

if you could find such a country it would only be necessary to change the tax laws to correct the evils.

Why don't we Single Taxers get at the facts about land titles? We do not need to change our system of *land ownership*. It is all right as it is. It recognizes the natural right of each individual to own land and to do with it practically as he pleases, subject only to the law of nuisance.

The right to "have and to hold" is an individual right. The *social value* belongs to all. Recognize this truth; conform our statutes to it, and the problem is solved. The whole problem of *Conservation* is solved. The Labor problem is also solved. —C. J. BUELL, St. Paul, Minn.

#### WOMAN'S INTEREST IN THE CONSERVATION MOVEMENT.

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

With the recent water power development there has arisen a situation which should interest vitally every woman in the United States—all women alike; those who deem themselves rich, those who live on moderate income, and the large army of women who earn a small daily wage, for it concerns the cost of living. We must have food, clothing, heat and light, in order to exist. Soon the water powers are to provide us with all these essentials, hence the importance of a thorough understanding of what this development is going to mean to every individual housekeeper. It is said that only about one-fourth of the coal now used will be needed in the near future.

Men who stand as authority on questions concerning electrical engineering, prophecy that within ten years all necessities, as well as numerous labor-saving machines, will be produced through water power development—"white coal."

Wherever a river exists, science will harness it to a dynamo. No Aladdin's Lamp could perform such magical results as will science when she applies her magician's wand to produce electricity.

When the time comes for construction of a series of dams on each river with large power stations providing electrical energy

in a radius of from 100 to 200 miles, it is very evident that large amounts of capital will be required to carry on this work. The question immediately arises whether these rivers which are ours by Divine right shall be handed over in perpetuity to a few corporations who will thus have the privilege of dictating to nearly one hundred million people, the prices of food, clothing, etc., with the power to reduce the wage-earner's salary to the lowest possible sum on which he can exist; or, should these rivers and potential power sites be controlled by the Federal Government and leased to monied interests under reasonable contracts so that it would be within the power of the people at any time that they feel that these interests are abusing their privileges, to force them to reasonable terms.

A favorite argument of the monied interests is to the effect that in order to invest their money for development purposes, they must own forever the water power sites. On the contrary, once they own these power sites, we lose all power to force their development, nor can we regulate the cost of food and clothing, nor protect ourselves against any abuse they are minded to inflict upon us. Switzerland and France, who lead the world in water power development, have placed their power sites under Government control. This works well for individual manufacturers and the people generally.

At present, laws governing power sites are inadequate to protect the people's interests. The only remedy for this lies in a sweeping public opinion which will force Congress to enact such laws as will meet the present situation. Such an opinion can only be created through women's influence. Something must be done and done immediately or this question will be beyond our control.

This winter there are several bills up before Congress which, unless counteracted, will place great blocks of power sites in the hands of a few corporations. Any woman can assist this movement who will use her influence in her own family and community.

Why not get up a Mothers' Club in your neighborhood, asking the children's school teachers to help to organize it. Send to

me for reading matter and information. In this way you will be helping your husband's and children's future welfare.

Through this reading matter, you can learn any particulars in regard to power site development and what it is going to mean in your own home, and just what legislation is necessary to protect your home against the encroachments of monopolistic influences.

An authority says: "The Nation owns the undeveloped power sites in National forests and on the public lands of the West and South. As landlord the Federal Government had a right and duty to compel the power companies to develop them promptly and fully, to pay a reasonable rental, to give the sites back to the public after a reasonable time, say fifty years, so that the lease may be renewed on terms dictated by the better knowledge of people as to their rights.

Power companies should furnish all facts relating to cost of construction and operation, and submit to such regulation of service and prices by the States as will allow fair return for the money involved. Violation of any of those conditions should work a forfeiture of the lease. This system has been in vogue in the National forests for many years with very beneficial results to all concerned. It should be extended to power sites on the public lands which have been withdrawn under Presidents Roosevelt and Taft, also to power sites on the navigable rivers in all parts of the country, because the consent of Congress must be given before any power dams can be built in a navigable stream. Power sites which are neither owned by the Federal Government nor situated on navigable streams should be developed under State laws imposing like restrictions.—ALICE BENNETT, 419 E. 64th St., N. Y. City.

Mr. Henry George, Jr. is now lecturing for the Henry George Lecture Association (Frederick H. Monroe, president.) Mr. George delivered over one hundred lectures for this association during the early part of 1910. This year he will give addresses at almost every point where he spoke on the previous tour.

#### THINKS THERE IS A DIVISION OF "RADICAL" AND "CONSERVATIVE" SINGLE TAXERS.

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

It would appear that the workers for the taxation of land values have come to the division of the ways, and that they may be divided into two classes:

The Conservatives, who wish to cling to old ways conspicuous for their failure to advance the cause materially.

The Radicals, who are weary of bumping their heads against stone walls (legislatures) and who see an opportunity which, if not appearing so short as educating the legislatures, may be the shortest route after all around the opposition to the goal.

It is false to infer that the interest of land taxation is being placed second to that of Direct Legislation, or that Single Taxers have no interest in the machinery of government, or that through legislative enactment is the quicker or easier route. The route is always through the people (except in one state of the Union). Such a change in taxation as we advocate necessitates a constitutional amendment\*—and there is only one state in the Union where constitutional amendments passed by the legislature and governor do not have to be submitted to a vote of the people for ratification (referendum is what it is). It is almost the only vital right the people managed to keep a grip on.

In either case the public must be educated—and the use of the Initiative permits us to begin now instead of waiting for our descendants.

Those who expect to succeed through the circulation of the George writings have had no experience in successful campaign work. Facts, for the average mind, must be put in a more subtle,† interesting and shorter manner. To depend entirely on the circulation of Progress and Poverty and the sending out of lecturers is to proceed in the old way, and experience has shown that the old way goes too slow. In large cities

\*The writer is in error. There are a dozen States in which the constitution offers no bar to the adoption of the Single Tax.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

†Surely, the writer does not mean in a "more subtle" way.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.