

full and complete enjoyment of "his own labor and the products thereof" which the masses of men cannot enjoy under the institution of private property in land as it now exists. For accomplishing this result, George has proposed a differential tax on land monopoly in the ratio of the value of holdings, concurrently with the abolition of all other taxes; Thomas G. Shearman has proved the fiscal practicability of this proposition; and Tolstoy has accepted it as being the best possible governmental method.

Mr. Watson has fallen into confusion in other parts of his criticism. He speaks of the present institution of private property in land as one thing and of misuse of governmental power as another. But the present institution of private ownership of land is itself a form, a fundamental form, of misuse of governmental power.

In this connection and with a surprising but evidently genuine air of innocence, Mr. Watson asks: "Why should railroad kings hunger for land, when they hold at their mercy the produce which toiling millions bring forth from that land?" But how do they hold this at their mercy? Simply by owning land of commanding location—that which commands points of shipment and points of delivery for the produce of other land.

Mr. Watson falls also into the common error of supposing that the Rothschilds are not great landlords. They are, in fact, the greatest in the world. Their railroad securities are titles to railroad land, including terminal points and rights of way; and their government bonds, what are these but pledges of sovereign power over the territory, and consequently over the people of the territory, which the governments issuing them represent? The power that the Rothschilds in any way exert over industry, how quickly it would all dissipate if the masses of men were not forced by land monopoly to beg for work on employers' terms.

Another slip is Mr. Watson's statement that "anybody who wants land can get it." This is an unfortunate example of Mr. Watson's liking for superlative forms of expression.

Still another is his assertion that "land is plentiful and cheap." Plentiful it doubtless is, though monopolized; but cheap it clearly is not. Probably Mr. Watson meant low priced when he wrote "cheap." It is true that there is plenty of low-priced land. But the lowest priced land is as dear as the highest priced—often dearer. The use of the highest priced land returns a profit on its price, over and above the cost of labor; the use of the lowest priced land will hardly return ordinary wages.

After all, however, the question really before Mr. Watson, and which, as the editor of a radical and independent magazine, he ought to answer if he touches the general subject at all, he has overlooked. It is this: If a man's "labor and the products thereof" justly belong to him, ought or ought not the tenure of land to be so adjusted that the value of improvements will be fully enjoyed, free even from taxation, by the improver or his representatives, and ought or ought not the value of location as distinguished from improvements to be taken for common use?

This is the thought in Tolstoy's mind. This is the thought that George expounded so clearly and forcibly that no one of intelligence is at this day quite excusable for not grasping it.

To grasp it is to understand that the real grievance of the masses is that the land has been taken away from them—real in the sense of fundamental, for they can escape no other social grievance permanently so long as this remains. It is to understand, moreover, that whether or not universal happiness would result from remedying the evil to which George and Tolstoy point, it cannot result without remedying that evil. It is to understand, finally, that irrespective of results, the reform that George and Tolstoy stand for is right.

Let's see: France and Russia were together in the late unpleasantness and England and Japan. But France and England are allied over this Moroccan business and France is joined to Russia. Therefore, if the German war lord makes good his bellicose bluff, the exigencies of alliance will—oh, pshaw, it's like comic opera.—Boston Globe.

NEWS NARRATIVE

How 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 so 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 Thursday, Oct. 12.

The Chicago traction question.

The battle ground of the Chicago traction conflict (p. 426) was shifted by Mayor Dunne on the 9th from the committee room of the transportation committee to the floor of the City Council. Owing to inaction of the committee, the Mayor addressed to the Council the following message:

At the last municipal election, held April 4, 1905, there appeared on the little ballot the following question to the voters of this city: "Shall the City Council pass an ordinance granting a franchise to the Chicago City Railway company?" Upon this question 151,974 voted "no," and 60,020 voted "yes." There also appeared at the same time the question: "Shall the City Council pass an ordinance granting a franchise to any street railroad company?" Upon this question 152,135 voted "no," and 55,013 voted "yes." The local transportation committee of your honorable body, instead of considering plans submitted by me in my message of July 5 for the purpose of bringing about municipal ownership of street railways, is now engaged in considering certain proposed ordinances presented by the Chicago City Railway company and the Chicago Union Traction company, contemplating the granting to such companies of new franchises for the period of twenty years. The consideration of these franchise extension ordinances, in the face of the above referendum, is in defiance of the express will of the people. For this reason I respectfully recommend that your honorable body direct the local transportation committee to cease consideration of the said proposed franchise extension ordinances and further report to this Council at its next meeting the ordinances submitted by me and attached to my message July 5, 1905, commonly known as the "contract plan." I herewith submit an order to that effect and respectfully urge your honorable body to pass the same without reference to a committee.

Adoption of the order submitted by the Mayor was moved by Alderman Werno, chairman of the transportation committee, as follows:

It is hereby ordered that the local

transportation committee do cease the further consideration of the ordinance submitted to said committee by the Chicago City Railway company, and the ordinance submitted, or about to be submitted, to the said committee by the Chicago Union Traction company, extending the franchises of these companies, and that it report to this Council at its next meeting the ordinance submitted by the Mayor and attached to his message of July 5, 1905, commonly known as the "contract plan."

A motion to refer this order to the transportation committee itself, was ruled out of order by the Mayor on the ground that "it would be manifestly inconsistent and contradictory to refer this to the committee at which it is directed." His ruling was reversed on appeal by a vote of 41 to 22. A motion by Alderman Werno followed to suspend the rules and adopt the order, and this was defeated by 45 yeas to 18 yeas as follows:

Nays—Republicans: Dixon, Pringle, Foreman, Young, Bennett, Jones, Moynihan, Smith, McCormick, Reese, Potter, Schmidt (23), Schmidt (24), Hahne, Williston, Dunn, Lipps, Butler, Stewart, Raymer, Larson, Wendling, Burns, Roberts, Badenoch, Eldmann, Hunt, Ruxton, Hunter, Race—30; (Harrison) Democrats: Coughlin, Dalley, McCormick, Martin, Hurt, Scully, Cullerton, Maypole, Harkin, Conlon, Ryan, Powers, Dougherty, Sullivan, Carey—15. Total, 45.

Yeas—Republicans: Harding, Bellfuss, Slits, Uhlir—4; Democrats: Richter, Fick, Hoffman, Zimmer, Considine, Riley, Nowicki, Dever, Finn, Werno, Reinberg, Bradley, O'Connell, Kohout—14. Total 18.

After the Council meeting Mayor Dunne said of this vote:

It simply indicates that the majority of the aldermen do not favor the contract plan. I hardly think there is any possibility of a change in their attitude, but I intend to have another message for the Council next Monday night, and I shall put the matter to them in such a way that they will have to place themselves on record. I cannot say what that message will be, nor upon what lines; but I shall place the matter so that they will have to meet the question squarely and honestly.

No action on the referendum propositions (p. 426) was taken by the Council at this meeting, but two substitutes were proposed, one by Alderman Foreman and the other by Alderman Kohout. The Foreman substitute is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this

Council that the procedure in dealing with any ordinance or ordinances for the settlement of the Chicago street railway question shall be as follows: The ordinance or ordinances shall be framed up for passage and voted on in committee of the whole without final action by the City Council. Thereupon such ordinance or ordinances as shall receive a majority of votes taken by roll call in the committee of the whole shall be published and the City Council shall take steps to have the question whether it or they shall be passed by the City Council placed on the ballot to be voted on by the people. The form of the proposition or propositions to be placed on the ballot shall be formulated by the committee on local transportation and approved by the City Council. The City Council pledges itself not to pass any ordinance or ordinances that shall not receive a majority of the votes cast by the people upon the proposition or propositions.

Following is the Kohout substitute:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Council that in case any ordinance or ordinances granting a franchise to any street car company should be introduced in this Council the mode of procedure by this Council shall be as follows: The proposed ordinance shall be considered by the Council in committee of the whole; the proposed ordinance shall then be submitted to the people at the next city election, and no report of the committee of the whole shall be made to the Council or final action be taken by the Council on said ordinance until after the people of Chicago have voted on the same as submitted to them and it is approved by a majority of all persons voting on the question.

Progress of the referendum idea.

The proposed referendums noted above, especially that of Alderman Foreman, for he has heretofore opposed the referendum idea, are indicative of its growing popularity. These instances are in harmony with what is known as the "Winnetka plan" (vol. iv, pp. 340, 342); and so is the recent action of the Central Labor Union of Lancaster, Pa., which has instructed its legislative committee to push the adoption by the local City Councils of a joint resolution that has been introduced proposing that before the final passage of any ordinance it shall lie on the table for 30 days and if within that period 5 per cent of the voters petition that a referendum vote be taken, the ordinance shall be voted upon by the whole body of voters and shall not become law un-

less a majority of the voters favor it. The joint resolution also provides for the advisory initiative, namely: "Every petition to the City Council proposing an instruction to a public official, and signed by at least five per cent of the registered voters of the city, shall be received and referred to committee, testimony shall be taken and the measure reported back, together with such amendments, substitute, or recommendation as is thought best; and a yeas and nays vote taken, after which the measure as originally introduced, together with the amended measure, substitute or recommendation, shall be submitted to an advisory vote of the registered voters of the city."

Another labor organization, "the Workingmen's Federation of the State of New York," which is the State branch of the American Federation of Labor, adopted at its recent annual convention at Ithaca, resolutions for the same non-partisan plan of securing the referendum and initiative through the advisory system. These resolutions declare: "The initiative and referendum is one of the most vital reforms now being demanded by the working people in the interest of the masses, and indeed of the entire community," and they "appeal to the farmers of New York State and all well disposed people of all classes to aid in this movement for popular government," and pledge "hearty cooperation and support to the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor and other organizations which are now so earnestly engaged in the effort to establish the sovereignty of the people."

Along the same general lines were the following resolutions adopted by the Ohio Federation of Labor on the 4th:

Resolved, that the Ohio Federation of Labor co-operate with other nonpartisan organizations to secure from the next General Assembly a resolution submitting to a vote of the people a constitutional amendment embodying the principle of the initiative and referendum. Resolved, that the executive committee of the Federation be instructed to send a communication to the legislative candidates of all parties asking them to pledge their support to such a resolution. Resolved, that the committee be instructed to so