

interrogative reply would fit the Star's intimation that there would be a greater volume of trade, and consequently a greater aggregate of profits for merchants. Would not that bring in more merchants to compete for the higher profits until they were reduced to the old level—less what the land owners appropriated in higher rents in the competition for store locations? All the numerous illustrations of the Star are like one or the other of those two. The flaw in its argument is not in its statements of primary probabilities; as far as they go these statements are true enough. But it overlooks the reactionary probabilities. Greater demand and consequent higher prices for houses and other products, caused by a boulevard, would be offset by greater supply; greater profits for merchants would be depressed by more merchandising; greater demand and consequent higher wages for workers, would be neutralized by an influx of more workers. But the higher prices and rentals for building-sites and neighboring ranches, caused by a boulevard, could not be offset by an influx of more building-lots and ranches. The financial benefits of the boulevard would, therefore, under the law of competition, flow into the pockets of the owners of building-lots and ranches beneficially affected by the boulevard.

\* \*

#### Labor and Land.

It is reported that a church to cost \$1,000,000 is soon to be erected in New York upon a site valued at \$2,500,000. The comment evoked by this report rarely goes beyond the point of contrasting a \$3,500,000 temple for the worship of the Nazarene Carpenter, with the humble cradle in which his infant body was laid. But there is a far more important consideration. Let it be noted that while the site is worth \$2,500,000, the structure, though a grand one, is to cost but \$1,000,000. Now consider what that difference implies. Every dollar of structural value represents human labor; the site value represents nothing but land monopoly. The laborers who plan and erect the church, thereby adding another building to the aggregate of buildings, are to get \$1,000,000—scant wages for their work; but the monopolists of the site are to get \$2,500,000, two and a half times as much, without adding an iota to the utilities of mankind. Here is a difference which makes a more important contrast than the comparison of an expensive temple of worship in the twentieth century with the manger in which the infant object of the worship was laid in the first century. It is the contrast between the munificent incomes which idle Christians get from the labor

of their brethren for the usufruct of the Lord's earth, and the earnings that working Christians get for building objects of beauty and use—the contrast between those who get and those who earn, between Christians who eat bread in the sweat of other men's faces and those who eat it in the sweat of their own.

\* \*

#### Mallock's "Ability" Theory.

Mr. Mallock, the English essayist and lecturer who is now furnishing legalized looters in the United States with specious academic arguments in support of economic conditions favorable to their lootings, makes a grand flourish with "ability" as a factor of wealth production in addition to labor. By this he must mean either one of two things. If he means "ability" to get service without giving equivalent service, he is introducing larceny into economics; if he means "ability" to give service in extraordinary measure, he is merely subdividing "labor." And if he means to subdivide "labor" there is no end to the possibility. He could say that the factors of wealth production, besides "land," are "labor," "ability," "skill," "education," etc., etc., etc. But ability, skill, education,—these are after all only qualities of labor, tending to render it the more effective and serviceable. In the last analysis there are but two conditions of industry. One is "land," which varies in degree of serviceableness according to natural qualities and social location; the other is "labor," which varies in degree of serviceableness according to natural abilities and acquired qualities.

\* \*

#### The President's Land Message.

In a message to Congress on the 13th President Roosevelt urged the policy of leasing instead of selling public lands containing coal. Though not the best possible method, this is better than no method at all for conserving public rights in a country the great majority of the inhabitants of which are fast becoming landless. That the proposed reform comes only after half the coal lands of the West have passed from public to private ownership, is not the President's fault. But it is emphatically the fault of the preachers of contentment with whom this country has long been cursed,—those who protest against theorizing and exalt the practical. It is always impracticable with them to close the barn door until the horse is out of the stable; and after that, to mix metaphors somewhat absurdly, they object good naturedly to crying over spilt milk. There is one way

of saving to the people their rights to the land of their country, even though it has passed into private hands, and that is by abolishing taxes on industry and collecting taxes exclusively from land ad valorem. While this would not get the old horse back into the stable nor the spilt milk back into the pail, it would accomplish even better results. For, dropping metaphors, it would leave the land in private control while taking annually for social uses its annual social value.

\*      \*

### Child Labor.

Among the insidious excuses for child labor is the plea that children ought to do useful and remunerative work. Proceeding from this major premise it is easy to state as the minor premise that factory work is useful and remunerative, and then to draw the conclusion that children ought to work in factories. But the syllogism is chock full of holes. In the first place, the major premise is all in confusion. It is not true, unqualifiedly, that children ought to do useful and remunerative work. The truth of the statement depends upon the kind of work. Children ought, truly enough, to do some kind of useful and remunerative work; but if we classify useful and remunerative work we shall soon see that the kind that children ought to do is not the kind that the great factories offer them. While children ought to do useful and remunerative work, the work ought to be attractive in character, developing in effect, moderate in amount and mild in intensity. But factory labor for children answers to none of those requirements. It is intense, monotonous, grinding toil, and it wears out the body, stunts the mind, and paralyzes the affections. There is a vast gulf between the deadening drudgery of the factory, to which children are subjected, and the rational industry by which they would be stimulated.

\*      \*

### Expert Witnesses.

The exhibition of conflicting opinions of experts in noted trials always calls out newspaper criticism, as if the fact of diversity of expert opinion proved bad faith on one side or the other. An instance is a recent newspaper suggestion to the effect that experts should not be permitted to testify if they are paid. This suggestion utterly confuses experts, who elucidate opinions, with witnesses, who narrate facts. The witness happens to be familiar with facts connected with the question on trial, and it is his duty as a good citizen to apprise the jury of these facts. To pay such a witness more than the statutory fee would be

in the nature of a bribe. But the expert knows nothing of the question on trial until he is employed to investigate it. His relation to a lawsuit is less like that of a witness than of a lawyer. As the lawyer assists the judge in reaching conclusions as to the legal aspects of the case, so the expert assists the jury in arriving at conclusions as to its scientific aspects. And it is no more significant of bad faith if experts disagree on novel scientific propositions or novel applications of scientific principles than that lawyers should disagree regarding unsettled principles or novel applications of the law. Precisely as the wrangling of opposing lawyers of intelligence tends to lead an honest and intelligent judge to a sounder legal conclusion than either lawyer would come to or than he himself would come to without the wrangling, so do the conflicting opinions of experts tend to lead a jury of honest and common-sense men to sound conclusions regarding scientific questions at issue. To prohibit the payment of fees to experts would be to practically rule out experts and thereby withhold from juries the benefit of scientific advice and controversy.

\*      \*

### Death of Helen Taylor.

To many Americans still living, Helen Taylor's name is more than a name. They remember her as the step-daughter of John Stuart Mill, who assisted him in the preparation of his book on the "Subjection of Women," and of whom he wrote after the death of her mother: "Surely no one ever before was so fortunate as, after such a loss as mine, to draw another prize in the lottery of life." Upon her step-father's death Miss Taylor threw herself into active political work, for which woman suffrage in school-voting afforded her an opportunity. From 1876 until 1885 she was a member by election of the London school board, and in 1885 she became a Parliamentary candidate but was refused recognition by the election officials because of her sex. She was intensely a democrat, and from the democratic point of view she advocated woman suffrage and land nationalization and sympathized with socialism. She was an ardent supporter of Henry George's work in Great Britain in the '80's and a personal friend of whom he often spoke in terms of respect and affection. Miss Taylor died on the 29th of January in her seventy-sixth year.

\*      \*

In every country the nation is in the cottage if the light of your legislation does not shine on your statesmanship is a failure and your statesmanship a mistake.—Canon Farrar.