

with the others. The brutal scene is reported to have been witnessed by 5,000 persons.

◎

Upon requisition from the sheriff, Gov. Folk promptly ordered State troops to Springfield to prevent a probable race war as a result of this wanton attack upon Negroes, and at the same time he gave out a statement in which he said:

Lynching is murder, cowardly murder. It is murder, regardless of the guilt or innocence of the accused. Every person charged with a crime is entitled to be tried by the law, not by a mob. The Springfield affair was fiendish and revolting. The extreme penalty should be administered to some lynchers by law. It would have a salutary effect. Assistant Attorney General Gentry has been instructed to go to Springfield and aid the prosecuting attorney in investigating this disgraceful occurrence, to the end that proper punishment may be meted out to those who took a hand in the crime. I shall offer a reward of \$300, the limit allowed by law, for information given to the prosecuting attorney leading to the arrest and conviction of any person engaged in this dastardly offense—not against the wretches mobbed—but against the State of Missouri. The sheriff and prosecuting attorney and mayor of Springfield having informed me this afternoon that the city is in imminent danger of mob violence, and that they are powerless to control the situation, I have honored their request for the State troops to preserve peace and protect the lives and property of citizens there.

Four leaders of the mob which committed these murders have been arrested and admitted to \$10,000 bail. All but one have given the required bail and been released. A special grand jury is investigating the crime.

◎ ◎

Municipal Ownership in Buffalo.

The referendum vote in Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of a municipal lighting plant to compete with the private company (p. 8), has been disregarded by the city council. That body has overruled the city controller who obeyed the referendum mandate by inserting in the estimates an item of \$250,000 for beginning the construction of a municipal lighting plant. His action was approved by Mayor Adam. But on the 14th the item was struck out by the council. Four of the nine councilmen were pledged to support it and two did so; but the other two were won over, thereby giving the two-thirds majority required. An extension of city contracts with the private company is now under negotiation.

◎ ◎

Land Values Taxation in Great Britain.

Within a month after the deputation from British municipalities committed to land values taxation had waited upon the Ministry (vol. viii, p. 838), the first step in support of that policy was taken in Parliament. The measure related only to Scottish burghs, and is known as "the Glasgow bill," it having been formulated and adopted by the Glasgow council in 1898. It came under discussion on the 23rd of March, when petitions from Scottish municipalities to the number of 471 were introduced in support of it. In explaining it Mr. Sutherland, member from Elgin Burghs, is reported by the People's Journal of Dundee, as saying that—

It was intended to include in the measure the application of the principle to counties, and also to empower local authorities to acquire compulsorily land at fair value. At a later season, however, it was thought that the embodiment of these clauses would unnecessarily overburden the bill, and also, keeping in view the fact that some of these

might be incompetent, it was resolved to limit the scope of the measure, and he presented what was generally known as "The Glasgow bill." By so doing the House had a straight issue on which to divide—namely, the taxation of land values. The bill, which applied only to Scottish burghs, provided for the separate valuation of the sites of buildings, and for the imposition of a tax not exceeding two shillings in the pound upon the value of land. It also provided for the taxation of feu-duties, but upon this point a great difference of opinion existed, and it could be thrashed out in committee. One great advantage of the bill would be that it would provide for the taxation of unoccupied land, and would thus tend to kill speculation in land. With regard to feu-duties, they derived their value from the presence of the community, and they ought therefore to contribute to the burdens of the community. There existed no real sort of freedom of contract between the few landowners and the great number of people who wanted to purchase or feu land from them; therefore, the measure would not interfere with freedom of contract. One particular reason among many others Mr. Sutherland had for recommending the bill was because it would deal a heavy blow at the slum landlords.

The second reading of the bill, continues the same report, was—

seconded by Mr. Laidlaw (East Renfrew), who declared that industry and labor created the land values which the monopolists swooped down upon. The bill would prevent the squeezing of the poor man by the land monopolist, would give to labor and industry a due share in their earnings, and also bring idle land into the market.

In opposing the measure Mr. Harold Cox is reported by the same paper as having—

denounced the measure on the ground that it was a direct attack on the rights of property. The whole effect of the bill would be to put a special income tax on land, and it was therefore a direct attack on private property. Dealing with the proposal from the point of view that under the present system land was not a monopoly, the honorable member attempted to persuade the House that the measure was an iniquitous one, but, as subsequent results showed, without success. He contended that the government should devote its efforts to something more substantial, and the ideal to be aimed at was that they should devise a system of taxation by which every citizen should contribute to the expense of the State in proportion to his means.

Sir Henry Craik, another opponent, seems to have—

pleaded the cause of the many charities, the friendly societies, the trades unions, and the poor investors who had their funds invested, and who would be badly hit were the bill to become law. He thought landowners could be left to judge by self-interest what was the most useful purpose to which they might turn their lands. There was no doubt left as to the purposes of the bill. Its real vice was not merely changes in the incidence of taxation, but that it rested on confiscation and robbery.

In voicing the opinion of the Ministry, the Lord Advocate is reported by the same authority to have—

scoffed at the idea put forward by Sir H. Craik that the measure was for confiscation and robbery, and remarked on the fact that it had been approved by a Conservative House of Commons. In the opinion of the Ministry, the time was ripe for the bill. It was a measure not of social expediency, but of social necessity. In language which went home to the hearts of the Opposition like a knife thrust, he asserted that the owners of the land it was proposed to tax were not partners in, but parasites on, the community, and described the present system as one which legalized plunder. He urged the House to accept the bill, because it was an attempt to reach the heart of their social trouble and to alleviate it, if not cure it.

Of the 59 Scottish members who entered the division lobby, 52 voted in favor of the bill and the remaining seven voted against it. The total majority in favor of the bill was 258. In 1905 this bill passed the second reading by a majority of only 20.