

war. But what are we to say of the savagery displayed by the Christians of the Balkans? When they had driven the Turks from their territory they fell upon each other with such ferocity as to stagger belief. Each nation accused the others during the war; and now comes the report of the special commission of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which says all told the truth. That great numbers of men should have been guilty of the acts certified to by this impartial commission leads one to doubt whether less severity than that of the Turkish government will hold them in check. And in any event it is evident that the nominal profession of a religious creed does not necessarily accompany a corresponding state of ethical development. Cruel the Turk doubtless was, as a master, but his subjects have proven to be no less cruel. They are the victims of centuries of wars, and are in sore need of the hand of fellowship. It would be a good investment if each of the great powers could contribute the price of a battleship toward the rehabilitation of the Balkan countries. The example would serve as well as the money. s. c.



The True Inwardness of Toll Exemptions.

Congressman Bowdle of Ohio in a speech in the House on March 30, well explained the predatory nature of the Panama tolls exemption proposition. He asked what would have happened to a Congressman, who, if the canal had not been dug, would have "seriously proposed giving to our coastwise steamship corporations as a subsidy a determined portion of the interest on four hundred millions of money?" That is what the exemption proposition practically amounts to, and no amount of demagogic talk of "British domination" can make it anything else. S. D.



Land Values and the Cost of Living.

In disregard of facts, which can easily be gleaned from census reports, James J. Hill attributes the high cost of living to poor methods of farming and to the increased wages of farm laborers. He suggests as a remedy adoption of methods by farmers to increase production per acre. Of course any improvement in methods is a good thing, but it can not alone solve the cost of living problem. It seems strange that one as observant as Mr. Hill should have overlooked the principal obstacle to farming—one that has grown tremendously during the last decade and is still growing—the increase in farm-land values. Mr.

Hill refers to increase in wages of farm laborers which he estimates at fifty per cent, but he has not a word to say about more than one hundred per cent increase in land values. Adoption of improved methods can not remove that obstacle. On the contrary it must augment it, unless action be taken at the same time to discourage speculative withholding of farm lands from use. Actual decrease of population in Iowa is one example of the result of inflated farm-land values. In Kansas there is a noticeable tendency toward increase of tenantry, especially in the eastern half of the state. What seems most needed to encourage farming is what is needed in all other industries. More opportunities to prosper, should be given the laborer, and less to the appropriator of unearned increment. S. D.



What Ails Iowa.

"What is the matter with Iowa?" asks the Providence (R. I.) Journal and then continues: "It was the only state in the Union which lost in population in the decade from 1900 to 1910. . . . The Census Bureau's present estimate that it has lost about 3,000 since 1910 is probably not overdrawn, as it is known that thousands of Hawkeye farmers have emigrated to the Canadian Northwest during the last few years. But why do they leave?"

The answer to the Journal's question is in a speech by Congressman Vollmer of Iowa, delivered in the House on March 19. Speaking of the price of farm lands, Mr. Vollmer said: "In my county I have seen it go up from \$50 to \$250 per acre, and it is still going up." That means that in order to farm in Iowa one must either pay a fancy price or be rack-rented. Canada offers better inducements, not only in cheaper land, but in exemption from local taxation of labor products. S. D.



Lords as Democrats and Suffragists.

The vote of the British House of Lords against the Unionist Lord Selbourne's bill for the enfranchisement of women was in truth, however intended, a vote *for*, not *against*, woman suffrage. To grant Parliamentary suffrage merely to those few women who through property qualifications already possess the municipal franchise, would be to set back the universal suffrage movement—the one-man-one-vote, one-woman-one-vote cause. The true "entering wedge" for democratic woman suffrage in England is no such limited bill for women, but the Liberal party's "plural