

ing it in five years to a depth of forty-five feet," the estimated cost of the work being "\$100,000,000, which is considerably less than the United States has expended on the Panama Canal to date."

—El Renacimiento, the Filipino daily at Manila, asks that a Filipino be appointed as Vice-Governor General of the islands. It says in its issue of June 23:

Why should not a Filipino be appointed Vice-Governor? It is said that we are being educated for self-government and that everything will be done to enable us to learn by that experience, which circumstances have prevented us so far from acquiring. Well and good. Let a Filipino stand beside the Governor in order that he may divide with the latter the responsibilities of the supreme executive position, and at the same time acquire the experience for which he needs but the practice. Since he is to act under the guidance and direction of a superior officer there will be no danger of demagogic actions and utterances. Nothing would more tend to the Filipinization constantly flaunted before our eyes. Let the people also recall the fact that the Filipinos who have been put in high positions have been dignified and conservative whatever may be the political party from which they came, and they have proved that they have become possessed of the sense of responsibility which is inherent in every position they have occupied.

PRESS OPINIONS

The Tory Motive.

Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury (I.Ib.), August 12.—The Tories have been clamoring ever since the finance bill was brought in to have the cost of the valuation of land and minerals placed on the state, and now the Government have met them in this respect they are as dissatisfied as ever. The plain truth is that what the landlords object to is valuation at all. They fear that it will lead to what Mr. Balfour today called "ulterior measures," or, in other words, that it may be used for imposing further taxation on land. They will, therefore, oppose the valuation clause as keenly as ever.

+ +

The Land Values Tonic in British Politics.

The (London) Nation (ind. Lib.), July 31.—Every observer of our politics must be conscious of the great change that has come over them since the introduction of the budget. . . . At the beginning of this year it seemed doubtful whether the good fortune which followed the Government during the first two years of its life would be sustained. . . . Today we survey a country so changed that politicians hardly know it for the same. Four bye-elections have just been fought, avowedly on the budget, and three Ministers have appealed directly for re-election. . . . All have retained their seats, and the four supporters of the budget have registered a joint majority of nearly 4,000 votes in its favor. . . . It is clear that the budget has re-heated the force out of which all Liberal triumphs grow, the enthusiasm of the main body of the party. Popular as it is in the House of Commons, it is more popular still with the rank and file. Anyone acquainted with the move-

ment of economic thought among the progressive workers could have seen that the principle of the taxation of land values, growing not only out of the fiscal issue but from the development of the rural question and the expansion of town life, had taken firm hold of the people, and would furnish one of the historic rallying grounds of Liberal action. The Liberal party has got something to fight for in which it believes with its whole heart, which is intelligible and just, and on which it is going to win.

+

New York Nation (ind.), Aug. 19.—A revulsion of feeling over the new taxes proposed by the Liberals is now going on in England. The cable dispatches but faintly reflect it. They state that the Conservatives are much worried to discover that Lloyd-George's budget is much more "popular" than they supposed. They have been attacking it tooth and nail, denouncing it as "fraud," "spoliation," and "robbery," but now they find that it is meeting with warm approval from large classes in the electorate. The Liberals have been unexpectedly winning bye-elections on the issue of the budget, and a general chill has fallen upon the divided counsels of the Conservatives.

+

Chicago Record-Herald (ind. Rep.), August 24.—The unearned increment tax is called spoliation and confiscation by the interests affected in Great Britain; but in Germany municipalities are already taxing it, and the Imperial government has served notice that in a year or two it will take a hand in that process. Unearned increment of land value is also taxed in Australasia. The British House of Commons has repeatedly indorsed the tax in principle, as have the "classical" and orthodox economists. To take for the public a part of the value created by it without effort or investment by the owner, it is argued, is neither to attack the true theory of property nor to discourage enterprise and industry. The defense of the land taxes has been so able and vigorous that some alarmed Tory organs and politicians admit that the people have been alienated from the opposition because of its excessive zeal in behalf of the landed interests and monopoly.

+ +

The German and the English Land Movements Contrasted.

A. Pohlman-Hohenaspe in Bodenreform, Berlin, Germany. (Translated for The Public), July 20.—Because in England, too, the contest centers mainly about the increment, it is interesting to draw a parallel between German and English conditions, a comparison, which in one case turns out very favorable to Germany, while in another respect the advantage is with England. With us in the various parties there exists scarcely a difference of opinion over the propriety of making the unearned increment an object of taxation. The point here is that each taxing district wishes the revenue for itself. In England, however, there is still a lively discussion as to the justice of the general principle. Their leading papers still set forth as deep politico-economic wisdom those old threadbare objections which here one

finds only now and then in certain landlords' journals. On the other hand, the English have the advantage in the fact that their guiding spirits in this question know just what they want, and how to set about creating in the land valuations bill something uniform and fundamental. Of further interest is the fact that in England it is the Conservatives who, with all the means at their command, wage war upon the increment tax, and the Liberals who stand firmly by it; while among us, if not directly the opposite, still it is true that the increment tax has more supporters in the party of the Right than among the Liberals, although as before remarked, the rightfulness of the principle is recognized in all parties. In our nation there never was a more favorable moment for a real financial reform in the direction of taxation of land value than just now, except that, most unfortunately, there falls us the right man in the right place to begin the great work. What outcome there will be to the land reform strife in England is not yet to be foreseen. The lower House is beyond all doubt for absolute acceptance; and the upper House must accept or reject the budget as a whole, alterations or excisions being inadmissible. What will it do? At all events it is both interesting and inspiring to witness a whole great people battling over a great principle.

* *

A Remedy—Simple, Sound and Sovereign.

The Johnstown (Pa.) Daily Democrat (dem. Dem.), August 12.—The single tax would destroy land monopoly. It would free labor. It would increase the earnings of capital. It would stimulate every branch of industry. It would encourage the arts. It would lessen crime. It would abolish involuntary poverty. It would forever put a stop to recurring industrial depressions. There would be jobs for all willing to work. Wages would always be the full measure of the product. Labor unions would become useless. Lock-outs would become impossible. Strikes would cease to breed violence. Employers could no longer resort to tyranny and oppression. Practically every thrifty man could own his own home. Child labor would cease to be a problem. Under the single tax no man would be so foolish as to hold land out of use or put it to other than its best use.

* *

The Truth About Land Grabbing.

Milwaukee Daily News (ind. Dem.), August 13.—What matters it to the public if the coal lands of Alaska are monopolized through entries legally made or through entries illegally made? In either event, the land is turned over to favored individuals at a song that they may reap immense profits that will come when demand shall be made upon the fuel supply of Alaska. The unearned increment that of right should belong to the American people will be given over to a few capitalists and a few more swollen fortunes created. If we had a government that was what it pretends to be, a government for the people, the timber lands and the coal lands and the copper lands and iron lands of Alaska would be held and administered as a public trust, with the unearned increment turned into the public treasury instead of into the pockets of a few plutocrats.

The Sacramento Bee (ind.), Aug. 14.—What the nation and the States severally need are laws forbidding further gifts or sales of water power, and declaring it vested perpetually in the people, subject to reasonable use for irrigation and power purposes, with due compensation to the government, national or State. Switzerland has wisely grafted this principle on her constitution, France is likely to follow suit, if she has not already done so, and Oregon has adopted it by an act of her legislature. California should lose no time in amending her constitution to the same effect. And meanwhile the legislature at its next session should make radical changes in the laws of appropriation, in harmony with the same policy.

* *

A Progressive Capital.

Duluth (Minn.) Herald, July 28.—The city of Edmonton, which has sprung up as the capital of the new Canadian province of Alberta with a miraculous suddenness equaled only by the manner in which the broad prairies of the Canadian Northwest have changed from an unproductive waste to a richly productive empire. . . . has consistently followed the principle of taxing land values. A speculator who buys a lot, not to improve it but to hold it until improvements made by others give him an unearned profit, finds that his idle lot pays as much taxes as his neighbor's lot with a \$4,000 house on it. In other words, this system does not penalize improvement by making it pay more taxes, but it penalizes speculation by making lots held for speculative purposes pay as much taxes as lots that are used and are therefore of benefit to the community. It puts a bounty on improvement by making those who do not improve stand a greater relative share of the burden of government than do those who do improve.

* *

The Inverted Tariff Revision.

The (Los Angeles) Graphic (ind.), August 7.—Stripped of all buncombe, relieved of all persiflage concerning the mighty influence wielded by Taft and his "unyielding position," truth is the people again have been flimflammed. . . . It is a sorry business. Mr. Taft we believe to be sincere in his desire to lower the schedules, but his silence, until the Senate finished its traitorous work, left the ten insurgent Republicans without the moral support an earnest message of protest, such as the country had a right to expect from him, would have supplied.

*

La Follette's (ind. Rep.), August 14.—Tariff revision meant downward revision. But how much and what kind of downward revision? Not a cunning, deceitful, downward revision, applied to articles rarely if ever purchased by the mass of people. Not a sleight-of-hand reduction on articles of general use, so shrewdly measured as to enable the trust to continue to charge exorbitant prices. Downward revision meant honest downward revision, producing the result for which the consumer sought revision. It meant reducing the rates on articles entering into general domestic use enough to insure foreign com-