

as mere speculative theory. The hunger for revenues will outstrip all ordinary sources of supply.

+

The (Oklahoma) Oklahoman (ind. Dem.), July 25.—Mr. Lloyd-George's budget, for instance, contains proposals which are calculated to shock all but the most extreme of our theorists. In dealing with land, the Chancellor of the Exchequer takes a long step toward the goal which Henry George had in view when he wrote his classic book, "Progress and Poverty." The spirit of the bill is embodied in the clauses which relate to the "unearned increment."

+ +

The Great Issue in England.

The (St. Louis) Mirror (ind.), by William Marion Reedy, July 22.—Consequences of almost unimaginable benefit to mankind depend upon the fight the Liberal government of Great Britain is making for the burden-bearers of society against the confederacy of wealth and privilege and aristocracy. The Liberals have a majority in the Commons, but the majority seems to be precarious. All the tremendous influence of the nobility, the landed gentry, the vast business concerns of the Empire is brought to bear in every way against the budget. This opposition is headed by the brilliant Balfour in the Commons, and by Lord Rothschild, the head of the wealthiest family in the world. The power of money and of social prestige is reinforced by the animus of factional bigotry, the discordant tendencies of racial and religious feeling, the subtle bribery of the approval of the successful to break down the ministerial majority. The budget is opposed as being godless. It is an attack upon property. It is insidious treason to the Empire. It is anarchy. And all because the budget proposes to tax into the government's coffers at each transfer of land a small percentage of that increase in value from the time of the last preceding transfer that is due not to the application of any labor to the property by the owner. Every possible appeal on every conceivable side issue of interest to individuals and factions, is made against the budget. There are a million arguments against the budget, but the one feature that concentrates upon itself the antagonism of every parasite of society or finance is the entering wedge of Henry Georgeism. . . . There has been no such fight in the world for the rights of man since Lincoln made his fight. But the American press is mostly silent upon the subject. Why? Because, to print the news of the battle would arouse Americans to the knowledge that all the present fight on privilege in this country is but make-believe and must end in defeat until the issue is changed into a direct attack upon monopoly in land. There's been no such struggle in England since Chartism. The people then won free corn—they thought. Only now are they learning that there can be free nothing until there is free land. But their representatives are subject to every allurement, every seduction that the classes bottomed on engrossed and forestalled land can bring to bear, also to every threat of personal disadvantage and defeat. "The week," says T. P. O'Connor, in Sunday's Chicago Tribune, "ends in darkness, uncertainty and peril. If Lloyd-George were not the most courageous

man in political life to-day, the situation would be hopeless, but his adroitness and courage and tenacity may carry the day." Nothing of this great drama which makes our own tariff rebate mere paltering, in our press. Why? Because the budget shows how to tax the wealth that belongs to all, because created by all, and is held by the few. Because the budget shows that tariffs are but a passing of the burden from the privileged to those whom privilege robs. Because the budget shows how to get at the unearned wealth of a country and therefore how to check the expenditure of government. Make government get its money from the wealth that is made by all the people and get it in such a way that wealth can't make the poor pay the tax in the long run and we shall have no great armies and navies on the backs of the poor. Nay, more; we shall have no poor, because there are the poor always with us for no other reason than that they have to pay for the right to live and then pay the cost of the government that gives the landlord the right to charge for the right to live.

+ +

Artificial Soap and Natural Dirt.

(London and Glasgow) Land Values (land values taxation), August.—Speaking at a meeting of the Anti-Socialist Union at the Whitehall Rooms on 29th June, Mr. Long said: "Many forms of property depended on the community. There were men who had made great fortunes from the manufacture of soap. (Laughter). In some degree their success had been due to cheaper and better methods of manufacture, in some degree to advertising, for the people could now read—owing to state expenditure—and one lesson above all others that had been taught in the schools was that cleanliness was next to godliness. Did not the community come into that? (Hear, hear, and laughter). It was not due to the individual that the public was more anxious to wash now than 50 years ago." We would point out that as the demand for soap increases, whether due to state education or not, so also does the supply, and moreover there is keen competition to supply soap. It is different with land. Soap can be manufactured; land cannot.

+ +

Landlord Insolence.

The (London) Nation (ind.-Lib.), July 17.—We have never in the history of politics met anything quite like the ill-bred insolence with which the landlords and their friends are conducting their alleged argument on the budget. The insolence is of all sorts and varieties. There is the insolence of the mendicant who whines for a boon, and curses the hand that gives it. There is the schoolboy insolence of Lord Winterton to Mr. Thorne, a Labor member of singularly honest and upright character, who was falsely accused of being drunk in the House, and half re-accused under pretense of an apology, until a real withdrawal and apology were wrung from the offender. There are the ponderous insolence of Lord Balfour of Burleigh and the flippant insolence of Lord Hugh Cecil, who abused the privileges of a deputation in order to bait the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his own room, and were properly trounced for their pains. Mr Lloyd George is the