

"Then at last—but who can tell  
Such miracles as ne'er befell?  
Then England will be great indeed,  
And all the world will cry, 'God-speed!'"

"Dear old England, how I hate  
The things that now have made you great!  
Still I love you for I see  
Your greatness that is bound to be."

GEO. HUGHES.

+ + +

## POLICE CENSORSHIP.

Los Angeles, Cal., Nov. 23.

While reading with interest Mr. Norton's article on "Labor in Los Angeles" (p. 1093), I feel there is a comment on his account of the parade which must be made.

To the spectator, two features were significant; the first being that police flanked the marchers throughout their journey, and the second that a large number of transparencies bore a query mark and nothing more.

On inquiry it turned out that the unions themselves invited the authorities to police their parade, and that the chief of police had censored such mottoes as the following: "Workers, unite;" "Join the union and at the same time better conditions;" "They did it in Milwaukee: We can do it in Los Angeles;" "Capital organizes to keep labor from organizing;" "Los Angeles for the workers in 1911;" "Labor united industrially and politically is invincible;" "Unionism and Socialism a united force;" "Join the union and demand the label."

Observing these things, the autocratic insolence with which the police recently dispersed a labor meeting at San Diego, and similar occurrences, I wonder at the folly that led me to give up my British citizenship and enroll myself under the Stars and Stripes.

Such action as that taken by the Los Angeles police, and tamely submitted to by the unions—for not a whimper of protest has been heard—is unthinkable in England.

WM. C. OWEN.

+ + +

## FORWARD.

Chestnut Hill, Mass., Nov. 23.

Perhaps it is not too late for an observer in this northeastern corner of the land to say a word upon the result of the late election. Wherever I go I am impressed with the fact that we are moving.

I meet few conservatives so solid as not to have been affected in opinion by the current unrest. On the night of the election I dropped in at a Boston Club that certainly would not be quoted as radical, a purely social club, somewhat carefully censored as to membership, including artists, men of letters, newspaper writers, and well-to-do amateurs of many kinds. I found a strong sentiment of satisfaction with the result in Massachusetts, and encountered opponents of Mr. Roosevelt who were not friends of Cannon or of Ballinger.

A day or two ago I met a conspicuous Republican of Maine who was far from discontented with the Democratic victory there, and who expressed in plain words his satisfied conviction that the people of this country clearly apprehended the necessity

of continuing the battle against Privilege. I found him at heart a free trader, and favorable to immediate trade relations with Canada approaching free trade. He specifically instanced the abuse of power and privilege by the great corporations controlling the timber lands of Maine as something that would be remedied by freer trade relations with Canada.

In New York I talked long with an important business man who is a Roosevelt Democrat, but in sympathy with much for which The Public stands, and who sees in the general result no backward step.

Among active newspaper men here in conservative Boston I find much the same sentiment, and all the indications I am able to gather seem to prove that the conservatives who see in the New York result and the check to Roosevelt there a sign that the country is hesitating in the face of its great task, have rejoiced too soon.

I received on my way over to New York in a luxurious train that I permit myself only when in great haste, an illuminating hint from a Standpatter, who admitted his belief that Big Business must and should rule the country politically for the present, but confessed behind all this his realization of the fact that democracy must and should eventually triumph.

EDWARD N. VALLANDIGHAM.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

---

Week ending Tuesday, November 29, 1910.

---

### Single Tax Movement in Oregon.

After numerous reports contradicting the original report of its adoption (pp. 918, 1024, 1035, 1090, 1094), the county option tax amendment to the Oregon Constitution was authoritatively found on the 21st to have been adopted by a majority of 1,655. This amendment was proposed by Initiative petition and is as follows:

Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Oregon shall be, and hereby is, amended by inserting the following section in said Article IX, after Section 1 and before Section 2, and it shall be designated as Section 1a of Article IX:

Article IX. Section 1a. No poll or head tax shall be levied or collected in Oregon; no bill regulating taxation or exemption throughout the State shall become a law until approved by the people of the State at a regular general election; none of the restrictions of the Constitution shall apply to measures approved by the people declaring what shall be subject to taxation or exemption and how it shall be taxed or

exempted whether proposed by the Legislative Assembly or by Initiative petition; but the people of the several counties are hereby empowered and authorized to regulate taxation and exemptions within their several counties, subject to any general law which may be hereafter enacted.

+

The amendment is denounced by the Portland Oregonian (the great corporation organ of the Northwest) of November 21, in these terms:

Thus we may have the single tax in Oregon under an ingenious system of home rule by counties in the important function of taxation. The single tax as a State-wide policy was rejected two years ago by an emphatic vote, but its persistent and adroit propagandists devised this deft and plausible scheme by which the single tax might be introduced, either for purposes of experimentation or as a permanent system, in the various counties. The hands of the legislature are tied so that there may be no interference from Salem. The historic requirement of the Constitution—of all constitutions—that taxation shall be equal and uniform, is boldly wiped out, along with every other constitutional limitation that might have been invoked to defeat so novel and revolutionary an innovation. No measure in future concerning taxation may be enacted except on the express approval of the people. The plans of the single-taxers were well-laid and completely realized, for they have been crowned with a remarkable success. . . . The Oregonian would not have it appear that single tax as an institution is imminent throughout Oregon. This measure, so far as that abominable device is concerned, is only the initial step, though so far as it removes all legislative checks on Constitutional restraints, it is complete enough. What county is now to be selected for exploitation and experimentation by the single taxers? Multnomah? It is incredible, for the overpowering sentiment of the community will be found to be against it, though the vote here two years ago against the single tax was far less overwhelming than might have been supposed. The majority against the measure was indeed small. It carried in only a single county (Coos). Yet it is not to be assumed that Coos County will offer a more attractive field for innovators and experimenters than any other. Here we have the Constitution fixed, nevertheless, so that any county may impose all its taxes on real estate if it desires, or on any other class of property. The next move undoubtedly will be to select some community, or group of communities, for the perfect crystallization of the single tax idea into a tangible and productive reality. But there is a way to escape, and one way only. It is through the Initiative. That the people of Oregon will take the back track through that avenue to safe and reliable ground The Oregonian has no doubt whatever if the issue shall be presented to them fully and fairly and not complicated by other questions. Another Constitutional amendment will do the work. If the measure for the repeal of the present amendment (except as to the poll tax) shall be submitted by the legislature or through the Initiative it will doubtless be carried by a large vote. The abolition of the head tax should stand, but the single tax must go.

The opposing view is taken by the Portland Labor Press of the 24th, the organ of the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity, the body which, with the State Federation of Labor, initiated the amendment in question:

The complete returns of the election show that organized labor's tax amendment has been carried by a good substantial margin. The carrying of this amendment is one of the greatest victories ever won by the voters of this State. . . . Hereafter all tax laws and exemptions will have to be approved by the vote of the people before any taxes can be collected. . . . There is no occasion for alarm except by those who sit idly by and collect that which they do not produce. . . . In Oregon today three corporations are holding out of use enough land to make almost a 40-acre farm for every voter in the State. These corporations are holding this land until there is a great increase in population and a corresponding raise in the monopoly-made values of the land. . . . Now, suppose legitimate business men and farmers and workingmen should take all taxes off of factories and homes and fences and stock, and place only a small tax on the small home owner and a larger tax on the big land speculator, what would be the result? Certainly there would be no profit in holding land out of use. . . . There will then be homes and farms a plenty, labor will be permanently employed and business good. . . . Here in dear old Oregon the land speculators and holders of special privilege compel us to stand and deliver, and when we holler they call us "jaw-smiths," "professional agitators," "members of the profess," etc. This is now very fine indeed for the speculators and stock gamblers, but simply hell on the fellow who must work and then deliver up. Thanks to the corporations, they, with our tough experience, have taught us to value Direct Legislation and to think and act for ourselves. But, gentlemen of the corporations—that is, the stock watering type—don't get alarmed over the carrying of this labor tax amendment. It only gives the people the power to regulate the tax question. You will now do business in the open and will be accorded the treatment that each and every citizen will ask for himself and his family—the right to serve and be served with equal opportunity to all and special law-made privileges to none.

+ +

#### The Initiative and Referendum in Oregon.

The full report on measures of general interest voted upon in Oregon on the 8th (pp. 1094, 1095) is given by the Portland Labor Press of the 24th as follows:

Taxpaying suffrage for women. Yes, 36,200; No, 58,459; defeated by 22,259.

A constitutional convention. Yes, 25,427; No, 59,753; defeated by 34,326.

Two tax amendments proposed by the Grange and submitted to referendum by the legislature. (1) Yes, 37,847; No, 40,246; defeated by 2,399. (2) Yes, 32,118; No, 40,995; defeated by 8,877.

Construction of railroads by the State, counties, and railroad districts. Yes, 34,013; No, 46,121; defeated by 12,108.

County option in taxation. Yes, 49,989; No, 48,334. Adopted by 1,655.

Control of liquor traffic by cities and towns. Yes, 52,461; No, 47,914; adopted by 4,547.

Employers' liability in hazardous occupations. Yes, 55,641; No, 33,529; adopted by 22,112.

Two Statewide prohibition amendments. (1) Yes, 43,433; No, 61,279; defeated by 17,846. (2) Yes, 42,649; No, 63,564; defeated by 20,915.

Commission to inquire into employers' liability. Yes, 32,232; No, 51,725; defeated by 19,493.

Extension of direct primary law to Presidential nominations and delegates to national conventions, and payment of traveling expenses of delegates. Yes, 43,253; No, 41,574; adopted by 1,679.

An official gazette. Yes, 27,953; No, 52,317; defeated by 24,361.

Increasing initiative, referendum and recall powers, restricting legislative use of emergency proviso, providing for proportional representation and increasing pay of legislators, requiring presence of Senate and speaker of House to be outside of membership, limiting corporate franchises to 20 years, imposing \$10 fine for non-attendance of members at legislative sessions, revising oath of office to prohibit logrolling. Yes, 37,031; No, 44,958; defeated by 7,927.

Providing for verdicts in civil cases by three-fourths of jury, prohibiting re-trials where evidence supports verdict, and otherwise reforming judicial proceedings. Yes, 44,545; No, 39,307; adopted by 5,238.

+ +

#### Improved Charter for San Francisco.

The results of a charter amendment election in San Francisco on the 15th, when 38 proposed amendments were voted on by the people, are reported from there as having greatly surprised opponents of direct legislation by the discriminating judgment of the voters. The movement began last winter. The chairman of the Good Government League of San Francisco, Isidor Jacobs, called a convention for February 14, 1910, consisting of 100 members from the various commercial associations, improvement clubs and political parties. The recommendations of this convention were disposed of at the election. Such as are of general interest are as follows:

Establishing an effective system of Initiative, Referendum and Recall, with 4 per cent for Initiative petition at general elections, and 10 per cent at special elections, 5 per cent for Referendum petition and compulsory referendum on public service franchises. Yes, 21,666; No, 17,677; adopted by 3,989.

Establishing majority rule, restoring the Australian ballot, providing for direct nominations, and putting candidates' statements before the voters with the sample ballots. Yes, 33,619; No, 7,527; adopted by 25,092.

Forbidding the printing of party designations on election ballots. Yes, 31,352; No, 8,443; adopted by 12,909.

Permitting city to recall a franchise for a street

railroad on buying the property. Yes, 20,464; No, 17,696; adopted by 2,768.

Imposing restrictions on grants of street railroad franchises. Yes, 7,677; No, 18,909; defeated by 9,232.

Adding tax of from \$200,000 to \$300,000 a year for playgrounds. Yes, 12,800; No, 23,835; defeated by 11,035.

Forbidding building of municipal street railroads and other city work by contract. Yes, 10,916; No, 25,715; defeated by 14,899.

The close vote on the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, and the recall of street railroad franchises is explained as due to the opposition of business interests.

+ +

#### The American Federation of Labor.

At the convention of the American Federation of Labor at St. Louis (p. 1097) on the 21st, a resolution endorsing "industrial unionism" (syndicalism) as opposed to federations of trades, authorizing central officials to call general strikes, was defeated after a prolonged discussion. The subject was raised later in connection with the admission of the Western Federation of Miners, a question that was finally referred to the executive council. A committee was instructed to demand of President Taft the reinstatement of Oscar F. Nelson, a post office clerk dismissed for urging legislative demands of the Federation. A resolution was adopted opposing government appropriations for river improvements or water ways except in cases where the States or cities interested agree to provide free wharves or landings for all vessels, without discrimination. Also a resolution recognizing the migratory laborers' union; and on the 22d one demanding the voting franchise for residents of the District of Columbia. Anti-injunction legislation in all States was demanded on the 25th; and a resolution was adopted at the request of President Gompers indorsing the policy of David Lloyd George in the fight against the veto power of the House of Lords of Great Britain, and expressing the wish of the convention for an overwhelming success of the Liberal and Labor parties in the pending elections. The convention adjourned on the 26th, after selecting Atlanta, Ga., as the place for the next convention, and by unanimous vote declaring for woman suffrage. The former officers were re-elected.

+ +

#### The Chicago Garment Workers' Strike.

The American Federation of Labor, in session at St. Louis, took favorable action on the 21st on the strike of the 40,000 garment workers of Chicago (p. 1114), and will give them financial assistance.

+ +

In accordance with resolutions offered on the