# The Public

## A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy & A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

#### ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

James H. Dillard, Louisiana Lincoln Steppens, Connecticut L. F. C. Garvin, Rhode Island Henry F. Ring, Texas Herbert S. Bioelow, Ohio Prederic C. Howe, Ohio Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, Ohio Brand Whitlock, Ohio HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York
ROBERT BARER, New York
BOLTON HALL, New York
MISS GRACE ISABEL COLBRON, New York
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, IOWA
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon
LEWIS H. BERENS, England
J. W. S. CALLIE, England
JOSEPH FELS, England
JOHN PAUL, Scotland
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, JULY 19, 1912.

No. 746.

Published by Louis F. Post
Effsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents

Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 16, 1898, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 8, 1879.

CONTENTS.
EDITORIAL:
The Land Question in Great Britain673
Panama Canal Tolls674
A Policeman's Thrift674
Two Companionable Claimants674
Lorimer's Comeback at the Chicago Tribune674
Farmers and Farm Taxes675
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:
St. Paul's New Popular Charter (C. J. Buell)677
NEWS NARRATIVE:
The Land Question in Great Britain678
Prohibition Party Convention682
Republican Revolt in Iowa682
The Unseating of Lorimer682
National Educational Association683
Proportional Representation683
News Notes684
Press Opinions685
RELATED THINGS:
The Vision (Gertrude Colles)688
Little Tales of Fellow Travelers. 7. (Chas. H. Shinn)
The Liberal Forward Policy
The Electrical Concession of the Concession of t
BOOKS:
The Singletax Exposed
Land Value Taxation692
Periodicals692
CARTOON:
The Sad Truth (Arthur Voung)

### **EDITORIAL**

#### The Land Question in Great Britain.

The third of a significant series of by-elections was won for the Liberals of Great Britain last week by R. L. Outhwaite. These successes take their special significance from the fact that the victorious candidates are what would be known in the United States as Singletaxers, and that their campaigns were not only unreserved but aggressive along Singletax lines.



Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, the youngest King's Counsel at the British bar, Recorder of Liverpool, and a member of Parliament who resigned a sure constituency two years ago to contest a hopeless one on the land question issue, was the first to win in this recent series of victories. Although he lost in his hopeless contest of two years ago, he was eminently successful in his main purpose, which was the emphasizing of the land question in Liberal politics. At the North-West Norfolk by-election in May he was triumphantly returned to Parliament, and his victory is being celebrated in London (even as this issue of The Public goes to press) at a Trocadero dinner over which Alexander Ure presides and which more than 40 members of Parliament have announced their purpose of attending. Mr. Hemmerde's victorious campaign was speedily followed by another of like kind, and with like result-Sydney Arnold's for the constituency of Holmfirth. The third is Mr.

Outhwaite's at Hanley. Mr. Outhwaite is a Singletaxer of Imperial reputation, who, like Mr. Hemmerde and Mr. Arnold, made the land question his slogan and swept the field.

In response to, if not in consequence of, such evidence as this of the popular strength in Great Britain of the Singletax method of industrial socialization, indications are now abundant (as a perusal of our News Narrative and Press Opinions of this week will disclose) of a contemplated advance by the Liberal ministry much farther than heretofore in the direction of Henry George's pro-

posals for abolishing industrial monopolies by

#### Panama Canal Tolls.

abolishing monopoly of the land.

Something very like pettifogging is the position of the United States government with reference to the discriminatory tolls at the Panama Canal. This canal is either an international enterprise managed by the American government for the general good on equal terms, or it is a national enterprise for national benefit; and that it is the latter the American government has not the face to claim. Then the American government must concede it to be the former. But if it is the former, if that canal is an international affair, the American government has no right in good conscience to impose any tolls upon the commerce of other nations which it does not impose upon our own. To insist upon doing so is in effect to claim the right to make a national monopoly of the whole carrying trade through the canal. And by charging the tolls and then refunding them nothing can be gained but a reputation for bad faith.

#### A Policeman's Thrift.

Upon resigning from the Chicago police force not so very long ago, the wealth of a canny policeman proved to be about four times as much as his total salary during twenty years of service. Graft! Not necessarily—not in the sense in which you mean; not criminal graft. At any rate he didn't get caught. His graft seems to have been quite legal. He bought building lots and sold them as Chicago grew, thereby legally putting into his own pocket profits of communal growth. This is graft, to be sure, but it is a kind of graft that the law allows. "I have paid but \$50," said this policeman in explanation, "for many a lot that I

have sold only a year or so later for \$500." When you realize that his profit of \$450 a lot means food, clothing, shelter—labor in some of its manifold forms—and that the fruits of this labor go not to those who do it, but to the thrifty policeman who bought a space on the planet for \$50 which he sold for \$500, you begin to recognize the grafty character of his profit. Somewhere in the complexities of business the \$450 which that policeman gets without earning it, others earn without getting it.

#### Two Companionable Claimants.

For the honor of having expelled Mr. Lorimer from the Senate, there are two claimants besides the legitimate ones. William Randolph Hearst claims it, along with the phenomenon of dawn at cockcrow, the invention of sleep, etc., etc.; Theodore Roosevelt claims it a logical result of his having refused to shake hands with Lorimer. Roosevelt's is somewhat the stronger claim of the two, by inference from the fact that whereas he did not shake hands with Lorimer and Lorimer was subsequently expelled from the Senate, he did shake hands with the unsavory Boss Cox of Cincinnati who has not been expelled from the Sen-To be sure, Cox was never in the Senate, but neither was Lorimer, by the terms of the decision; and anyhow this is only a detail. Apart from that advantage, however, Roosevelt's claim and Hearst's are upon an equal footing. Did these two modest men graduate from the same megalomaniacal institute or are they only a coincidence?

#### Lorimer's Comeback at the Chicago Tribune.

Whatever may be the merits of the Lorimer case, Senator Lorimer's excoriation of the owners of the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News is justified by the facts. It is absolutely true that valuable property rights of the public schools of Chicago have been turned over to them without consideration under newspaper pressure.

Both the Chicago Tribune company and the Daily News company owned leases of school land in the heart of the business district of Chicago in 1895. These leases had 90 years to run, but under their terms the ground rents were to be readjusted every ten years. In 1895 the Chicago school board was induced to cancel those readjustment clauses, thereby transforming a ten years' tenure (so far as rentals were concerned) into a