

Reclamation law, as it now stands, in that its beneficiaries are almost entirely those who are from the middle classes of society (such as have at least \$1000 or \$2000 in hand before going on to the new land). No provision is made for the unfortunate persons who really have the most need of help, but who do not possess as much money as is now required. The vast sums of money which have been spent in reclamation projects must be returned to the government by the beneficiaries.

ENLARGEMENT OF RECLAMATION.

It is now proposed to extend the reclamation service (now limited to *arid* lands) to *swamp* and *overflow* lands, which are mainly found along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Three bills have been introduced in Congress to accomplish this purpose. One of them was several years ago by ex-Senator Flint, of California, one by Senator Newlands, of Nevada, and one last June by Congressman Dupre, of Louisiana. So far as one can see by the reading of these bills their beneficiaries must be, as now, above the poverty line.

At the Reclamation Congress held in Chicago last December an organization was formed for the purpose of securing governmental aid in reclaiming swamp and overflow lands of which there are over 20,000,000 acres. "This means" says one writer, "something like \$4,000,000,000 in real estate plucked from the river. The water power, the sanitary redemption, the town sites—the value of all these should bring the whole to five billions."

HAS NOT THE CHURCH AN OPPORTUNITY HERE?

The organization which was formed in Chicago to push swamp reclamation was mostly composed of railroad officials and real estate dealers who are naturally looking for dividends. It would seem that right here is an opportunity presented for the church to show her love for the poor men of our cities by advocating that the law ere it pass, to reclaim the swamp and overflow lands, shall contain provisions whereby the very poor of *our own* citizens, if worthy, shall be the first beneficiaries of the act.

One can see no reason why our general government can not do as well by our poor as did New Zealand a few years ago for its unfortunates. It will be remembered that that island had tramps and beggars for a time, but now they have none, because of their successful colonization and land laws, which took their poor from their cities, advancing them transportation, buildings, etc., and started them at work upon small farms.

If this seems a reasonable scheme let me suggest that the reader write favoring the idea to his congressman, or to Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, chairman of the House Committee on the Public Lands, or Henry George, Jr., of the same committee.—JAMES P. CADMAN in the Baptist *Standard*, Chicago, Ill.

NATIONAL SYMPTOM OF UNREST.

Indeed, it would be unjust to English conditions to account for this uprising solely upon the ground of the grievances which merely gave occasion for it. It cannot be understood apart from the very prevalent unrest among the world's manual wage-workers to which it gave a local, yet national expression. Whatever the immediate occasions for this unrest may be in different lands, however the local situation and grievances may differ, whithersoever the movements of this unrest may tend under differing political and economic conditions, it has a common origin and a common goal. This world-wide unrest has its origin in the world-wide spread of aspirations which increase the wants of the people. Its common goal is a larger share in the product of the common toil and larger control of the conditions under which the working people live and labor. The dominant motive and aim of their struggle is for a higher standard of living and better working conditions. By a strangely common impulse, yet without international organization, or even an understanding between any of them—except the socialist minorities—the ranks of the industrial peoples of Spain and Italy, Belgium and Holland, Germany and France, England and the Scandinavian countries, Australia,

New Zealand, and America, and even of the poor peasants of Russia are seething with discontent, and with a fixed determination to share more largely the increasing wealth of the world and the better conditions of human life which they think they are producing. For this they have enlisted in a war without discharge. If all signs fail not, the twentieth century comes in with a people's movement more widely revolutionary than that with which the eighteenth century went out. Its second decade is freighted with greater portents than even in the year 1848.—England's Revolutionary Strike. Address before the City Club of Chicago, by Prof. GRAHAM TAYLOR.

THE EDMONTON WAY.

The city of Edmonton, the capital of the province of Alberta in western Canada, is the latest important accession to the Single Tax ranks. To be sure the city did not have far to go to get there. For some time it has been raising local revenues by a tax on land values, together with a tax on business as the only additional form of taxation. Now the latter tax has been abolished and the city has for all local purposes the unadulterated Single Tax in operation.

For some time the Hudson Bay company held a large area of vacant land in the center of the city. But as industry became exempt the tax bill for this land increased. This continued until this year the company has been requested to pay \$225,000. It has concluded that the expense of holding is too great and so is subdividing the tract into lots and getting rid of them as quickly as possible to persons who want to make use of them. This is but one more example of a constantly increasing list which shows what the Single Tax will do.

Besides raising all public revenue from land values, Edmonton owns all public utilities. Street railways, telephones, gas, electric light and water plants are all under municipal ownership and control. The city seems to have more progressive policies at work than any other in the western hemisphere, if not in the world.—Johnstown, (Pa.) *Democrat*.

BOOK NOTICES.

A PRETENTIOUS BOOK.

Man's Birthright, by Ritter Brown, (12 mo, 307 pages, gilt top, price \$1.50, Desmond Fitzgerald, N. Y. City) is a pretentious treatment of the economic problem. The world is to be reconstructed by means of income taxes, limitation of land ownership and regulation on regulation—Pelion upon Ossa.

How little qualification the author brings to his task is shown by the reasons he gives for rejecting the Single Tax. He tells us that the individual or corporation could continue to hold thousands of acres so long as the Single Tax or rent demanded by the government was paid. So they *could*, but not even the foolish *would*. And he tells us "And naturally the tax exacted by the State from those who rented the forests and the mines would be added to the price of wood and minerals; so that the consumer would virtually pay not only the price of the wood and minerals, but the tax demanded by the State as well. The public would derive no benefit from such a change." If the consumer would have to pay this there would of course be no benefit. But if the author were fitted for his task he would know they *would not*.

Mr. Brown says: "Taxation should not assume the nature of a penalty placed upon human industry." But he urges as a recommendation for the income tax that "A man would pay taxes only on what he annually earns." But how a tax can be levied upon earnings and not upon human energy he does not tell us.

He states nothing quite correctly. For example he says: "The Malthusian theory that there is not enough land area on the surface of the earth for the nourishment of its inhabitants is given by most economists, etc." Not even the foolish Malthus taught this.

Try again, Mr. Ritter Brown. Or on second thought, *don't*. The world is already too full of printed words without thought.—J. D. M.

ARE you a subscriber to the SINGLE TAX REVIEW? If not, why not?