenants in parliament, supported it; the solicitor general for Scotland in the last Liberal ministry, making a radical speech in its favor, while many Tories and Liberal-Unionists abandoned their party to vote for it. In the Liberal party, not only did the leaders support the bill, but it was treated rather pointedly as a party measure. It came within only 13 votes of passage.

Regarding the importance of this vote the London correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News* cables the following which appeared in that paper on the 28th:

Political specialists regard the vote in the House of Commons last night by

which the single taxers reduced the Government's majority to 13, the lowest in the history of the present ministry, as a significant test. The vote is a record for England on the single-tax question. The bill, the second reading of which was rejected by so slim a margin, was framed on Henry George lines and bore the indorsement of all the single-tax propagandists in the country. It proposed to give discretionary power to local urban authorities to levy a rate on the capital value of land, whether occupied or not, and distinct from the value of any structures thereon.

The political significance of the vote is described as follows by Lewis Henry Berens, a distinguished single tax advocate of Great Britain:

The vote shows nothing can stop this movement. The Liberals now stand definitely pledged to taxation of land values and must bring in a bill providing therefor whenever they succeed to power. Ordinarily the movers of private measures are compelled to appoint private tellers, but last night the official Liberal whips told for Macnamara's bill and the leader of the Liberal party and the whole front Opposition bench supported it. Mr. Soares, solicitor general for Scotland in the late Liberal administration, made a rattling single-tax speech, and many Tories and Liberal-Unionists voted against the government. Others, especially the urban members, disappeared rather than face the music. Liberals are proverbially more sensitive to public opinion than Conservatives, and it may be accepted as certain that the single-tax sentiment is even stronger in the country than appears in the House of Commons' vote. Indeed, almost every constituency with large centers of population petitioned its representatives in Parliament to support taxation of land values.

In France a vote was taken in the Chamber of Deputies on the 26th with reference to the enforcement of the law for the suppression of the Catholic orders. The Carthusian monks had applied for permission to remain in France on the ground that they were engaged in industrial pursuits as well as charities and were a class apart from the other orders. It was urged among other things that their removal would cause serious financial loss to the Department of Isere, in which their monastery is situated; and, further, that they do not meddle with politics. Replying to the first point, the premier, M. Combes, argued that it is debasing to associate religion with commercial enterprises. Regarding the

second, he asserted that while it is true that the Carthusians have not meddled in politics openly with drums and trumpets, like the other orders, they have conducted an active propaganda against the Republic. The Chamber rejected the Carthusian application by a vote of 338 to 231.

On the 27th the French ministry formulated their programme for executing the law for the suppression of the Catholic orders. Official notification is to be sent to each congregation of every order, and all that refuse to disband are to be prosecuted in the courts. The courts will be called upon also to appoint receivers to take charge of the property of the dissolved orders. Each case will be examined separately, with a view to considering special circumstances. The teaching orders will be allowed to delay their departure until the end of the school year, in July, if no governmental schools are available. Where such schools are available these orders also must wind up their affairs within one month.

The Dominican revolution (p. 809) is reported to be still in the heated stage, a battle having been fought on the 28th at Juan Calvo, in which the government forces were defeated with a loss of 27 killed and 43 wounded. The revolutionist loss was 3 killed and 11 wounded. Nevertheless government authorities insist that the revolution, at no time general, is nearly subdued. Gov. Caseres, of Santiago, telegraphed the Dominican consul at New York on the 30th as follows:

Gen. Horacio Vasquez captured the cruiser *Independencia* at Macoris; all the chiefs of revolution on board imprisoned. Revolution confined to San Domingo city, where they are besieged by government troops. Rest of country is with the government.

Cuba has ratified the reciprocity treaty with the United States (p. 809) as amended by the American Senate. A majority of the foreign relations committee of the Cuban Senate, to which the amended treaty had been referred on the 24th (p. 809), reported on the 26th in favor of ratification, but with a proviso that the interchange of ratifications must be completed before December 31, 1903. When the question came finally before the Cuban Senate, how-

ever, which was on the 28th, that body ratified the amended treaty absolutely without conditions, by a vote of 12 to 9. The time limit proposed by the committee was dispensed with by the Senate upon the positive assurance of Secretary Hay that President Roosevelt will call a special session of the American Congress before December 1. On that point the American minister to Cuba, Mr. Squiers, was reported on the 28th to have said:

The ratification of the treaty without amendment is due almost entirely to the assurances given by President Roosevelt that he will call an extra session of Congress before December 1. This action of the President will be appreciated and accepted by the Cuban government and people as an additional evidence of the most sincere friendship and interest on the part of a man in whom they have ever had unbounded faith and confidence. Having ratified the treaty, the special session of the Cuban Senate at once adjourned sine die.

A decision has been rendered in the Wabash railroad strike injunction case (p. 775) by Judge Adams, the Federal judge who granted the injunction. His decision appears to be a sweeping one in favor of the strikers. Judge Adams explains in his opinion that the railroad lawyers had laid before him charges of what appeared to be a conspiracy to precipitate a strike undesired by the men, and thereby to interfere with interstate commerce and the mail service of the United States. For that reason he granted the preliminary injunction. But the strikers have met these charges, says Judge Adams: and after fully considering all the proof on both sides he finds that the statements of the complaint, to the effect that the employes were satisfied with their wages and conditions of service, are not supported; that irrespective of the question of whether the men of the committee of the brotherhoods representing them first suggested the increase of wages and change of rules, the employes themselves, at and for a long time prior to the injunction were dissatisfied with their wages and conditions of service; that a real difference of opinion existed between the railroad and a large majority of its employes, members of the brotherhood, with respect to their wages; that the defendants as officers and committees of the brotherhood were fully au-