

a millionaires' luncheon club. But our statement appears to be regarded in Pittsburgh as libelous. It was not always so. The Pittsburgh rich have, however, been getting found out, and the thing has an odor. It seems that "if there is one thing in the world which the Hungry Club is not, it is 'a millionaires' luncheon club.'" What it is may be inferred from this description: "When Chas. F. Weller, the general secretary of the Associated Charities of Pittsburgh, came to Pittsburgh from Washington in September, 1908, he brought with him the idea of a weekly conference of men interested in civic and social work, at which, as he expressed it, 'the half-baked ideas of the members of the club might be worked out.' This 'get-together' idea was something of a novelty in Pittsburgh, and it took hold immediately. From a membership of six or eight, the Hungry Club slowly grew until now there is an average attendance at its Monday luncheons of forty or fifty, comprising men in various lines of social and civic work in Pittsburgh, as well as young professional and business men interested in those problems. The first argument in defense of the charge that the Hungry Club is composed of millionaires, appears in the statement that it is largely made up of social and civic workers. As additional defense, is the fact that if the table d'hôte luncheon which is served the members of the Hungry Club once a week cost more than 50c, it would be a serious matter to keep the club going. The Hungry Club has an aspiration, tempered with due humility, to some day become a full-fledged City Club, an institution which many of us feel would be a great thing for Pittsburgh. When that time arrives, we may, in order that there may be no question as to the real democracy of the club, admit to our membership millionaires. However, they will only be such millionaires as give evidence of a desire to reform."

\* \*

#### Death of Estella Bachman Brokaw.

All readers of Henry George's "Standard" in the early nineties, knew of W. E. Brokaw, and his devoted work in "spreading the light" that had come to him; and few of them but knew also of Estella Bachman, whom he married in 1894, and who died on the 26th of last month in California—"escaped from her life-long hampered body," as Mr. Brokaw describes her passing away. She was the author of "The Soul of the World" (vol. xii, p. 909), a book in which she used the fiction form to explain and propagate economic theories which she and her husband had developed together. At one time, early in their married

life, they edited and published at St. Louis the Single Tax Courier, an organ of the organized single tax movement, of which Mr. Brokaw was the official editor, and which has now come to be the Single Tax Review. This devoted woman, hampered through life by deafness and latterly by the progressive paralysis of which she died, gave herself freely and unreservedly to the service of her moral convictions. And she and her husband were one. Neither of them counted the cost, either to pocket or person, when things they believed in needed volunteers. It is not impertinent to say what all their friends well knew, that their whole married life was passed in poverty; nor is it out of place to add that this need not have been so, if they had selfishly preferred physical comfort to the promotion of their ideals.

\* \*

#### The British Land Values Movement.

Readers interested in the tremendous and successful work of the British leagues for the taxation of land values, should send for copies of the third annual report of The United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values. The Committee offices are at Broad Sanctuary Chambers, 20 Tothill street, Westminster, London, S. W. This report is an illuminating side history of the Budget fight, from the introduction of that historic measure by Lloyd George on April 29, 1909, to and including the organization of the "land values group" in the present Parliament. The names of this group, numbering 105, are given, as are reports of meetings, conferences, and Budget demonstrations in which the Committee took part. There are also sketches of the general election and the London County Council election, showing the active, strenuous and effective work undertaken by the United Committee. An account is given too of the municipalities and associations that supported the Budget and the taxation of land values. Short reports from the leagues and branches of leagues for the taxation of land values show how the activities of the United Committee have been supported all over Great Britain. The report closes with the plan of campaign for the future, from which we quote:

We have secured, in the Budget, provisions for a complete valuation of all land. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the land values taxes of the Budget are small and discriminating and do not put the principle for which we stand into operation. When the business men and the masses of the people raise their voices insistently for the taxation of land values then will the political leaders examine the principle and find its worth, and not until then. There is yet a hundred times as much ground to cover and a hundred times as many vic-

ories to be won before our object is achieved. This then is our work. We have to interest and educate the people. We must go to them in their homes and show them how their emancipation from monopoly is wrapped up in the taxation of land values. The magnitude of the task cannot be overestimated, but there is no reason why it should not be accomplished. Cobden succeeded in a similar campaign for the repeal of the Corn laws, and with persistent effort we can succeed in establishing freedom and justice; equal opportunities for all, privilege for none.

\* \* \*

## NATIONALIZATION OF MEDICAL MANAGEMENT.

Several Congressional measures for the establishment of a national health Department—five bills, as we are informed—were pending in Congress at its adjournment. The controversy over them, which has become bitter to the point of vituperation on both sides, is likely to grow in bitterness; and in the interval between the Congressional sessions they should be considered by the people with as much freedom from partisan bias as possible.

\*

On the one hand, it is charged that these measures are intended to establish a medical trust.

On the other, it is retorted that the opposition is inspired and paid for by persons interested in unwholesome proprietary medicines.

The sponsor for the measures is a "Committee of One Hundred on National Health," under the leadership of Irving Fisher, professor of political economy at Yale. According to the opposition, that committee is the "alter ego" of "The American Medical Association," the exclusive and powerful union of the allopathic school, which has for years been lobbying for a national health Department.

The organization opposing the measures is the newly formed "National League for Medical Freedom," of which B. O. Flower, editor of the *Twentieth Century Magazine*, is president. It is accused by the other organization of being a mask for patent medicine manufacturers and enemies of pure food laws.

In both organizations are persons who not unlikely deserve the denunciations of the other side. It is only fair, however, to notice the fact in passing, that the opposing organization, in response to insinuations that the source of its income is illegitimate, has offered to disclose the source of its income to "one or two representatives of the Committee of One Hundred, say Rev. Lyman Abbott, Joseph H. Choate, Walter H.

Page, Melville E. Stone, Henry Phipps or Edward K. Bok." Until that offer is accepted (or shown to be disingenuous, if it be so), no further insinuations or accusations against the opposing organization can be treated with respect by fair minded men. But while both organizations may have in their membership persons whose motives, records and expressions might warrant vituperative attacks, this is far from true of the membership of either as a whole. The intent of most of the individuals of both organizations is in our belief, above reasonable suspicion; and this judgment is emphatic as to Prof. Fisher, the leading advocate of one of the pending bills, and Mr. Flower, the leading adversary of them all.

\*

The pending bill which the "Committee of One Hundred" supports, is known as "the Owen bill." It was introduced in the Senate by Senator Owen of Oklahoma, as to whose good faith we heartily repeat our estimate regarding Mr. Flower and Prof. Fisher.

But the merit of the bill is not to be determined by the good faith of its proponents. No dangerous legislation is more dangerous than that which is proposed for a good purpose in good faith, but ignorantly or recklessly with reference to its inherent powers of evil development.

The so-called "Comstock laws" of Congress, for instance, were proposed merely for the suppression of salacious literature, an object so beneficent that few wished to oppose them and most of those who wished to, dared not. Yet they lodged in a Federal bureau a new power, which, partly by supplemental legislation and partly by bureaucratic development, has reached a point high up in the scale of despotic government. One Department can now absolutely deprive any man of legitimate postal rights for life, upon a charge of petty fraud and without a judicial trial (vol. xii, p. 700). Another Department can prevent the return from a trip abroad of any American citizen, whether native born or naturalized, upon a mere charge, without judicial trial, that he is a foreigner and comes within an immigrant exclusion law (vol. viii, p. 98, vol. xiii, p. 388). The Comstock laws were not intended to develop any such revolutionary and despotic results; but in less than forty years they have done it.

Would it not be wise then to reflect upon the despotic possibilities of the Owen bill, rather than sanction it upon no better basis than that in some respects it is desirable and that its proponents' intentions are good?