

seem to dispel all doubt about Cook's ability to travel in what is winter weather in the arctic.

Cook's references to "milling ice" and "purple snows" would seem unimportant, except that the doubting Thomases have seized upon it. Peary says that as he approached the Pole he found the ice in motion that was both visible and audible. And, though he says nothing of "purple snows," he describes the surface of the old floes as being "dotted with the sapphire ice of the previous summer's lakes."

So if we doubt Cook, why should we not doubt Peary? And if we believe Peary, why should we not believe Cook? Peary's is the unemotional, detailed, matter-of-fact story of a scientist. Cook's is the breathless and exultant tale of a triumphant adventurer.

If both Peary and Cook reached the Pole—and there is, on the face of things, no more reason to doubt one than to doubt the other—their expeditions must remain distinct in purpose and character. The one was a scientific achievement, the other a heroic adventure.

Dr. Frederick A. Cook (p. 872) received on the 7th from the Royal Danish Geographical Society its large gold medal in recognition of his having been the first explorer to reach the North Pole. Dr. Cook crossed from Copenhagen to Christiansand, Norway, on the 11th, and there took the steamer Oscar II for New York. He was received with enormous enthusiasm by the Norwegians, and a special salute was fired in his honor by order of King Haakon.

The Land Question in England.

All doubt of the early adoption of the budget (p. 875) by the House of Commons is now at an end. The problem now is what the House of Lords will do with it. They may cut out the land tax clauses and adopt the rest of the measure; but this would be revolutionary, and if the Commons refused to submit, as they doubtless would, the very existence of the House of Lords might hang in the balance. Or, they might reject the whole budget, as they have the constitutional right to do; but that would cut off public revenues, and stop the wheels of government, all for the sake of a few dukes, and this is an issue the Lords hesitate to challenge. For these reasons a speech by Lord Rosebery, announced for delivery at Glasgow on the 10th, was anticipated with intense interest, as likely to indicate the policy of the House of Lords. When Rosebery's first words were reported in London, they were ferocious in their hostility to the budget, and there was a rush to the conclusion that the Lords had decided to kill it. But when he came to his peroration he restored the old feeling of uncertainty by disclaiming all responsibility for the House of Lords. "The situation, then, remains indecisive," says T. P. O'Conner in his Chicago Tribune cable letter of the 11th,

"especially as two to three weeks must elapse before the budget reaches the House of Lords and anything may happen in the interval. This indecision is reflected in the organs of the Tory party. The Times does not cease to hesitate and the Morning Post will have no alliance with Rosebery unless he abandons free trade. The Daily Telegraph alone boldly advocates the rejection of the budget. . . . The Radicals and Irish members believe the rejection of the budget too good news to be true, all parties agreeing that such rejection means the beginning of the end of the privileges of the House of Lords and a certain and early advent of home rule.

The tremendous upheaval of public opinion in favor of the budget is pictured in the following excerpts from "Land Values" of London, which are confirmed by the British press in general:

The revolution inaugurated by the budget is making steady progress. The first notice of this overturning movement appeared in the Westminster Gazette of July 29th, in a series of letters intended to burlesque the policy of the tariff reformers. The correspondents confessed that tariff reform associated with protests against the budget was received unfavorably by the people, and the leaders of the movement were advised to dissociate themselves from the attack on land values. On August 4th a more serious indication of the change appeared in the Times. There was a respite of a few days in the discussion of the finance bill. The Times political correspondent said this had given an opportunity of estimating how opinion in the country stood on the question of the budget. "That the Government," he said, "feel themselves to be in a stronger position today than two months ago is plainly indicated by the confidence which ministers exhibit in conversation on the subject. It is also indicated by the trend of gossip, and by that curious sense of change which may be felt by those sensitive to impressions, a change comparable only to the turn of the tide upon an estuary when the moored boats swing slowly round." These faint shocks and rumbles were but the precursors of the most serious earthquake, eruption, and tidal wave that have overtaken a political party for generations. Up till this time the old landmarks had remained. The Conservatives talked bravely in parliament, on the platforms, and in the press, but on August 5th the Daily Mail and the Morning Post abandoned their old positions, and were found standing on that morning on what their readers might regard as their heads. The whole landscape was changed. What was anti-budget yesterday was pro-budget today. The fight against it was over. The country was strongly in its favor. Its new and great features had commended it to the people as nothing had done before. The same upheaval was taking place at meetings in the country. On August 4th, at Biggleswade, a resolution in favor of the budget was carried almost unanimously at a meeting called to protest against it. . . . The defection in the Tory Press was a result of the defection in the country. A simple promise of Liberal policy has taken the heart out of the re-

actionary Tory party. The British people were only waiting for the call to freedom in order to turn from the shams which were offered them by the tariff reformers. They never loved protection, or sat content under it for a day, but their suffering during the last generation made them intolerant of Conservatism. They were nauseated and sickened almost to death by being told that they were living under the best possible system. They knew this was a lie. The country almost to a man knows that our systems of land tenure and taxation are terribly unjust. This fact has been brought home during the last two months to the Tories in the House of Lords, in the House of Commons, and in the press. Some of these are already shaping their policy to meet this new situation, and the next few years will see an increasing number of them accepting this policy. Clear observers hesitate to say what the future of the Tory party will be, if the Liberals are faithful to this principle which has found expression in the budget. The Tories are now running an alternative scheme. In the first issue of *The Budget Week by Week*, the new organ of the Budget Protest League, they submit the following as the Unionist proposals: "Rate on annual ground values; taxation confined to urban land; rates to be collected by the municipalities; proceeds of ground taxation to go in relief of rates." . . . Up and down the country dukes and earls are indulging in arguments mingled with threats and appeals to the pity of the happy people who have no land and no incomes to tax . . . Lord Rosebery asked for a referendum on the budget. He has got it. The agitation has been more thorough than any carried on for years. For some time the event seemed doubtful. Two months ago, or less, it was possible for the House of Lords and their advisers to hesitate and weigh their chances of success in forcing a general election by overstepping their Constitutional powers. Their position called for sympathy in these days of suspense . . . We congratulate the Lords on their relief from the agony of suspense. They know now what the mind of the country is, and they can determine their course in the light of that clear declaration. We need not recapitulate the stages in this wonderful movement of public opinion in favor of the taxation of land values, a movement as of an avalanche or landslide. When its progress was irresistibly felt, one Conservative newspaper after another altered its tone, endeavoring to adjust it to the new conditions. There were the inevitable reproaches and recriminations among them. The bitterness of despair showed itself in the *Spectator*, *Standard*, and *Daily Telegraph*. The humiliation of recording or suppressing the overwhelming defeat of resolutions against the budget was too much for their temper . . . From every quarter reports come that the budget is received with favor. We are sorry for the men on whom the task of arguing against it is laid. The only means of getting a hostile resolution passed seems to be for some lord to invite people to assemble in his park, to entertain them with tea, and in return obtain a vote condemning the budget.

* *

Taxing the Unearned Increment in Sweden.

A committee appointed early in the year by the Swedish government for the purpose of pro-

posing methods for taxing the unearned increase of land values in Sweden for local purposes, has now completed its work, and the following are the propositions advocated by the committee, as reported by the *Vernamo Posten* of August 21:

In city or town, the tax shall amount to one-fourth of the increase in value, and be levied as specified below. A lower rate of taxation may be levied if two-thirds of the voters in any municipality so decide.

In country townships, the increase in land values may be taxed at a rate up to one-quarter of the increase, if two-thirds of the voters so decide.

The tax is payable upon the transfer of the property from one owner to another, and shall be paid by the seller; in case of inheritance, it is paid by the heir or heirs. When property in land has not changed hands in 20 years, the tax may be levied against the property as if transferred, and is payable in 20 yearly installments.

The primary value, in relation to which the unearned increase shall be determined, is the assessed value in 1908.

The proceeds from this tax may only be used for permanent improvements, such as the building of roads, railroads, public buildings, etc.

* *

Henry George's Seventieth Birthday.

One of the memorial dinners in celebration of the seventieth birthday of Henry George (p. 874) was given in San Francisco on the 2d. Judge Robert Ferral presided, and the speakers were Mayor Taylor, Judge Coffey, Police Commissioner Leggett, Judge Maguire, Walter MacArthur, Richard I. Whelan, James H. Barry, Wells Drury, Andrew Furuseth, Rev. Robert Whitaker, W. G. Eggleston, C. F. Knight, Walter Gallagher, Patrick J. Healy, Herman Gutstadt, W. A. Cole, and Stephen Potter. A poem by Frances Margaret Milne was read. The speeches are reported at length and the poem is reproduced in the *San Francisco Star* of the 4th.

*

At Omaha, on the 2d, L. J. Quinby presided, and the principal speaker was John Z. White, of Chicago. Other speakers were Paul Herbert, E. C. Clark, I. J. Dunn, Harriet Heller, and J. J. Points. A Nebraska organization was formed with L. J. Quinby of Omaha as president, and E. C. Clark, of Syracuse, as secretary.

*

The Providence, R. I., Single Tax Club, of which Dr. J. A. McLaughlin is president, celebrated the birthday on the 2d with a "bohemian dinner" at Dr. McLaughlin's residence. David S. Fraser and T. J. Connolly were the speakers.

* *

The Cleveland Traction Question.

Only the question of maximum rate of fare now stands in the way of settlement of the traction