

(Zurich), Switzerland; Mr. and Mrs. Louis R. Ehrlich (New York), Byron W. Holt (New York), Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Hoopes (Coatesville, Pa), U. S. A.; Frederick Verinder, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Fels, J. C. Durant, John Paul, Sam Dugdale, R. C. Orr, and A. W. Metcalfe (United Committee for Taxation of Land Values, London), C. R. Smithson and Fred Skirrow (Yorkshire Branch of English League for the Taxation of Land Values), James Busby, David Cassels, Mr. and Mrs. James Stewart, and Mr. and Mrs. David McLardy (Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values), Great Britain.

Upon the passing of the Paul resolution, the Conference adjourned.

+

On Friday morning, the 12th, the committee from this Conference was informed by officials of the Congress that time could not be allowed either for the reading or for the discussion of Mr. Verinder's paper or any part of it. The intention of the authorities to suppress all reference to the single tax was made still more pointed by the omission from the printed minutes of the first two days' proceedings of the Congress of remarks on the subject by three separate speakers.

The Single Tax delegates retired at once to an adjoining room, where they were advised that the French delegates under the leadership of Yves Guyot, had announced their intention of leaving the Congress if the subject of land-value taxation were recognized, and that the managers of the Congress purposed suppressing all reference to the question. They thereupon decided promptly to demand a hearing, appointing Mr. Paul and Mr. Fels to present their case, and agreed unanimously to leave the Congress in a body if their demand were rejected.

The demand being made, President Strauss allowed Mr. Verinder five minutes to present the subject to the Congress, and Mr. Verinder utilized this brief time with great tact and skill, and so forcefully and logically that he must have carried conviction to the minds of some and aroused the interest of more.

What he impressed upon the Congress was (1) that the abolition of protection is not the same thing as the establishment of free-trade; (2) that the revenues now supplied by custom-houses must be replaced by something, and that a practical free-trade congress must face this problem; (3) that theory and experience both prove that any increase of national wealth from free trade will be entirely absorbed by the consequent rise in land-values without reaching the worker whom it is desired to benefit; and (4) that Cobden himself regarded "free-trade in land" as absolutely essential to the accomplishment of his great purpose. In other words Mr. Verinder showed that the "freedom of trade," which embraces only freedom of exchange, ignoring freedom of production, is only a half-way measure unworthy the attention of serious men.

The liberal applause at the close of his address indicated that a large proportion of the audience appreciated favorably the value of what Mr. Verinder had said, and his way of saying it.

+

While perhaps nothing of great immediate importance was accomplished by this International Conference on Land-Value Taxation, yet it will be

remembered with satisfaction and pleasure by those who participated in it.

The opportunity to meet leading Single-Taxers of many countries and to get a bird's-eye view of the movement in those countries, was well worth while. Especially appreciated by some, at least, was the opportunity to become acquainted with the world's great Single-Tax dynamo and financial promoter, Joseph Fels, and with that land-value tax Encyclopedia Britannica, John Paul.

ARTHUR HOOPES.  
BYRON W. HOLT.

+ + +

## PROTECTIONIST SMUGGLERS.

New York, Sept. 9.

Now is the season of the year when our plutocratic—and would-be plutocratic—society falls into one of its most delightful inconsistencies. The columns of our dailies are full of the trials and tribulations of returning European voyagers in the unavoidable clash with custom-house regulations. Theater, restaurant and home drawing-room thrill with tales of indignities suffered alike by the innocent and the would-be smuggler of high degree.

"In no other country is the public treated so shamefully." "It's enough to make one regret ever coming home again." "They treat you like a liar and a thief; they ask for your sworn statement as to what you have, and then they take for granted you are lying and go through your trunks anyway." "It's disgraceful—shameful—disgusting!" One hears these remarks on all sides now; mainly from women of course, although sometimes the lord and master of the fair complainer, if he be a man of weight in the business world, lends his name to a signed protest in the newspapers.

Now the joke of it all is that most of these good people are staunch and true protection Republicans, or plutocratic Democrats, and never for one moment do they seem to see that the thing they uphold politically is the chief reason for the other thing which arouses their ire.

The U. S. Government desires no more than any other to harass its citizens needlessly, or to make their vacation home-coming a thing to be dreaded, as it certainly is now. But if the majority of its citizens vote for a ridiculous tariff system, they ought to have decency enough not to complain about a necessary consequence.

It's the height of absurdity. But if one mildly suggests the connection between the Republican tariff and the custom-house rules, one is met by an uncomprehending stare, and the outraged citizen passes on to complain about his (or her) wrongs to someone more sympathetic.

It seems as if someone ought to "see the cat" in this matter. Among the names signed to recent journalistic protests against indignities suffered on the steamship piers are names of men high up in the ranks of those most benefited by the tariff. One would expect them to know better, even if their womenkind do not. Do they expect to build up a tariff wall for everyone else, and then slip through it unscathed themselves?

Even the conservative New York Times hinted at the connection between the tariff and the custom

troubles in an editorial on this timely topic recently. But beyond mentioning its pet plan of gentle revision as a possible help, the Times did not dare lay too much stress on the real truth it had discovered.

It would be a pious idea for some ardent reformer to call a mass meeting of the protestants against the custom-house rules—New York's biggest hall couldn't hold them,—and then explain to them just why they suffer thus! It would be amusing to see how they would take it. No one but a true free-trader has any right at all to complain about the absurd and decidedly obnoxious treatment accorded the home-coming traveler on New York's steamship piers. Bad as our tariff laws are, they deal more gently with citizens who are able to go abroad than with those who are not. They allow each individual tourist to import \$100 worth of foreign goods free of tariff duties; but they do not allow the stay-at-homes to import a dollar's worth without paying duties.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

+ + +

## THE PRINCE RUPERT CONSERVATION.

Vancouver, B. C.

Prince Rupert is the Pacific terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific, Canada's new transcontinental railway. It is on the coast, six hundred miles north of Vancouver.

The extract from the "Seattle Post Intelligencer" copied in *The Public* (p. 732) is correct. The government of British Columbia reserves one-half of the area of all town sites platted on government land in the new territory. This law is due to the efforts of Joseph Martin (now a member of the British House of Commons), when Attorney General of this Province. The law as he drew it, provided that all such reservations should remain government property, not to be sold or otherwise alienated, but to be leased and held subject to periodical revaluation of rents. The Tories and Liberals who succeeded him in office repealed the leasing proviso, and now sell in fee simple giving the agency to their friends.

JOHN MACMILLAN.

+ + +

## PROGRESSIVE MICHIGAN.

Detroit, Mich., Sept. 10.

Because 12,000 voters wanted to play a joke on the present Mayor of Detroit, while at the same time showing their displeasure with his way of running the office, Proctor K. Owens received more votes for the Republican nomination for Mayor than did Mayor Breitmeyer. Consequently Breitmeyer, who stood for a new franchise to the Detroit United Railway, must retire from office, and Wm. B. Thompson, the Democratic nominee on a platform for municipal ownership, will have a walkaway.

There is no objection to the Owens platform. It demands the municipal ownership of all public service corporations, an economical administration, low taxes, and a "square deal," whatever that may mean. But it is the Owens personality that is the trouble. He is "all things to all men," having heretofore run on Prohibition and Democratic tickets for various unrelated offices.

By this fluke the proposed campaign for municipal

ownership has been temporarily thrown into disorder, as there is nothing to strike at. The Socialists have a Mayorality candidate, and he also is a municipal ownership man.

+

The 40,000 majority given Charles E. Townsend for United States Senator from Michigan, replacing Julius Caesar Burrows, Standpatter and reactionary, puts this State in the Insurgent column. Townsend is not an Insurgent of the Cummins type; a milder strain runs through his blood. But he was the best offered the voters of Michigan. For the first time they had a chance to "get at Burrows" through the primary, and they took the opportunity to express their feelings regarding the tariff on lumber and iron and the other "interests" which Mr. Burrows ably represented.

JUDSON GRENELL.

## NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, September 13, 1910.

### Democratic Victory in Maine.

At the election in Maine on the 12th, the Democratic candidate for Governor reversed the Republican majority of 7,653 of last year, and was elected by 8,700. The Democrats win two of the four Congressional seats, and one is still in doubt. They also win enough members of the legislature to elect the successor to Eugene Hale in the United States Senate, the Democratic majority on joint ballot being 36—21 Democrats and 10 Republicans in the Senate and 88 Democrats and 63 Republicans in the House. This is the first Republican defeat in Maine since 1881, when the father of the Governor-elect was elected Governor by a fusion of Democrats and Greenbackers; and it is the first time the Democrats have had a majority of the legislature since 1861. The Governor-elect is Frederick M. Plaisted.

+ +

### The Election in Arkansas.

At the Arkansas election on the 12th (pp. 845, 853), Gov. Donaghy, the leader in that State in behalf of the Initiative and Referendum, was re-elected; and latest Associated Press reports of the 12th stated that "while at midnight the fate of the proposition to incorporate an Initiative and Referendum amendment in the State of Constitution is not certain, the indications are that it has carried." Reports of the 13th verify the foregoing,