

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The manner in which it is proceeding to grab the patrimony of the Filipinos is shown in an editorial in *The Public*, of January 7, 1910, which says:

"The Organic Act of the Philippine Government provided that the unapportioned public lands obtained by treaty with Spain, should not be sold in tracts of over forty acres, and that no one corporation engaged in agriculture should hold more than 2,500 acres. Attorney General Wickersham has ruled that the church lands bought from the Recollet friars by the United States to straighten out certain semi-ecclesiastical questions which had arisen, do not come within this limitation, and has upheld as legal the sale of 55,000 acres of them in one parcel. The decision may be legally correct, and it may be true that the original restriction was unwise. But the argument of officials in Washington about the matter as reported in the daily press, seems highly inconsistent with the avowed purposes of that original restriction, which we were told ought to convince Anti-Imperialists that the United States would never permit its citizens to exploit the Philippines to the exclusion or injury of native interests. The active head of the Bureau of Insular Affairs and the Secretary of War are quoted in the *Inter Ocean* as saying, 'The church lands were bought for an investment. They are not public lands in the sense that the lands acquired from Spain are government lands. We want capital to go into the islands, and it would be preposterous to think that men will invest their money in the islands if they are to be limited to a little 2,500 acreage.'"

So, according to this argument, the government of the United States is in the field as a land speculator; as a proponent, aider and abettor of land monopolization in the Philippines.

We will next hear that the devil-fish of land monopoly has reached out its tentacles across the Spanish Main and is gathering in the soil of the Porto Ricans, if, indeed, it is not already doing so.

The next article in this series will be entitled "Tenant Farmers in the United States."—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

FROM AN ADDRESS BY HON. WM. H. BERRY, OF
PENNSYLVANIA.

The area of the United States is so great that the rapid monopolization of land was for a long time but little felt, but it is now becoming evident that our system of land tenure—and our land laws are essentially the same as those the Britisher is beginning to fight—must within a generation or two produce a landowning class as arrogant, as powerful, and as merciless as ever were princes and nobles, and a working class as subjected, as miserable, and cheated of the fruits of their labors as were any serfs or slaves.

And while Henry George, who has taught us, was a prophet and a seer,

and while we, too, contemplate a perfection in government that has "not entered into the mind of man," yet we are not wild theorists nor idle dreamers, but hard, level-headed, practical business men. We know not only the ills we have, but the error that causes them and just how that error can be corrected.

I will say to you that the most serious of our social and political ills are really but symptoms of economic disease; that every economic problem that vexes us can be largely solved by the destruction of private property in land; and that property in land can be easily and safely yet surely and wholly destroyed by only taxing the owners of land and exempting everyone and everything else.

I cannot now discuss the many aspects of this wide and fundamental reform, but in closing I want to congratulate the British land taxationists upon having begun the fight and bid them fight on; and then will ask everyone of you who have so patiently stood and listened to me to resolve now here at this meeting that you will learn just what Henry George proposed, what Single Taxers are so persistently urging, what I and these other gentlemen have come here to speak of and then each one decide for himself whether or not this is a righteous war; and I think that if you do this every man of you will be sooner or later enlisted in it.

"COUSIN ALECK."

Asking A Soldier To Pay His Own War Expenses.

(Address of Hon. Geo. Wallace, of Jamaica N. Y. at North Hackney, England, reported by the London *Daily Chronicle*.)

This speech caused Mr. Wallace to be complimented by three members of the cabinet, and resulted in his election to membership in the National Liberal Club.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.)

The Hon. George Wallace, of New York, was one of the speakers at a recent Budget meeting in North Hackney.

Mr. Wallace, whose father was born in the Scottish Highlands, said that in 1901 he was on a visit to some near relatives there, and after the usual greetings he asked about Aleck, the youngest boy, and was told that he had gone to the war with a Highland regiment. "Of course, I was proud of Aleck," said Mr. Wallace, "when I learned that he was keeping up the old reputation of the family and was willing to fight for his Queen and his native land.

"Inquiring where Aleck's land lay I was told that he had none—(laughter)—and that he had been even born on land that did not belong to his parents. I asked what land Aleck would have if he got back alive, and was told he wouldn't have any. I was not so charmed with Aleck's fighting qualities as at first.