

ipalities of the State of Ohio the power to regulate street-car fares; and, referring to a proposed legislative bill accompanying his address, he recommended that the city council.—

by resolution or otherwise, request the members of the General Assembly representing the county of Cuyahoga, to present this bill and press for its enactment. That the matter may properly come to the attention of the General Assembly, it would seem wise that some memorial be prepared by the council to accompany the bill, and that a copy of it be presented to each member of the Cuyahoga delegation, and copies likewise to the Governor of the State, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Chamber of Commerce and the United Trade and Labor Council of the City of Cleveland, with a request that they examine the proposed measure and express their opinion upon it to the members of the General Assembly from this county.

Of this new move on Mayor Johnson's part the Cleveland Plain Dealer, in describing it says:

In view of statements hitherto made by the Mayor in regard to contemplated action by the legislature, it is hardly probable that he has serious hope that that body will heed the request of the Council of Cleveland. If, however, the legislature should act as is desired, it would provide a most speedy termination for the agitation of three years towards the goal of lower fares. Balked by injunction and every possible device of litigation at home, checks made possible by the existing street railway laws of the State, Mayor Johnson, should he obtain the petitioned aid from his political enemies at Columbus, could, with the concurrence of a friendly city council, in three weeks' time reduce the fare on every railroad in the city of Cleveland to the desired 3 cents. And, under the provisions of the amendment which he has proposed, the railroads would have no redress in the usual procrastination of litigation. To throw directly upon the legislators, with their mammoth Republican majority, the onus of providing 3-cent fare for Cleveland, will remove for a time the storm center of the low fare fight to Columbus.

The city council immediately referred an appropriate resolution to a committee.

The crisis in British politics (pp. 729, 758) approaches more and more obviously. On the 9th the Balfour ministry came to the verge of defeat, its majority being reduced to 46. A Liberal, Mr. Pirie, had moved that the House, "noting the continued agitation in favor of protective or preferential tariffs, which is encouraged by the lan-

guage used by certain of His Majesty's ministers, deem it necessary to express its condemnation of any such policy." After three hours of debate, in which the Premier participated in opposition to this motion, the motion was defeated by a ministerial majority of only 46. The result came very near being absolutely disastrous. A ministerial member had moved an amendment "approving the ministerial declarations of the fiscal policy, as including neither a general system of protection nor preference based on the taxation of food," whereupon over 100 of Chamberlain's followers notified the ministerial leaders that unless this amendment were withdrawn they would abstain from voting on the Pirie motion. As that would have left the ministry in the minority, the amendment was withdrawn. And yet the ministerial majority was only 46.

Within a week thereafter the ministry was actually defeated. John Redmond, the Irish leader, moved on the 15th for a reduction of the Irish education estimates by \$2,500. He did so for the purpose of calling attention to grievances in connection with the Irish schools. The ministry opposed the motion and was defeated by a vote of 141 to 130. As the small vote suggests, this was really no test of ministerial strength. The vote was taken immediately upon the making of the motion, when the attendance was slight, and it was soon after changed to a ministerial majority of 25, on another and more vital point. Notwithstanding that, however, the circumstances are regarded as indicative of a steady weakening of ministerial power.

Again a single tax measure for British municipalities has come before the Commons, making a further gain. This measure would enable municipalities to levy site value taxes for local purposes. It is what would be known in this country as a measure for local option in taxation. The measure was first voted on in Parliament on the 19th of February, 1902, (vol. iv. p. 754), upon a motion that it pass the second reading. After a strikingly radical line of debate, both for the measure and in opposition, its

second reading was defeated by a vote of 158 to 229; a majority against the measure of 71. About a year later, March 27, 1903 (vol. v., p. 82; vol. vi., p. 72), the measure was again voted on in the Commons on second reading and again defeated. But at that time the adverse majority was only 13. Under the description of "the land values and rating bill," the measure came before the Commons for the third time, on the 12th of the present month, and again the question was on the passage of the stage of second reading. The vote stood 223 for and 156 against—a majority of 67 for the measure. The bill now goes to third reading. If it passes that stage it will go into the House of Lords to challenge the great landed interests represented there.

This vote in Parliament is not a haphazard thing. It has come as the result of long agitation, and is probably due most immediately to a formal address by the corporation of the City of Glasgow to the other rating (local taxing) bodies of Great Britain, issued December 28, 1903, and attested by the town clerk of Glasgow. This address makes several requests relative to the parliamentary matter in question, the principal one of which closes the following extract:

The question of the taxation of land values has been before this Corporation for several years. On 21st October, 1902, they convened a conference in the Hotel Metropole, London, which was attended by representatives of over 100 rating authorities, when the following resolutions were adopted, viz.:-

(1) That this Conference of representatives of municipal and other rating authorities approves of the principle of the taxation of land values for local purposes as being just and equitable.

(2) That this Conference of representatives of municipal and other rating authorities cordially thanks the Corporation of Glasgow for their recommendations regarding the taxation of land values for local purposes, and pledges itself to support by every competent means, and at the earliest possible moment, with a view to its becoming law, any equitable and just measure giving effect to the foregoing resolution.

At that conference a committee, consisting of representatives of twenty-five rating authorities, was appointed, and that committee have had several meetings. A second Conference was held in the Westminster Palace Hotel, London, on 9th instant. The accompanying pamphlet contains a full report of the proceedings to date.

I am instructed to ask you to be good enough to submit this communication, with the pamphlet before referred to, to

your Council at their first meeting, and to request their co-operation in the movement.

As a result of that address several city councils took affirmative action. Chief among these was that of Liverpool, which, on the 2d of February, adopted the following resolution by 51 to 30:

That in the opinion of this Council it is desirable that amendments should be effected in the law governing the assessment of property to the local rates, by requiring (1) that land and the buildings standing thereon should be separately assessed; (2) that land should be assessed, whether occupied or not; (3) that in the cases of tenancies created after the passing of the Act, the tenants should be entitled to deduct the rate on the land from the rent payable to the landlord; that the Council is of opinion that the draft bill embodies the principles above set forth, but that further provision should be made for safeguarding existing contracts; that copies of these resolutions be sent to the Prime Minister, the President of the Local Government Board, and all the members of Parliament for Liverpool.

It is doubtless in consequence of widespread municipal action of that kind that the Conservative House of Commons has passed the Liberal measure for taxing land values through its second reading. While the above demand and the parliamentary measure are extremely moderate, it is to be observed that both in the municipal councils and in parliament the affirmative has been supported on the ground that the "unearned increment" of land belongs of right to the public, while the negative has been supported on the ground that it belongs of right to landowners.

NEWS NOTES.

—Judge MacLean, of the New York State Supreme Court, has established a precedent by appointing a woman as referee in an action for foreclosure of mortgage. She is Miss Gabrielle T. Stewart.

—Harold Cox has been succeeded as secretary of the Cobden Club by G. H. Perris, editor of "Concord," the organ of the English Arbitration Society, who spoke on international questions in several American cities about a year ago.

—Mr John Farrell, at one time editor of the Daily Telegraph, of Sydney, New South Wales, and a staunch personal friend of Henry George as well as prominent Australian advocate of the single tax, has recently died.

—The various labor movements and

the allied social movements are about to be investigated by Prof. Richard T. Ely, and the results compiled in a volume to be called "The History of Industrial Democracy in the United States."

—The Chicago city council has extended the street franchise of the Chicago City Railway (pp. 757, 777) until January 1, 1905, the company agreeing to pay a license fee of \$100 per year per car 13 trips to constitute a car day. The ordinance passed 55 to 8.

—The monthly statement of the United States treasury department (see p. 713) for February shows on hand February 29, 1904:

Gold reserve fund.....	\$150,000,000.00
Available cash.....	223,068,505.51
Total	\$373,068,505.51
On hand at close of last fiscal year, June 30, 1903.....	384,394,275.58
Decrease	\$11,325,770.07

—The monthly treasury report of receipts and expenditures of the Federal government (see pp. 713-14) for the eight months ending February 31, 1904, shows the following:

Receipts:	
Tariff	\$175,784,376.72
Internal revenue.....	157,260,235.98
Miscellaneous	32,276,636.85
	\$365,321,249.55
Expenses:	
Civil and misc.....	\$83,203,464.69
War	79,104,862.35
Navy	66,122,087.85
Indians	7,463,675.94
Pensions	96,635,724.54
Interest	17,906,120.52
	\$360,438,935.89
Surplus	\$4,882,313.66

PRESS OPINIONS.

RAILROAD MERGER CASE.

Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Mar. 16.—That decision gives more power to the Federal elbow to deal with all corporations which do business outside the limits of their own States. And the great majority of large corporations do business outside the limits of their own States.

Chicago Record-Herald (Ind. Rep.), Mar. 15.—Men who now attempt what Hill and Morgan attempted may be set down as conscious lawbreakers, whatever their methods. The decision destroys the old sophistries at the very least, and puts a lasting stigma upon capitalistic anarchy.

Chicago Evening Post (Rep.), Mar. 16.—The decision leaves everything except the Northern Securities Company in its present form exactly as it was on the day the merger was challenged. The "logic" of the opinion is of no consequence, and no morals or lessons are to be drawn from it. Are any other railway systems illegal? We do not know, say the judges and the government; we only know that the merger is illegal. Such an attitude is at least safe. It leads to nothing in an industrial and social sense, and its practical effects are nil.

Milwaukee Daily News (Dem.), Mar. 15.—Carried to its logical conclusion, the decision concedes the power of Congress not only to prohibit restraint of trade, but to say who shall and who shall not own certain railway stocks. Its effects are far-reaching. It gives to Congress great power—power that may be used for good or evil. The court, however, declined, and quite properly, to consider the effects of the decision. Congress has made the law. It was for the court to determine if Congress had

exceeded its powers, not to judge whether it had used its powers for good or evil.

THE HEARST CANDIDACY.

Omaha World-Herald (Dem.), Mar. 11.—Editors of metropolitan papers would become very indignant were they charged with deliberate and persistent misrepresentation; and yet, these editors are just now engaged in the effort to make it appear that there is a tie-up between Mr. Bryan and William R. Hearst, to the end that Mr. Hearst shall become the Democratic nominee. . . . The charge that there is a tie-up, between Hearst and Bryan is made in the face of the fact that Mr. Bryan has repeatedly, in his paper and in newspaper interviews, declared that such was not the case. Mr. Bryan has made no tie-up with any candidate for the Presidency, and he has frequently explicitly stated that he has made no combination with Mr. Hearst. . . . It is true that many of the men who supported Mr. Bryan are favorable to Mr. Hearst. The same may be said of those who favor Carter Harrison, of Chicago, and those who favor Congressman Williams, of Illinois, and those who favor Gen. Miles and Gov. Garvin, and a number of other gentlemen, whose names have been mentioned for the Democratic nomination. Mr. Bryan cannot, however, hope for fair treatment or for honest statements at the hands of the editors of the metropolitan papers that are so vigorously opposing him in his effort to prevent the Republicanization of the Democratic party.

Springfield Republican (Ind.), Mar. 4 (weekly ed.).—None of the conservative Democrats, who exulted over Tom Johnson's tremendous defeat in Ohio last Fall, had an idea that the wiping out of Johnson meant greater momentum to the Hearst candidacy. Yet does not a strict regard for the truth of history compel one to point out that in crushing Johnson they helped to raise up Hearst? Had Mr. Johnson even made a fairly close race for governor, he would surely have been the Presidential candidate of the more radical wing of the Democracy, and at least he would have made a decent, respectable leader. But the Ohioan was terribly beaten by the aid of gold Democratic votes. And now the Hearst candidacy profits from the absence of Tom Johnson in the field. The descent from Johnson to Hearst is frightful—it might be said that it is tragic.

Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat (Dem.), Mar. 12.—The friends of Mr. Hearst are alert and determined. They are making hay while the sun shines. The absence of any other active candidacy is an important help to them, and the utter inability of the reorganizers to unite upon any one is an additional encouragement to the Hearst movement. As far as the radicals are concerned no one is even mentioned, except Gov. Garvin, of Rhode Island, as a possible choice. Thus it is coming to look like either Hearst or a reorganizer. And as between Hearst and any reorganizer thus far suggested or that could be suggested it is a safe guess that democratic Democrats will not long hesitate.

IN CONGRESS.

This report is an abstract of the Congressional Record, the official report of Congressional proceedings. It includes all matters of general interest, and closes with the last issue of the Record at hand upon going to press. Page references are to the pages of Vol. 38 of that publication.

Washington, March 7-12, 1904.

Senate.

On the 7th consideration of the naval appropriation bill was resumed (p. 3043), and the bill, amended, was passed (p. 3045); after which, consideration of the army appropriation bill was begun (p. 3057). This was continued on the 8th (p. 3118) and 9th (p. 3184), when it was passed with amendments (p. 3190). Prior to action on the army bill on the 9th, a resolution of-