

Considering the effect on the young men and women of the British leisure class of the present social order in Great Britain, it is quite amusing to read the following extracts from Lord Milner's addresses to "Governor Major-General Sir E. Northey, K.C.M.G., C.B., etc.;" (this is a person and not a procession, as people not familiar with the nomenclature of dignitaries might be led to suppose):

"As regards compulsory labor for private employment, there could of course be no question of entertaining any proposals which involve this *principle* . . . absolutely opposed to the traditional policy of His Majesty's Government, etc., etc. *On the other hand* from the point of view of the natives . . . in their own interests they should *seek* outside employment, when not engaged in work in their own reserves; it is desirable that the young able-bodied men should become wage-earners and should not remain idle in the reserves for a large part of the year. Again, "on the other hand" (we wonder how many hands Foxy Grandpa has) from the point of view of the settler, it is *necessary* that there should be an *adequate* supply of labor, if he is to develop his holdings, and in my opinion the *Protectorate* Government (O, Euphemism, how many crimes are committed with thy aid!) would be failing in its duty if it did not use all lawful and *reasonable* means to *encourage* the supply of labor for the settlers, who have embarked on enterprises calculated to assist not only the Protectorate itself, but also this country (Great Britain) and other parts of the Empire by the production of raw materials which are in demand." (Roll of Drums.)

It is such stuff as this that gives diplomacy its bad name by pretending to contradict what it affirms and to deny what it admits, until plain thinkers and speakers lose their way in a haze of verbiage. It would all be very much simplified if Milner would cable Northey: "Abolish the reservations!" Then rich men, poor men, beggars and thieves would fall into their due places in that sacred order which is the finest flower of civilization.

Concessions to Our Principle From Many Sources

FOLLOWING the interview with our nominee for the presidency, Robert C. Macauley, in the *New York Globe*, which appeared in our Sept.-Oct. issue, came a series of articles in the same paper from Charles Harris Whitaker, editor of the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects*, in which he says:

"The basic reason for the congestion of our cities is the high cost of land. As population increases, so do land values. The increased values of land which result solely from the fact that individuals are crowded together are of no benefit to those who create them. The land increment, in most cases, is wasted in speculation. If the city pays for a subway to distribute the population over a wider area the land along the subway immediately increases in value. It is charged as part of the cost of the house, either as rent or selling price."

Following this the *New Republic* in its issue of Sept.-1st,

said, commenting upon the proposition for city home-building:

"Besides, even if it were possible to put together all the holdings needed for an important improvement without encountering the blackmailing, or worse, the obstinate owner, the net effect of the improvement would be to raise ground values in all the adjoining territory and thus to put additional improvements out of reach."

Senator Boies Penrose, in the *Times* of Sept. 19th said:

"Perhaps the States and cities should exempt from taxation property erected to meet the emergency for a period of five years. Something of this sort must be done to induce private capital to take up building at a time in which it is so sorely needed."

Governor Smith, of New York, in his message to the legislature, said:

"The emergency is such at the present time that it might be well to consider the enactment of a law exempting from taxation, for a period of years, with proper restrictions, buildings used for dwelling purposes, whose construction is undertaken within such a period as will assure an immediate increase in housing accommodations. I believe this will aid in putting new construction on a fair competitive basis with buildings erected before the war and will assist in creating a market for new buildings."

Every one of these would doubtless deny that the suggestions were favorable concessions to the Single Tax principle. Yet they are all straws in the wind set in motion by the appearance of a notable book published in 1879, and known as "Progress and Poverty." This is recognized by the American Bankers' Association which has issued a statement opposing the bills submitted to the New York Legislature to relieve the housing situation. Referring to the proposal to exempt new buildings for a period of from five to ten years, it says:

"This is subject to all the iniquities and wrong principles involved in Henry George's so-called 'Single Tax.'"

The bankers are right. And as we increase our demands for the full return due from the owners of land to those who create the wealth now going into the hands of a few, the politicians, educators, and the men of "light and leading" who wait for public sentiment to grow before announcing their wise conclusions publicly, will ask for more and more. We will get an increasing part of the loaf by demanding the whole.

Signs of Progress

FOLLOWING are a few of the signs of progress being made in the direction of the Single Tax:

Australia raised over \$10,600,000 from a federal land tax; Germany's new constitution calls for various land law reforms; the convention of the Canadian Council of Women called for the release of industry from taxation and the raising of the necessary revenue from land values; in Denmark a bill was recently introduced replacing the local property taxes by a tax on land values. Another bill proposes a tax of 2 per cent. on land in towns, and 1.2 on rural