

(lecturer); W. G. McMurchy (editor Daily News); Tyler McWhorter (cartoonist, Pioneer Press); Rev. E. B. Woodward (St. Clements Episcopal Church); Rev. John D. Reid (Unitarian Church); H. D. Frankel (lawyer), and C. Harold Richter (artist).

To meet the requirements of the Minnesota Constitution, the charter had to provide for a mayor and a council. It provides for a Mayor, comptroller and six commissioners who constitute the City Council. The Mayor is empowered to assign the six commissioners to their respective duties, and has power to re-distribute them at the end of six months. This throws the whole responsibility for the general administration of city affairs on the Mayor. All these eight elective officers are subject to a Recall election on petition of 25% of the voters; and all acts of the council are subject to an easy working Initiative and Referendum.

The business of the city is divided into the following six departments, aside from Mayor and comptroller: Commissioner of Finance is city treasurer and general financial officer of the city; Commissioner of Public Works in charge of public works (streets, sewers, bridges, collection of garbage, work house, etc.); Commissioner of Public Safety (police, fire, health, public baths); Commissioner of Education (schools, library, auditorium, art galleries, museums), aided by an unpaid advisory board of education (one elected by the voters of each of the twelve wards, and eight to twelve elected by the teachers), this board having no power except to advise; Commissioner of parks (all parks, playgrounds, except school playgrounds and all public buildings) aided by a city architect who is building inspector; Commissioner of Public Utilities, who is president of the water board and has charge of city lighting, city markets, all public utilities owned or acquired by the city, and public service corporations. The Commissioner of Finance, Commissioner of Public Works, and Commissioner of Public Utilities constitute the water board. All elections are non-partisan, fifty voters being necessary to put a candidate on the primary ballot and no party designation being permitted. The chapter on franchises and public service corporations is extraordinarily strict.

The only organized opposition to this charter came from the Socialists, who objected to the clause prohibiting party names on the ballots.

To adopt the charter required that three-fifths of all voting at the election must vote for it. Yet it secured considerably more than the required three-fifths of affirmative votes.

All the daily papers strongly urged the adoption of the charter, which was largely due to John W. Bennett of the Despatch, and W. G. McMurchy of the News. There would probably have been more organized opposition, but most of its opponents—Big Business and corporations—had no idea it could secure the needed three-fifths vote. The charter was on a separate ballot and this helped much. The Current Topics Club committee would gladly have adopted the Grand Junction and Spokane plan of one election with preferential voting, but feared it might cost votes. They are now of the opinion that the charter would have received just as many votes had that plan been embodied in the document. The people of the city were ripe for a change. Many perhaps did not know very definitely what they voted for; but

they adopted a good charter by an affirmative vote of 22,215 to only 4,485 in the negative.

C. J. BUELL.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, July 16, 1912.

The Land Question in Great Britain.

At the by-election for Hanley on the 13th, R. L. Outhwaite, the Liberal candidate, and an active and prominent Singletaxer who fought his campaign on Singletax lines, was elected to the Parliamentary vacancy caused by the death of Enoch Edwards, a Labor member, by a plurality of 4,953 over the Labor candidate and 654 over the Unionist. This result emphasizes the significance of E. G. Hemmerde's victory a short time earlier, at another by-election, and of Sydney Arnold's at a second, and, confirming political opinions as to the popularity of the democratic side of the land question, tends further to strengthen the expectations of an advance in radicalism on that question by the Liberal party. [See vol. xiii, pp. 779, 900, 924, 947, 961, 996, 997, 1083, 1156; vol. xiv, pp. 327, 891, 897, 1030, 1101, 1170, and current volume, pages 204, 363, 541.]



American newspapers are characteristically wanting in news of this development in British politics, but a glance at London newspapers indicates that a revolutionary crisis is near at hand of even greater general interest than that of 1909, the news of which did not bestir American papers until it was a year old or more.



The London Daily Telegraph (opposition) of June 28 indicates the situation, saying that:

Evidence is forthcoming that the Government are formulating a policy of land and housing reform as the basis of an appeal to the country at the next general election. They are now awaiting the labors of the Committee on Imperial and Local Taxation—a body which was appointed a year ago, and whose report is expected in the course of the coming autumn. . . . Mr. Lloyd George is reported to have informed his political friends that the Government intend to remain in office until July, 1914, but in some quarters it is believed that a general election may occur even before the present year is out. The Prime Minister claims that twenty years back he was associated with Lord Haldane, Sir Edward Grey, and others in a movement for securing to local authorities part of the value of land due to the enterprise, expenditure, and energy of the com-

munity. Practically that was the policy embodied in the famous Budget of 1909. In May, 1911, more than 170 Radical and Labor members memorialized the Government in favor of a development of that policy. They formed a deputation to the Premier and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and represented that the separate valuation of land would provide a foundation for giving the people a more equitable distribution of the burdens of the state, and would open up the land to those who could make the best use of it. Both Ministers expressed their sympathy with the views of the deputation. Mr. Lloyd George especially admitted the urgency of the problem, but pointed out that it must obviously be considered in connection with the readjustment of Imperial and local taxation which was then engaging attention, and suggested that some members of the deputation should lay their opinions before the Committee which the Cabinet had brought into being. That advice, it is understood, has recently been acted upon. Mr. Asquith declared the question to be of great importance, both in its urban and its rural aspect, and for the moment he thought the rural aspect the more urgent of the two. So matters went on until the end of November, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer hastened down to Bath and attended the annual meeting of the National Liberal Federation. He . . . indulged in this significant declaration:

What is the most urgent need of Britain today? It is the regeneration of rural Britain, and you will not do that without a complete reform of the land laws. What is happening now? You have got millions of robust citizens driven by the present system from the healthy environment of the soil to the allurements of our great cities. Hundreds and thousands, if not millions, pass into other lands. I am not surprised. When the just rewards of labor are given to those that labor not, and where those who do toil are requited with wretched wages and still more wretched houses, you will not keep the laborer on the land.

There is no reason why the new policy of the Cabinet should not be settled immediately after the Taxation Committee have reported. Since the election of Mr. Hemmerde for North-West Norfolk communications have passed between the Government and the Radical land-taxers, and there is every prospect of land reform being a prominent feature in the Radical programme at the next general election.

Another opposition London paper, the Express, of June 28, confirms the Telegraph's prognostications:

When Mr. Lloyd George under his "great" Budget of 1909 undertook a valuation of all the land in England, the "Express" predicted that the valuation would be used for the purpose of land nationalization, and not, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his henchmen declared, merely for the purposes of the comparatively light taxation under that Budget. Developments in the last few days prove the truth of this prophecy. Mr. Lloyd George is preparing for another great attack on the landowners which will make his previous efforts look small. His plan is nothing less than a tremendous scheme of land taxation, based on the Singletax, the economic

heresy promulgated thirty years ago by his American namesake, the late Mr. Henry George. . . . The new Liberal policy was outlined yesterday in the leading article in the "British Weekly," the organ of the advanced Radicals.



The leading article in the British Weekly of June 27 (the paper referred to above as the organ of the advanced Radicals), from which the Express copiously quotes, outlined the anticipated new Liberal program in this way:

There is an unmistakable thrill in the air. We are on the eve of a new departure. . . . Those who have read Mr. Massingham's article in the Daily News on Monday on "A Land Programme: Liberalism and the Laborer," and those who have duly noted the hints given by Mr. Francis Neilson,* M. P., in his constituency on Saturday, those who are trained to watch the newspapers, may have some shrewd idea of a change coming which will make politics again to glow. . . . Liberalism cannot live in torpor. When a Liberal Government confines itself to administration and to piddling action it keeps losing all the while. Assuredly this is not the plight of the Government at the present moment. They are engaged in legislation of a most arduous kind. Their measures of home rule, Welsh disestablishment, and franchise reform give infinite scope for discussion and for opposition. In a manner the fight will be maintained till the end arrives, and maintained with fierceness. But the masses in this country are not troubling their heads over Welsh disestablishment and home rule. . . . The British people have made up their minds that Ireland shall have home rule and that Wales shall have disestablishment. . . . The masses are not vitally affected by the measures now debated, and it is to the awakening of the masses that we must look for another era of Progressive government. We must continue the campaign against wrong. We do not need to leap on any policy that offers, as the horse that will carry us back to power. But what we do need is the honest development of our own party principles. This development must be carried out till it sets free the British people from the yoke of the Tory oligarchy and reinstates them in the possession of their liberties. What can the Government do? They have done much; they have prepared the way for more. They have passed old-age pensions, checked the power of the Lords, secured great and needful reforms in finance, defended free trade in the most effective manner, and last, not least, have passed the Insurance act. These were great achievements, and the Insurance act was a great conservative measure in which Mr. Lloyd George played the part not of a mere politician, but of a disinterested and highminded statesman. . . . Notwithstanding the mighty work which he has accomplished, we believe that Mr. Lloyd George thinks he has made no more than a beginning. At Marple Mr. Neilson said, after referring to the Insurance act, that he did not want only that kind of

*One of the leading Singletaxers in Parliament along with Wedgwood, Hemmerde, Raffan, White, McGhee, Whitley, Outhwaite and others.

legislation. He wanted to go deeper and remove all the causes that made the insurance act necessary. He wanted to deal with the problem of poverty at its source. He wanted the people to have a proper life, proper air, proper houses, and a proper water supply, and opportunities to use the land that God intended for them, and to be individualistic and independent in their existence. The act was not the end, but the beginning. Of that he was assured by Mr. Lloyd George, who had a deeper, a more profound work to do. He was getting impatient, and when he got impatient something happened—and something was going to happen. One or two things had been let slip this week by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Masterman that showed the Government had been going along the lines that he had wished for so long. People were beginning to realize that they were right when they said they had wasted years and years in tinkering, in giving the people palliatives, and what they had to do was to go out and tell the people what their case was, and they would respond. For Liberals and for progressives there is only one way, and that is the way of justice and not of charity. . . . Mr. Massingham, who may very possibly know that he is pushing at an open door, outlines the kind of measure that the times require. Pointing out that Mr. Hemmerde and Mr. Arnold held their seats on a policy of land reform and land taxation, on the abandonment of defense and the substitution of counter-attack, Mr. Massingham affirms that no one can defend the land system, and that when it is assailed the average Tory candidate is as helpless as a beetle on its back. The standard of land reform needs to be raised boldly and definitely. . . . Mr. Massingham makes certain definite suggestions. The laborer wants (1) land, (2) decent house room, (3) better wages, and (4) personal independence. Here we emphasize Mr. Massingham's saying that the farmer must be included. It is by the uniting of the farmer and the laborer that success can be achieved. Any policy that lays additional burdens on the farmer without relieving or assisting him is bound to fail. We would also suggest that the new policy must be a policy not only for the country but for the town; in short, for the nation. We believe that the limitation of the power of the landlord in towns is as important as it is in the country. In a word, the land problem, as Mr. Massingham says, must include all branches of workers, must be based on the transference of the burden of local taxation from improvements to land, and must inaugurate a great policy of compulsory purchase on the capital value and of compulsory building. . . . We doubt very much whether any great measure of land reform will accomplish its purpose or stir a conquering enthusiasm without the policy of a minimum wage. We cannot tell how far the Government have gone in preparing a definite programme. It is obvious that problems of the greatest complexity will be raised, and it may well be that facts will have to be collected on a very large scale before a policy can be announced. The success of the Irish land measure and the effect of the small holdings act in Scotland may have to be pondered. Anything like precipitate action must obviously be avoided. To raise high hopes and then to disappoint them is the most fatal of all methods. But the Government

which addresses itself to this great task is equal to its undertaking. We may predict without much fear of error that by autumn the solution of the main problem will be reached, and the chief lines of the new programme settled. It is fairly obvious that while much may be done through the Budget, the greater part will have to be accomplished through special legislation. That legislation cannot be carried to its end in the present Parliament. But whenever it is promulgated the by-elections will mainly turn on it, and the general election will be decided by it. There will still be keen interest in home rule and in Welsh disestablishment on the part of very large classes, and they will be thoroughly debated. But the minds of the masses who have the decision in their hands will be concentrated on the land measure.



Further light on the general situation may be had from the London Times of the 27th, which in its political notes said that—

the new Liberal land policy is being discussed. All that can be said of it at the moment is that it has not assumed definite shape. But there have been pourparlers between the important group of Liberal land-taxers and members of the Government. This group, which includes Sir Albert Spicer, Mr. Neilson, Mr. Morrell, Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Raffan, and a number of others, did a good deal of campaigning in North-West Norfolk in support of Mr. Hemmerde, who is at one with them. The memorial presented by the land tax group last year to the Prime Minister in favor of land and taxation reform was signed by 172 Liberal and Labor members. In the forefront of their programme is the proposal to make land values available for public needs, and there have been some recent indications that the Government are inclining to the use of the land valuation for other purposes than those of the Budget of 1909-10.



Following these pronouncements came the London Daily Express of the 29th, with this disclosure of the incipient campaign:

A vigorous campaign in support of the taxation of land values—which is, as the "Express" pointed out yesterday, Mr. Lloyd George's new plan of campaign—is already being carried on throughout the length and breadth of the land, and Unionists will have to bestir themselves to defeat the Chancellor's latest electioneering scheme. A "Land Values League" has been established in many of the great towns, especially in the north, and all these leagues are connected with a "United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values," which has a vigorous headquarters and "press bureau" in Tothill-street Westminster, while the "English League for the Taxation of Land Values," carries on a ceaseless campaign from its office in the Strand. An immense quantity of pamphlet literature, with alluring titles, such as "How to Get Rich Without Working," "The Crime of Poverty," and "Real Land Reform," is being scattered by a special "publication department" of the "English League," in the Strand, and cheap editions of the books of the late Mr. Henry George,

the American inventor of the Singletax scheme, are being placed on the market. There is no doubt that there is a widespread and growing interest in the question, an "Express" representative was told yesterday at the offices of the "English League," "and in addition to the work being done by our own lecturers and members of the League up and down the country, the 'Young Liberal' men are everywhere taking it up. A notable fact is that we do not give, but sell, our literature, and we dispose of hundreds of thousands of pamphlets and large quantities of books. For instance, a fourpenny edition of Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty,' in which he expounds the taxation of land values, has been published recently, and the first edition of 10,000 copies is already sold out. A shilling edition of 'Protection or Free Trade?' in which he also discusses land values, has reached a sale of 35,000 copies. The interest in the land values question is so great that Messrs. Dent & Co. have added 'Progress and Poverty' to the Everyman Library, and we hear that they are altogether astonished at the immense demand for it. Last week alone we sold 200 copies of a new shilling book entitled 'Land Values Taxation, in Theory and Practice.' In addition to this we issue a monthly journal called 'Land Values,' which has a large sale." It is clear that Mr. Lloyd George has been "captured" by the land values taxers, and Mr. Frederick Verinder, the secretary of the "English League," makes it clear that it was the land values taxers who were responsible for the land clauses of Mr. Lloyd George's 1909 Budget. They got up a petition urging the Government to "make a beginning with the tax on land values in their next Budget," and the valuation scheme was the result. More recently 168 M.P.s have signed a memorial to the Prime Minister urging the Government to take various steps, including the levying of a Budget tax on all land values. In a pamphlet entitled "Form 14: What Next?" Mr. Verinder gives away the whole Radical game, for he shows that the object of the Budget was not to impose the small land taxes which have yielded such a paltry sum to the Exchequer, but to set up a valuation which can be used for the taxation of the whole of the land of the country. It is likely that Mr. Lloyd George's new campaign will have the support of the bulk of the Socialist party. Such confirmed Socialists as Mr. G. N. Barnes, M. P., and Mr. Ben Riley, a member of the executive of the Independent Labor Party, are among the chief supporters of the "English League." . . . Further light is thrown on the Radical plot against the land by a letter which Mr. William Jones, M.P. for North Carnarvonshire, and one of the Government whips, has written to Mr. R. E. Jones, chairman of the Liberal Association in his constituency. After referring to the franchise bill, home rule, and Welsh disestablishment, Mr. William Jones writes: "It was not for the purposes of child's play that the Parliament Act of 1911 was passed. By means of that act we expect to deal with the land question, leaseholds, the housing problem, and the livelihood of the working classes, so as to foster strength in the weak, to give better hope to the poor and needy, to lighten the cares of life, and to extend liberty and equality on the foundations of justice to the great body of the community."

Mr. R. L. Outhwaite, now a member of Parliament, showed the significance of Mr. Hemmerde's election from North-West Norfolk, and also of his own subsequent election from Hanley, in a leading editorial over his initials in *Land Values* (London) for July, published before his own election, the result of which confirms his inferences. In that editorial Mr. Outhwaite said:

All those Liberals who understand not Liberalism shook their heads when a by-election in North-West Norfolk was announced, and viewed the case as hopeless. But instead of a funeral march a clarion call was sounded, and with new life and vigor the cause went forward to victory. Such was the happy result of Mr. E. G. Hemmerde having secured the nomination. He tossed on one side all the political stock-in-trade of officialism, proclaimed a land value tax crusade to rescue the village from the bondage of monopoly, and called on the tillers of the soil to strike a blow for emancipation. For the first time the English village had the chance to declare itself on the land value tax issue, for the first time the man with the hoe had the opportunity that has been presented to the man of the forge, of the loom, of the mine; and the village has shown greater unanimity than the city, the laborer a keener appreciation, a finer enthusiasm, than his industrial fellows. There is no miracle in this. He who looks over the fence and sees idle acres he may not till, best knows that idle acres mean idle men. No "capitalistic" dust clouds his eyes to prevent him seeing in land monopoly the enemy; he knows the truth, and only waits for it to be proclaimed. And therein lies the pathos of the villagers' plight that this by-election has revealed. To the rural constituency is called the whip, to the village where is kept burning the fire of the old Radicalism, where the old faith in equal rights still lingers, is sent the plutocrat. The peasant is offered the husks; he sits below the salt at the Liberal table and he sits in silence. He has borne his part in victory after victory; lord and squire, parson and Tory farmer have showered their blows on his bare back; they have crucified and recrucified him for his faith, and he has remained true. And when emancipation was in sight, in the days when the Budget of 1909 was being framed by a son of the village, those whom the laborers had made Liberal members of Parliament thwarted his invention to levy a general land values tax, saying that the village would oppose what the town demanded. The North-West Norfolk result is the answer to this chicanery. For the first time in England the village has had a chance to pass judgment on it, and the verdict is unmistakable. Never again will whip opportunists be able to countermine the land-values men who are sapping the foundations of rural land monopoly. This election has made a profound impression in Liberal circles because it came just when calculated to have a maximum effect on future policy. When the ship is on a summer sea following an accustomed course the officers are indisputably in command. But when bearings are lost off a lee-shore and the storm blows, then the captain will heed the seaman who knows how to steer through the shoals. In such case now are those in command of the Liberal Party. The old

ports are closed or are closing, the old political voyages can be made no more, before lies an unknown sea and storm follows upon storm. So this declaration as to how the course shall be steered came when circumstances made for its being heeded, and it has not fallen on deaf ears; the Norfolk villagers lit a beacon when eyes were straining into the night, and it has been seen. The strength of the Land Values Taxation programme lies in the fact that it satisfies demands, the overlooking of any one of which would bring disaster at the polls. As North-West Norfolk has shown, it offers the only hope of shaking Toryism in its rural citadels. It provides a potent remedy for the disease made manifest by labor unrest, and so links up the town and rural worker in a common cause. At the same time it offers a measure of relief to the tradesmen and manufacturers to whom the insurance act is the last straw in the imposition of burdens at the hands of a Government to whom they looked for a lightening of the load. Finally, only by way of the Land Value Taxation philosophy can the Liberal Party be indoctrinated anew with Liberalism, and this is perhaps the crying need of the moment. The rank and file of the party are tired of having to wait for Cabinet pronouncements to know the faith they are expected to hold. They do not see salvation in being housed and planned by Mr. John Burns, nor do they think that a cozy corner in a Sydney Webb labor compound will satisfy unrest; they do not want to toll under the jurisdiction of Mr. Snowden's Compulsory Arbitration Court, nor have their names entered in a State Stud Book so that they may get a ticket of leave to marry from Mr. McKenna, counter-signed by some professor of eugenics, as proposed in the Bill for the Care of the Feeble-minded. Liberals do not want a Blue Book for a Bible, but do demand that in the sphere of economics there shall be enforced the mandate: Thou shalt not steal. When it is proclaimed that once again Liberalism stands for economic freedom, and that the straight road to emancipation is to be taken, an irresistible army will rally, and happily there will be missing those who, full of time-serving years and purchased honors, now retard advance. North-West Norfolk has shown that in that day the villager will play his part, and for the first time Liberal victory will mean fulfilment of his hopes, the dawn of liberty, the breaking down of the barriers that stand between him and the long-promised land.



Prohibition Party Convention.

Nearly 1,000 delegates attended the national convention of the Prohibition party of the United States, which opened at Atlantic City, N. J., on the 10th. The platform, adopted on the 11th, demands "a political party which will administer the government from the standpoint that the alcoholic drink traffic is a crime and not a business," and favors—

the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; Presidential terms of six years and one term only; uniform marriage and divorce laws; extermination of polygamy and suppression of the traffic in girls; suffrage for women upon

the same terms as to men; court review as to post-office decisions; protection of the rights of labor without impairment of the rights of capital; settlement of all international disputes by arbitration; Initiative and Referendum; tariff to be fixed on the basis of accurate knowledge secured by a permanent omni-partisan tariff commission; elastic currency system adequate to industrial needs; abolition of child labor; equitable graduated income and inheritance taxes; conservation of mineral and forest preserves; clearly defined laws for the regulation and control of corporations transacting an interstate business; greater efficiency and economy in Government service.

Eugene W. Chafin of Arizona and Aaron S. Watkins of Ohio, the candidates of four years ago, were nominated on the 12th for President and Vice-President of the United States, respectively. [See vol. xiv., p. 1268.]



Republican Revolt in Iowa.

Extraordinary action was taken by the Republican State convention of Iowa on the 10th, in its session at Des Moines, by the adoption of a State platform reported by the committee on resolutions, which contained the following plank:

The Republicans of Iowa believe in the rule of the people. We believe that the popular will, when fairly expressed in convention or primary, should be faithfully observed. Grave and serious abuses of the convention and caucus system of nominating our national candidates have brought the party to a condition in which great numbers of our loyal adherents question the integrity of the nominations made by our national convention. However, we urge upon every Republican to stand loyally by all of the party nominations made in the State, in districts and in counties, leaving to his individual conscience the controversy over the national nominations.

A minority report omitting the above plank and endorsing the national platform and candidates was urgently pressed by Governor Carroll, but was defeated by 773 to 342.



The Unseating of Lorimer.

William Lorimer's election as Senator of the United States from Illinois was decided on the 13th by the United States Senate to have been invalid, and his seat declared vacant from the beginning. [See current volume, page 492.]



After a long deadlock in the legislature of Illinois on the choice of a Senator, Mr. Lorimer (Republican) was elected May 26, 1909, by 55 Republican and 53 Democratic votes. Senator Hopkins, whose term had expired and who had been nominated as his own successor by the Republican voters at the primaries, was thereby dis-