

1,510. Every step forward in the direction of municipal ownership has been secured by direct popular vote and against the opposition of the local Republican machine manned by monopoly mercenaries.

In 1905 an unusually favorable opportunity for beginning the establishment of a municipal traction system occurred, and a definite plan was formulated and presented to the Council last November, with a petition requesting submission to popular vote. The statutory right to municipalize had existed since 1897. But the Council pigeon-holed the petition. This did not, however, allay the agitation, which culminated in January in the calling of a mass convention. Attended by labor representatives and professional and business men, this convention on the 20th of January organized the Municipal Ownership party, promulgated a declaration of principles and nominated a ticket with Judge Moore for mayor. The Democrats made no nomination; the Prohibitionists endorsed some of the Municipal Ownership candidates; the organized Socialists, as usual, as well as the Republicans, nominated straight tickets. The contest, therefore, was between the Republican party and the Municipal Ownership party.

At the election, which took place on the 6th, the nominal Republican majority was cut down from 8,000 to 3,000 on administrative officers other than mayor, and the Municipal Ownership candidate for mayor and 2 out of 13 councilmen were elected. The majority for mayor was only 15, although he carried 7 wards out of 11. That the victory was not more complete is explained upon the ground that the returns from 96 precincts were fraudulently tampered with, and that the Republican machine had the prestige of power and organization as well as campaign funds and newspaper support; whereas the Municipal Ownership party was a new organization of poor men with no daily newspaper support. But the effect is regarded as sufficient. "With a municipal ownership mayor," says a leader of the new local party, "and two councilmen to force the issue and make the record, and every Republican

councilman pledged by his platform and promises to certain definite action towards municipal ownership of street railways, and a recall provision of law with which 25 per cent. of the voters can 'yank' their councilman out to the test of a special election to hold his seat, Seattle is fairly equipped."

#### The recall in Seattle.

Another result of the Seattle election, also of national importance though only of local effect, was the adoption by an overwhelming direct vote of the people (9,312 to 1,271) of an amendment to the city charter, whereby the city establishes the Recall. By a petition of 25 per cent. of the voters, any elective member of the city government may at any time be forced to face the test of a special election for continuance in his office.

#### Land values taxation in British municipalities.

The municipal question most pressing in Great Britain is the taxation of local land values for municipal purposes—"rating" as it is called. This question came before the new Ministry on the 26th of February in significant form. The report on the American side has been delayed until now because the event has not been noticed in cable dispatches. A petition for land value taxation, signed by 518 municipal councils was laid before the ministry by 15 official representatives of 115 municipal bodies, being a deputation from the Conference of Rating Authorities throughout England, Scotland and Wales (p. 599). The deputation was introduced by J. H. Whitley, M. P., and its spokesmen were the Mayor of Manchester, the Mayor of Glasgow, and ex-Baillie Ferguson of Glasgow. The Mayor of Glasgow reviewed the history of the movement for the taxation of land values, and urged action by the Ministry. He was followed by the Mayor of Manchester, who testified to "the intense feeling of interest which the general body of the people took in the question of the taxation of land values," and presented the question as one of urgency, regarding which he believed that municipalities "cannot wait." Although there are many things

for the Ministry to do, "none is of greater importance than this." Ex-Baillie Ferguson also pressed the urgency of the matter, saying that—

No such influential combination of responsible rating authorities had ever before been organized for a reform. Their united demand is that the ever-increasing burdens upon the ratepayers should be alleviated by the restoration to public uses of a portion of the increasing wealth which was created by the whole community.

Owing to the illness of the Prime Minister, the answer of the Ministry was made by Mr. Asquith, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Among Mr. Asquith's assurances as reported by "Land Values" (Glasgow) for March and the Manchester Guardian of February 27, were these:

I suppose almost alone in the category of social and fiscal reforms, this is one which meets with practically the unanimous approval, without distinction of politics or party, of all the great municipalities. . . . I have always regarded this movement properly understood as being not a derogation from, but an assertion of the rights of property. What are the two principles upon which, as far as I understand it, it is founded? They are very simple. They seem to me to be based upon common-sense and equity. The first is that those who benefit by public improvements, should contribute their fair share of the cost of them. The next is—and I think it is right and just—that the community should reap the benefit of the increased values which are due to its own expenditure and its own growth. These two principles appear to me not to be inconsistent, but are a necessary corollary of the doctrine of the rights of property if equitably applied. I am not going to say a word to you now about the precise machinery which ought to be adopted for carrying this into effect. I suppose we are all agreed on some things, one being that it is necessary, at any rate, that as a preliminary step there should be a separate assessment on site values. . . . It has been said that no mention was made of the subject in the King's Speech. That is true. The reason is not that the Government in any sense undervalues either its importance or urgency. The reason that it finds no mention there, apart from the fact that we have, as I think you will all acknowledge, a somewhat ample programme to carry through quite apart from that, and without going into the question of the competitive merits or the precise order of precedence which ought to be

given to one reform as compared with another, the reason is that we desire to have time to carefully consider the best way of giving effect to the principles I have enunciated, and which I think all here hold in common, and in particular to review the subject in relation to all its bearings upon the general question of local taxation and local expenditure. I believe we are more likely to produce a satisfactory and permanently adequate remedy if we allow ourselves a little time for the consideration of the problem than if we at the moment introduce a comparatively small and piece-meal installment of the reform which we all desire. I do not think I need say more to-day on behalf of the Government. I assure you we are in hearty sympathy with the objects of your movement, and as time and opportunity offer, we shall be ready to do everything we can to put these objects into legislative form.

Mr. Bryce, Chief Secretary for Ireland, said—

they were all agreed in the principles laid down by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but, clear as the principles were, some little care was required in working them out in the most convenient form, and therefore he was sure the deputation would not ask for any hasty disclosure of what the Government might find it necessary ultimately to adopt.

Mr. Burns, President of the Local Government Board, added that—it was neither necessary nor relevant that he should add much to the practical, sympathetic, and direct observations which Mr. Asquith had addressed to the deputation. The Government sympathised with and desired to help the deputation in their objects and do adequate justice.

#### The new French Ministry.

Immediately following the resignation of the Rouvier ministry of France (p. 821), President Fallieres asked Jean Marie Ferdinand Sarrien to form a new ministry. Mr. Sarrien accepted on the 10th. The Ministry he formed is as follows:

Premier and Minister of Justice, Sarrien; Minister of Interior, Clemenceau; Foreign Affairs, Bourgeois; War, Etienne; Marine, Thomson; Instruction and Worship, Rand; Commerce, Dumergue; Public Works, Barrou; Finance, Poincare; Colonies, Leygues; Agriculture, Ruau.

The new Ministry outlined its policy on the 14th by declaring its intention regarding the separation of church and state, of carrying out the law firmly; and

concerning the Morocco question, of following the policy of the preceding Ministry.

#### Further fighting in the Philippines.

Another battle with Moros (p. 489) was reported officially from the Philippines on the 9th. The battle occurred at Mount Dajo, a lava cone with a crater at the top, near Jolo; it lasted two days, from March 6 in the afternoon until March 8 in the morning.—and the American loss was 18 killed and about 40 wounded. The Moros left 600 killed; no wounded are reported. Gen. Wood describes these Moros in his report to Washington as "a band of outlaws who, recognizing no chief, had been raiding friendly Moros and, owing to their defiance of the American authorities, had stirred up a dangerous condition of affairs." Owing to the horrible slaughter of the Moros, including their women and children, the Senate of the United States has ordered an investigation.

#### Progressive Democracy in New Jersey.

Pursuant to a movement for the revival of genuine democracy in New Jersey (p. 695) a conference to meet at Newark on the 20th has been called by representative democratic Democrats from all parts of the State. The call is led by ex-Congressman Allan Benny, and is signed by James F. Minturn, Charles H. Ingersoll, A. C. Pleydell, James E. Martine, Charles O'Connor Hennessy, John Moody, Joseph R. Buchanan, Albert Brandt, George White and other leaders among the progressive Democrats who think "the time has come for the citizens of New Jersey to take charge of their own affairs" and dismiss the public utility corporations which now control both parties in that State. In the call it is declared that—

The machinery of the two old parties has fallen completely under the control of corporate influences and other privileged interests, and the spirit of independence has reached its highest point in the history of American politics. While this statement is true of the country as a whole, it is peculiarly descriptive of the condition of New Jersey. In this State party leadership has been and is completely dominated by corporation influence. Party principles have been trampled under foot, party honor has been bartered for corporation pelf, party banners have

been trailed in the filth of political corruption. . . . It has been said that "when things get thoroughly bad they will right themselves," implying that, in public affairs there is a point in the decline at which the people will revolt, and inspired by the spirit of honor and pride will rally at the call of duty and check the downward course. We believe that New Jersey has reached that point. Dishonored in our party councils, betrayed in our legislative sanctuary, chained to the wheels of unbridled monopoly, a butt for the jokes of one-half the world and commiserated by the other half, the citizens of New Jersey have come to the time when they must assert their manhood and their patriotism.

In further explanation of this call, its sponsors state:

The movement is being started not in the interest of any men or set of men in or out of the State of New Jersey. It is the particular purpose of those who are starting the movement to make distinctively an organization for the promotion and propagation of what they feel to be the principles of fundamental democracy. It cannot, therefore, be said that the movement is in any sense inspired by, or organized in the interest of any particular individual. It is not a Parker movement, nor a Cleveland movement, nor a Black movement, nor a Hearst movement, nor a Bryan movement. It is, however, a distinctively State movement, which is calculated to crystalize and put into definite action the present more or less dormant but vital sentiment of true democracy in the State of New Jersey.

#### Progressive Democracy in Illinois.

A conference of the Majority Rule League of Illinois (p. 103) was held at Chicago on the 12th, to perfect details for ousting from control in the Democratic party of the State the so-called "Hopkins-Sullivan crowd," who also control the gas monopoly of Chicago. Representatives from every Congressional district but one were in attendance. Millard F. Dunlap, of Jacksonville, presided. Referring to the "Hopkins-Sullivan crowd," now in control of the party machinery, the resolutions adopted declare unalterable opposition to the continued management of the party business by those men or by any men who are directly under their control. A specification of particular acts of perfidy follows, including their gavel rule at the State convention in 1904 (vol. vii, p. 482). The address continues:

Capable, reliable and sincere Demo-