

The Sugar Tariff in the Senate.

Through a combination of Progressive with reactionary Republican Senators the United States Senate passed a bill on the 27th reducing the tariff on sugar—a compromise between a bill offered by Senator Lodge (Reactionary) and one by Senator Bristow (Progressive). It reduces the sugar duty from \$1.90 to \$1.60 per hundred pounds, abolishes the Dutch standard test which operates to exclude nearly all imports of refined sugar, and repeals the "refiners' differential" duty which is a supplementary tariff for the benefit of refiners. A Democratic bill for free sugar, passed by the House, did not come to a vote in the Senate, the Lodge-Bristow compromise being adopted as an amendment by 37 to 27. The two Louisiana Senators, both Democrats, voted with the Republicans. Thereupon the Senate Democrats offered a bill reducing the sugar tariff one-third as a substitute for the free-sugar bill of the House. The proposed substitute was defeated by 36 to 24. Finally the Lodge-Bristow measure was adopted by 52 to 3, the opposition votes being those of the two Louisiana Senators (Democrats) and that of Senator Heyburn (Republican) of Idaho. The subject goes now to a conference committee of the two houses, unless the lower house accepts the Senate measure without a conference. [See current volume, pages 265, 324.]



The First National Newspaper Conference.

At Madison, Wisconsin, the First National Newspaper Conference opened on the 29th under the auspices of the Extension Department of the State University. The opening addresses were made by Prof. Louis E. Reber, dean of the extension department of the University of Wisconsin, by James T. Trotman of Milwaukee, president of the Board of University Regents of Wisconsin, by William J. Anderson of Madison, chairman of the committee on arrangements, and by Dr. George E. Vincent, president of the University of Minnesota. Governor McGovern of Wisconsin made the principal address of welcome. The Conference continues through the 30th and 31st and the 1st. While it is attended by newspaper men from different parts of the United States, it is also attended and participated in by others than newspaper men, and its purpose is the promotion of newspaper service with reference primarily to public interests as distinguished from the private interests of newspapers. [See current volume, page 684.]



The Labor War.

"On the front page of a leading London Conservative daily paper I read a few days ago the glaring headlines: 'The King Visits a Music Hall—Three Millions of Roses Used to Decorate the Interior of the Palace!' A little farther down on

the same page another set of headlines, comparatively small beside those containing the more important announcement, catches my eye: 'Starvation in the East End—Baby Brought to Church for Christening Wrapped in Brown Paper!' The headlines contain a scathing arraignment of social conditions in England: Three million roses to please the eyes of the King—a piece of coarse brown wrapping paper to cover the nakedness of a workingman's baby!" These are the words of Philip Everett, the newspaper correspondent in the introduction to his cable letter to the Cincinnati Enquirer of the 14th on the labor war, a battle in which has been going on for weeks in England. [See current volume, page 582.]



The Labor side appears to have lost that battle. "Hollow-eyed women and gaunt, starving children, victims of ten weeks' hunger, today forced 10,000 dock workers to give up their fight for higher wages and return to work," says a special London correspondent of the Hearst papers by cable on the 27th, as we quote it from the Chicago Examiner of the 28th. Continuing, this correspondent says:

In a manifesto issued by the committee of the strikers it was stated that failure to secure the co-operation of other unions had caused the dock workers to quit the battle, but the newspapers here are of the opinion that starvation forced the surrender. The strike had reduced some of the workmen and their families to such destitution that some have literally starved to death. Fifty thousand men will resume work on the docks Monday [the 29th] and the companies against which the strike was directed have assured the workers that they will be given an opportunity to state their grievances peacefully. Throughout the strike the clergy and a large number of charitable organizations have attempted to alleviate the sufferings of the strikers and their families, but the task proved too great for their resources, and it had just been decided to appeal to the Government when the end of the strike was announced. John Havelock Wilson, president of the International Seamen's Union, failed today in his attempt to organize a national strike of transportation workers in support of the London dockmen. This attempt to extend the strike was even carried so far as to ask the assistance of the international labor unions in America, but all failed to respond. Transatlantic liners were held up here for weeks during the strike and public sympathy had been generally alienated by threats of violence made officially by the strikers. A frenzied mob of 10,000 strikers gathered on Tower Hill, prayed to God to "strike Lord Devenport dead," the Baron being chairman of the port of London, who, as an employer, had refused to make concessions to the strikers.



A London despatch of the 28th, appearing in the Chicago Tribune of the 29th, states that—
The dock strikers have angrily repudiated the deci-

sion of the strike committee of the Transport Workers' Federation, announcing the strike at an end, and have declared for no surrender to the employers. At a big meeting of the strikers at Southwark Park today the men hauled their leaders over the coals in rough language, and it was not until something in the nature of an explanation was given that comparative calm was established.



The Land Question in British Politics.

News of the advance of British radicalism toward the heart of all industrial problems, the land question, is spreading through the American press. In his cable letter of the 27th to the Chicago Tribune, T. P. O'Connor, M. P., refers in this wise to what he calls the "complex situation of internal politics" in Great Britain:

At all recent by-elections the radical land reformers have thrust themselves and their policy in the forefront of the battleground and have made a new departure inevitable in the Radical party. But this preliminary stage of land reform, especially when advanced by avowed Singletaxers, separates instead of uniting the Liberal ranks. Capitalists and land-owning sections already utter cries of revolt, and the Tories take advantage of the contradictions in the Liberal position by asking awkward questions in Parliament. All this reacts against the position of the Ministers, and especially of Chancellor of the Exchequer Lloyd George, and has led to constant rumors of his early resignation. These rumors are without foundation, but it is certain that Lloyd George intends to put himself at the head of a big land reform movement next October which, while different from the Singletax extremists' plan, will still send Tory landlords into furies of terror and vituperation, and may antagonize some moderate sections. The Liberals' fate in this crusade will depend largely on the nature of the proposals and also on what backing Lloyd George gets among his colleagues. Asquith, it is believed, will agree in the main with Lloyd George, but Lloyd George's relations with Churchill are strained partly through Churchill's complete change of front on the question of the navy and partly through Churchill's hankering friendship for Tory landlords, to whose stock he belongs.

The New York Sun of the 14th has this quotation on the same subject from Lloyd George through the United Press from London:

"And now that the workmen's insurance act will be in full operation next Monday," he concluded, "we intend to put our hands to the great work of freeing the land, which was meant for the use of the many but which has drifted into the hands of a few, freeing it for the people and for their children forever."

An interesting illumination of the subject appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer of the 21st in the special cable letter of Philip Everett. We extract the following:

The present Liberal Government probably means well enough and its legislation, nearly all inspired

by Mr. Lloyd George, seems to go in the right direction, but it is doubtful whether it will be able to save the country from a mighty social upheaval such as must come as surely as there are limits even to the patience of the English masses. In the first place the Liberal party supporting the Government contains a number of men on its right wing who in any other country but England would be called conservative, and, in the second place, the power of the Conservative party proper, the Tories, is enormous and their agitation against democratic reforms so violent that it is doubtful if the Government will be allowed to remain in power long enough to carry through such reforms as will convince even the dull masses of English voters that they must look to the Liberals and not to the Tories to save them from their present state of bondage. Lloyd George is going to tax the land. He is going to try in practice on a large scale for the first time the principles championed by the American, Henry George. There is no longer any doubt about it, and a cry of horror is heard in the whole English Conservative press, which on general principles tries to block every change. The Chancellor of the Exchequer will ruin the country, they cry; he is preaching class war and creating anarchists in England, where present conditions are nearer the ideal than anywhere else in the world. The plans of Lloyd George are striking at the very heart of English conservatism, that much is evident from the uproar they have caused. The land is sacred and so are its present possessors, according to the tenets of the Conservative faith. One single example, however, will show how radically wrong are the present conditions in England, where all land is owned by a mere handful of people. The Manor of Huddersfield was sold by the Crown to a certain William Ramsden, ancestor of the present owner, in 1599, for \$4,875. Three hundred years ago the yearly value of the Huddersfield was less than \$125. Now the yearly ground rents amount to no less than \$900,000. The whole of the land in the old township of Huddersfield, with the exception of a small plot in Firth street, long since built over, is the property of Mr. John F. Ramsden, who thus possesses a practical monopoly of the land, so that a man who wants to buy a plot in the township for a house cannot do so, but must lease it from the owner. In consequence no more glaring example of land hunger exists in the country. It is significant that up to the time when the finance act of 1909-10 was placed on the statute books the estate was held by Sir John Ramsden, who is still living. After the passing of the act the estate was transferred by Sir John to his son. Up to 1851 Huddersfield was almost wholly an agricultural town; its rise, as the world knows, being due to the woolen industry. In order to appreciate the present situation, it is necessary that the lease system in vogue should be understood. Until the middle of the last century the land upon which most of the buildings in the town were erected was held either under tenancies at will or renewable leases. In the case of the former the tenants had in most cases erected substantial buildings upon the faith that their rights to those buildings would be recognized by the landowner in the same way that in copyhold manors the rights of tenants are recognized and enforceable. These tenant rights owners were destined to receive a rude