

cient worker in the cause of democracy passed away at Chicago on October 4. William Denison died at the home of his daughter, Mrs. J. Laurence Hewitt in his seventy-first year. He was born at South Shields, Durham County, England, on July 17, 1844. For the past forty-four years he has been a resident of Chicago. For a long time he was a writer on political and economic subjects. Under Governor Altgeld's administration he was superintendent of West Park Boulevards. Three years ago he designed and laid out Riverside cemetery at Fargo, N. D., since which time he had retired. He is survived by a widow and four children.

S. D.

RESTRICTION CAUSES THE RUM PROBLEM.

We can't get total abstinence—as yet; we have tried our best—by force, and we can't. Do we want it now? Would it be any good if we got it before we got something else? Let us look at the evident facts.

Total abstinence brings a better way of living which creates new demands for goods—it can bring new expenditures only if some one will “give” the reformed men work; that is, give him permission to work on the land. This the lord of the land, being a good business man, will do only on condition that the landless men pay him, directly or indirectly, all that they get over a mere living. If a man saves by not buying rum, he can live on less than before, and there being more men than there are places, he bids lower than before to get work. There are men waiting for every place; even for every job. No one can work unless he gets space on the earth to live in, and materials from the earth to work on; consequently, where all the resources of nature are owned, competition for the use of them brings wages down.

It is true that in general any individual will get higher wages after his rescue from drink, but the total amount of wages paid out for the same amount of work will be no larger than before. To double the skill and industry of all men at once, in the absence of any free land, would only increase the amount of rent and would enrich no one but the owners of the land. It is no more the quality of work done than it is the number of workers that determines wages. The amount of opportunity to work fixes wages.

Millions of people need the products of work, yet the amount of work that can be done at present is limited, because all the opportunities of labor are held by a few; a part is held out of use for speculation and the use of other opportunities

is discouraged and limited by the exorbitant rents asked for land.

At the same time the ability to pay for the product of the labor of others is limited; because nearly every man has to pay out a large part of his earnings in rent, or in interest or purchase money of land, for the mere privilege of working.

If a man gets higher wages than others, it is because he does more work or else he does better work; but whether he does more work or does it better, he takes the job away from some less vigorous or some less skilled competitor.

The increased wages which a reformed man gets will reduce both the pay roll and the rate of wages. For four dollars a day to a man who hangs seventeen doors a day is lower wages than two dollars a day to a man who hangs seven. If living was easier in Prohibition towns they would be swamped with immigrants. That's the reason living is no easier in Prohibition states than in license states. That's the reason “the Interests” and employers in Coatesville, Pennsylvania, are satisfied with closed saloons.

Temperance is a benefit to the man who reforms; but to make individuals better workmen is no benefit to society, as long as all the places and all the means of work are in the hands of others. No matter how much more sober, how much more industrious, how much more skillful you make the mass of men, the results of it all go to the world owners.

We put such high license and excise taxes on drink that only those whose big capital can pay the Government charges, get control of it: so we make a practical monopoly of it for the great brewers and the Whiskey Trust, who are the landlords, or who pay tribute to the landlords.

Then they can afford to take three corners of a street and fit them up magnificently for saloons—run free clubs practically to get men to drink.

The price of liquor goes up to some hundreds per cent profit (a \$1.50 bottle of whiskey costs only about 13 cents to produce), then men “treat” because it is generous.

There is more milk sold in New York today than there is liquor; but nobody “treats” to milk, because it costs only three cents a glass. Competition keeps it there and it does not pay to advertise and push the sale of milk.

To make liquor free would destroy the treating habit, which starts more men toward the drink habit than anything else. We could decrease drinking by abolishing the laws that put a premium and an extra profit on pushing the sale of

drink; but it would do little good with things as they are.

The birds, the Temperance people, and the bees toil to fit the earth for man. The landlord gets it all.

BOLTON HALL.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE INDUSTRIAL OUTLOOK.

Bloomington, Ill., November 4, 1914.

The Bell Telephone Company asks its local managers over the country to interview a banker, a real estate man and a manufacturer as to the prospects for 1915. The question was courteously submitted to The Daily Bulletin, and the reply led unavoidably to the Singletax argument. We might have added if we thought it would be understood that if the producer received wages anything like the equivalent of what he produces, and exchange would be unhampered, there could be no over production and there could be no panics. A fair wage system is the only cure and only Singletax can bring it about. Appended is the letter:

Prospects for 1915 from a newspaper viewpoint seem to be encouraging. When the outlook is threatening there is an impulse to keep up by lowering prices; when the outlook is bright no such pressure is felt. The newspapers just now are agitating a raise from the penny paper to the two-cent paper. And this can not be said to be induced by higher cost of materials.

We of this territory can speak only of the general index. We are not in a factory field and we therefore escape the vibrations of a money market. A rich agricultural community, and this the richest in the world, is the last to feel adverse influences. It is natural to believe that the heavy destruction of wealth anywhere must effect the whole network of exchange. Whatever may be the formative after condition, the first effect will be a greatly increased demand for our foodstuffs and even manufactured goods.

There is lots of land held out of use in this country, but even then agriculture and manufacturing seem to show an abundance rather than a scarcity of production, and the chief excuse for trusts was to control agricultural output and dismantle factories in order that the demand would so far exceed the supply as to justify high prices. The war will do naturally what the Trusts did through combination, that is, drain away that so-called surplus production which left uninterfered with makes high prices impossible. It would seem, according to this reasoning, that 1915 will be the boom year in the United States.

T. A. BRALEY.
J. F. O'DONNELL.



LAND TAXATION IN NEW ZEALAND.

Wellington, N. Z., September 15.

The war is absorbing all public interest at the present time. But we are taking advantage of the opportunity to demand the abolition of all customs taxes on food and on the necessaries of life generally.

Hon. James Allen, Minister for Finance, gave in his budget speech some figures re unimproved values. He showed that our total unimproved values increased from £161,324,000 in 1908-9 to £212,936,000 in 1913-14, or by £51,612,000; while in the same

period "taxable land values" all above the £500 exemption limit, increased from £106,198,550 to £140,448,406—i. e., by £34,249,856; and the land tax increased from £604,900 to £767,451—i. e., by £162,551. This 34 millions sterling all went to the 40,889 land taxpayers; but out of the 34 millions no less than £25,747,558 went to the 6,148 payers of graduated land tax, the amount assessed to graduated land tax increasing in the five years from £58,437,718 to £84,185,276.

The land tax exemption being £500, the graduated tax commencing at £5,000, and the total number of landowners being estimated at 150,000 and the unimproved value in private lands at £170,000,000, we arrive, in round figures, at the following highly interesting table:

Holdings.	No. of owners.	Unimproved value.	Average U. V.	Land tax at 2d. in £.
Up to £500 u. v.	110,000	£30,000,000	£ 273	£ 2-5-6
£500 to £5,000	34,000	56,000,000	1,647	13-8-3
Totals up to £5,000	144,000	£86,000,000
Over £5,000 u. v.	6,000	84,000,000	£14,000	£116

Mr. Allen's figures, therefore, back up the contention that, even with no exemption for the additional tax, by far the great majority of the landholders themselves stand to gain by our Cost of Living Plebiscite proposals, adding 2d in the £ to the land tax, reducing customs taxes by the amount of the revenue so raised. Up to £500 u. v. the average landholder will pay £2-5-6 under the 2d. land tax, while gaining on the average £10 a year by the reduction of customs taxes. And the low average (£1,647 only) of the holdings between £500 and £5,000 u. v., shows that the great bulk of the 34,000 between those limits must come under £1,000 u. v., and therefore stand to gain, not to lose, by the change.

It will be noted that while on a 5 per cent basis (5 per cent on £34,249,856) the power of the land monopolists to levy rent tribute on the people has increased, as compared with 1908-9, by £1,712,492 a year, the land tax has increased by only £162,551. Thus for every £10 the people pay the land monopolists in increased rent tribute the land monopolists pay the people in increased land tax less than £1. So we need make no bones about drawing from the land monopolists by an increased land tax whatever we may require to abolish the food taxes, reduce the taxes on other necessaries, and meet the cost of the war.

We have fairly got our teeth into this business and we mean to hang on to it for all we are worth. Otherwise the land monopolists will go practically scot free as per usual, and the workers will have to foot the war bill.

We have been writing Sir J. G. Ward on this matter, but so far have failed to get him to make a definite pronouncement on our side.

ARTHUR WITHY.



A birthday is not worth celebrating unless the life that began on that day is a life that has honorably faced its earthly responsibilities, and grown with the years into something finer and more useful than it was at its birth.—Youth's Companion.