

tember, 1814—the day preceding the original publication in the "Baltimore American."

PRESS OPINIONS

The Tables Turned.

—(Cleveland) Waechter und Anzeiger (German), Oct. 3.—Now that Mr. Taft has become a Progressive he will perhaps withdraw from the Standpatters their patronage.

* *

Conservation in Great Britain.

The Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Sept. 22.—Nothing in modern times has so aroused the English people, particularly those belonging to the Conservative party, as the collection of the new land tax. The enforcement of this phase of the Liberals' policy has resulted in a storm of protest to the Tory press, the Englishman resorting to his inalienable right to write a letter to an editor. "Socialistic" is the mildest term applied to the tax, and all the country squires, the London clubmen, retired merchants, baronets, knights, or widows with landed property, wax hysterical in their denunciation of the measure. In the Daily Telegraph, a correspondent signing herself "Fighting Widow of 73," calls on the men to show the way and "we women will follow and support them." "It is the plain duty of every free and true born Briton to fight socialism in all its forms, and to fight to a finish." The British pocketbook has evidently been hard hit.

* *

British Democracy.

The Dumfriesshire (Great Britain) Young Liberal (Lib.), August.—We of the Liberal party had forgotten that first and last, and the whole way through, Liberalism must be based upon democracy. We were careless of the political ideals of our fathers, and spoke too little of liberty. The retribution has been sharp; we who should have extended the boundaries of political freedom now find ourselves fighting to retain territory won for us long since. The issue of that fight is not for a moment doubtful; but when it is over, let us remember our lesson: only by the completion of democracy can we ensure social progress. And democracy will only be completed when the House of Commons shall represent not only forty-shilling freeholds or houses or lodgings, but the men and the women who form the nation. That is our case against the Lords: that they represent coronets, our members constituencies; that they stand for money, we for men. But we who elect the Commons' House are ourselves but a minority of the nation; we are but some seven millions out of twenty-four million adults. That is not a position which a democrat can occupy with a clear conscience. We Liberal voters are pledged to destroy the privileges of the Lords; we must pledge ourselves, too, to abandon our own. Privilege, whether it be of an order, of a class, or of a sex, is a thing hateful to our political faith. It must go, root and branch, before Liberalism can achieve its work. Our first task must be to secure the supremacy of the

Commons' House; our second to make it a real Chamber of the People, chosen by the whole people, not by a favored few. "One Man, One Vote; One Woman, One Vote," is the motto of the People's Suffrage Federation, which is doing so much to forward the cause of adult suffrage. They are words which should evoke an enthusiastic response from every Liberal in the three Kingdoms.

* *

The Land Question in Great Britain.

(British) Land Values (land value taxation), October.—The advocates of the taxation of land values are passing through a stage of gratifying progress. The valuation schedules for England, issued by the Inland Revenue Department, have turned all England into a debating society on land values. The landlord party, organized and unorganized, have set up a universal howl of execration; their agitation finds daily and weekly expression in the newspapers and magazines of every complexion. . . . It used to be said by sagacious looking people that the question of taxing land values was an idle dream, a visionary abstract idea that would never come to pass, and that it was only discussed in a serious manner by a small coterie of Henry George's followers. Well, those days are over now. The coterie has broadened out; the field of its operations has extended in all directions. In every town, in every village, in every hamlet, and in every rural district throughout the length and breadth of the land, the question of land valuation and the taxation of land values is being debated with unsurpassed zeal and enthusiasm. . . . The Budget stirred into action and enthusiasm a powerful and influential section of the electorate, who were led to the conviction that, in addition to maintaining the policy of free imports, the government had committed the Liberal party one and for all to a radical land reform policy, We are for free imports, or for our free trade policy, as it is named by its votaries; but we contend that this regressive policy alone is no reply to the protectionists. It has to be admitted that notwithstanding this free trade policy, poverty is rampant throughout the land; overcrowding, with all its attendant evils, is tormenting every municipal and rural area and baffling every ameliorative scheme of redress. The unemployed are enduring or cursing, as the case may be, a political system they do not understand, while the passionate cry of their political exploiters, the tariff reformers [protectionists] is heard at every street corner. All this, notwithstanding sixty years of free trade! No, the free traders, so-called, have no reply to the protectionists. The only reply is the radical alteration in our systems of land tenure and taxation, as advocated and expounded by Henry George and his followers. Some Liberals and free traders, even now, do not appear to care to come into their kingdom this way. But if the Liberal party had listened to them—well, instead of being in power, the party would have been in opposition, talking no doubt about the difficulties of bringing the average English elector up to our high-water-mark, and filling in the programme of the party with all kinds of spurious Socialism. All this undeserved poverty in Great Britain to-day, and the pain and misery arising from it, has got to be faced. This is the

command of an enlightened electorate, and it is to the everlasting credit of the party of progress in our politics, that it has so courageously, and so intelligently, set out in this search for the underlying economic causes of social and industrial evils. The Liberal party was never more wisely directed than it is to-day. Time, energy, and money are being devoted by organized labor, and by well-intentioned men and women, in all kinds of organizations to benefit the worker; but the Liberal party in their land values crusade have set out to do more for the worker than all these combinations. It is going to free the land from the deadly grip of monopoly, and until that is achieved all other proposals are vain. It is in the nature of things, in the constitution of society itself, that all progress registers itself in higher land values; rent rises and wages fall. . . How can we deal with this economic tendency? How can we meet and successfully combated? . . . Landlordism is powerful, but we must attack and overthrow it if we would abolish dull trade and unemployment; if we would raise the condition of the people. The taxation of land values is the only genuine labor policy; and in making so bravely for this the Liberal party is now doing more for labor and social progress than has ever been attempted in the history of the country. The triumph of land valuation is complete. . . Land monopoly must give place to the needs of the community. It stands condemned as the greatest obstacle to freer trade, better employment and higher wages; no question of trade or social advancement can be firmly settled until this baneful monopoly is overthrown.

+ +

Land Monopoly in Missouri.

The Woman's National Daily (Ind.), Oct. 7.—The interesting theory has been developed by those who are persistently searching out causes for the surprising slump in population in the agricultural sections of Missouri that a somewhat extensive system of landlordism exists and that much of the improved farm land is held by non-residents. . . . This is not a tirade against the non-resident owner as such. He should be entitled to the same consideration as any other speculator who invests in the hope of benefiting by another's industry. And he will continue to derive this benefit until the people, through their state governments, cease levying a tax upon industry and thrift, while the land held for speculation goes practically tax free. Let the section of unimproved land which adjoins the section which has been made productive through thrift bear its equal share of the tax burden. . . . There are too many idle and undeveloped farms. There is too great a handicap upon industry and thrift.

+ + +

"I had heard and read so much about Mr. Lloyd George," once declared the chairman of a meeting in South Wales, "that I naturally expected to meet a big man in every sense; but, as you can see for yourselves, he is a very small man in stature." Mr. Lloyd George's retort was equal to the occasion, and characteristic of one so small in body and so potential in politics. "I am grieved to find that your chairman is disappointed in my size," he said quiet-

ly, "but this is owing to the way you have here in the south of measuring a man. In North Wales we measure a man from his chin up, but you evidently measure him from his chin down."—London World.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

THE VOICES OF THE CHILDREN.

I find no rest upon the wide, blue sea,
For little children ever call to me—
The little ones I might have helped to save,
The starving ones to whom I never gave.

I find no rest when I lie down to sleep,
For ever I can hear the children weep—
The little ones who served me in their need,
The children whom I stunted in my greed.

I find no rest upon my rich domain,
For always I keep hearing them complain—
The children left to sicken and despair
Because I selfishly refused to care.

—S. E. Kiser in Chicago Record-Herald.

+ + +

SOME OF DOBBS'S NONSENSE.

As Reported by Jackson Biggles for The Public.

Dobbs is a good friend, but even one's friends at times become somewhat a burden and hard to endure. He came over to see me the other night and forced me to listen to an account of the remarkable defense made by a man who was charged with getting something for nothing, by his skilful art of opening safes in the small hours of the night. Dobbs claimed that the man's business was so unprofitable that he could not hire a lawyer to speak for him, and that his confidence in the lawyer appointed by the court was so small that he spoke out boldly for himself.

According to Dobbs his remarks were something like the following:

"If the court please and my counsel will permit, I would say that I believe this country is committed to the principle of getting something for nothing, either according to law or in spite of the law, as circumstances may determine; but it is to the getting of things for nothing as a principle, and primarily in the interests of the standard of living of the American workingman, that the people are committed.

"I believe that when this business of getting something for nothing becomes not a principle but a privilege, or rather a jumble of privileges and preferences, then the American people disapprove of it. What the people want is a square deal in this business of getting something for nothing, as in everything else; a square deal for the wage-