

church. I see Berens and Verinder, Crompton and Harry Davies, Headlam and Wedgwood and many others, and I hear their quiet rendering, in the lull before the storm, of "For mine eyes have seen thy salvation." I feel with them the significance of that clear expression in that "best of all clubs," the House of Commons: "Is it too much, is it unfair, is it unequitable that Parliament should demand a special contribution from these fortunate owners, towards the defense of the country and the social needs of the unfortunate in the community whose efforts have so materially contributed to the opulence which they are enjoying?" That this has been said, that taxation on land values has now a concrete expression in England's Parliament, is to have seen the beginning of her salvation. Truly the fighting will be fierce; all the Pure Democrats and all the Fels and other dollars will be needed and must be kept untiringly active. But win or lose, sink or swim, there is no receding from this grand step upwards—the Budget of 1909.

My heart laughs. That I am an ass, that I cannot easily exchange my time and effort for wealth to satisfy my family's needs, that I cannot impress upon others the natural laws which are so clear to me, are matters of no importance. For, in the English Parliament, at which all the world looks with attention, there has clearly been advocated a commencement of enforcing that natural law which proves the almightiness of the Creator: That the value in the earth should be taken for all its inhabitants who create this value; and that to take this natural source of revenue is neither unfair nor inequitable.

Yes, my heart laughs. It is indeed a baby beginning—this half-penny in the pound, this 20 per cent of future rises in land value, to pay for increase of navy and old age pensions. But I have had babies born to me, and I have seen them grow lustily, attended by their nurse-mother. Shall not this baby grow into a full-sized Messiah, gradually replacing the silver-spoon rich and the helpless, hopeless poor, with inhabitants of England receiving in freedom the just proceeds of the efforts of their God-given faculties? Is there no nurse-mother over there? My heart sings as I hear Ure and Wedgwood, Paul and Berens, Verinder and the Brothers Davies, Headlam and Orr and hosts of others as purely democratic, singing before the approaching conflict: "For mine eyes have seen thy salvation." Yes, there is a nurse-mother, all right.

That time and effort of mine are not easy to cash, that imagination depicts babies of mine, either hat in hand, with head bowed, craving a chance to use faculties given by God, to work, or ignorantly riding in ennui on the necks of their brother men, signifies nothing to-day. For in an assembly at which all the world looks with attention, there has been proposed a law from which will result conditions that will forever destroy for those who follow and proceed from us, these worries which afflict us today, and blind us to the beauty, perfection and joy of the natural laws of God—the Pure Democracy.

Once upon a time some States united to fight a form of despotism. Through agony and bloody sweat they did prevail. Because they did prevail, democracy in England had thereafter a freer environment in which to grow. For this good gift from those

States which united against despotism, behold, England is making handsome acknowledgment. Though the heart sinks into the valley of "let it go" at times, over the tariff-to-protect-labor farce now being enacted at Washington, though there is great temptation to hate as one listens to farmers opposing without logic a tax upon land values, nevertheless, the Budget of England for 1909 is a long drink, which enforces yelling to those to whom one "may tie to." In the rioting gladness of one's whole being one must sing to them who are also bound by the real ligature, "For mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

G. HUGHES.

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, May 18, 1909.

The British Budget.

Cable news of the progress of the British budget (p. 462) through the House of Commons is meager and not very enlightening. The latest report is to the effect that on the 17th the House adopted the income tax additions of the budget by a vote of 299 to 66.

+

By mail it is learned that the budget was received by the United Committee on the Taxation of Land Values, which has its headquarters at London, with some reserve. At the first meeting of that committee, after the presentation of the budget, the following resolution was adopted:

That while reserving detailed criticism of the taxation proposals made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer until definite information is available, this committee welcomes the decision announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the budget statement "to provide machinery for a complete valuation on a capital basis of the whole of the land in the United Kingdom," but expresses regret that the budget does not contain a proposal for a uniform and general tax on land values.

+

In the House of Commons the debate on the budget began on the 3rd, according to the English newspapers just at hand, with an attack by the Conservative leader, Mr. Balfour. Commenting on the land tax, he declared he did not believe that there was the smallest proof that land was being held up to the injury of the community. The Ministry were taxing in this case, he said, not in-

come, but hopes and expectations which might never be realized. They were injuring everybody who possessed land, and frightening everybody who wanted to purchase it. Henry George, said he, with great emphasis on the "Henry," held that the possession of land was robbery. That was perfectly logical. But his great namesake, Lloyd George, was not acting on any clear and consistent principle. Among the replies to Balfour's speech was one by Winston Churchill, which is described as effective and brilliant. He poured a stream of ridicule and argument on the reasons given by Mr. Balfour for opposition to the tax on undeveloped land. The Ministry, he said, did not regard land as private property in the strict sense of that word; and the Opposition, who were constantly demanding larger expenditure, were not in a condition to resist these proposals for taxation. A reputation for patriotism was surely cheaply earned, he argued, by clamoring for ships that were not wanted, to be built by money which was to come from other people. In the course of the debate on the 4th, Lord Robert Cecil made for the land owners the plea that though they are rich they are a small and powerless class and should be gently dealt with in the matter of taxation; to which Sir Charles Dilke retorted, amid laughter and cheers, that this "powerless class" controlled exclusively one House and possessed no inconsiderable influence in the other. Lloyd George answered his critics on the same night, reminding them that their own party in Germany, the Conservative party there, had proposed to meet the German increase of expenditure by a tax on the unearned increment of land, to which the Conservative party in England were so strenuously objecting. On the 5th a Labor party member, Philip Snowden, who is a socialist, replied to the Conservative denunciations of the budget as socialistic, by explaining socialism, and saying that while the budget did not go far enough he was satisfied with it as far as it went. Mr. Snowden was followed by the Prime Minister, to whom Austen Chamberlain replied, after which closure of general debate was carried on motion of Lloyd George, by a majority of 107, as was reported last week by cable. The Labor party and the Irish Nationalists voted with the Conservatives against closure. Since this closure of general debate the items of the budget have been under daily consideration.

* *

The British Labor Party.

Reports by mail clarify the dispatches from London of several weeks ago (p. 396) to the effect that the Independent Labor party had adopted socialist resolutions and that Keir Hardie and others had consequently resigned from the administrative council of the party. We gather the facts from the London Labour Leader of April 16.

The 17th annual conference of the party had met at Edinburgh on the 10th of April. J. Ramsay Macdonald, M. P., presided. On the 12th, Mr. Grayson, the suspended Socialist member of Parliament (vol. xi, p. 712), moved to refer back a clause in the report of the national administrative council, as reflecting unjustly upon him. His motion was carried by 217 to 194. In consequence of this vote all the members of the council resigned and refused re-election. J. Ramsay Macdonald was the first to declare their purpose. He said he had been entrusted with a painful duty by the national administrative council, who after a meeting had instructed him to make a statement to the conference. They had had a trying time, he said, for the last twelve months owing to the growth of a movement of irresponsibility in the party. It was an impossibilist movement, unfair to the Parliamentary members of the party. Speaking for himself, and of his own determination, he absolutely declined to associate himself with the spirit of irresponsibility, its modes of expression, and its methods of bringing about socialism. For his colleagues and himself he said that the incidents in that movement which made it definite were referred to in the paragraphs of the report which the conference referred back. It was not the decision to refer back the paragraphs that had made the national administrative council take the action they had taken. It was the source and antecedents of that event that had to be considered. The national administrative council understood that the conference thought to establish peace. Honestly they believed that, but the gateway through which they approached peace was in the form of a vote of censure upon those who were carrying out the party's policy. The conference did not mean that, but a straight censure would have been more self-respecting and more respectful to the members of the national administrative council. He had therefore to announce that the four national members of the administrative council—Mr. Keir Hardie, M. P.; Mr. Philip Snowden, M. P.; Mr. Bruce Glasier, and himself—did not see their way to remain members of the council during the next twelve months. As private members of the party they would spend all the energies they could spare in building up the party upon its old lines and in seeing that the Independent Labor party at the end of the coming year would be much truer to its first faith in spirit and in method than it had been during the last twelve months.

*

The offensive action was reversed and a resolution of confidence with a request that the resignations be withdrawn was adopted. In response to this action Mr. Hardie said that they had been regarded as limpets clinging to the rock of office. Members present and a section of the Socialist