

Helnze and Clark interests at Butte, and in doing so fused with them under a new holding company named the Anaconda Company, is "the whole thing" about the central part of Montana and has the lion's share in other parts of the State.

This group originally owned all and still owns a large part of the townsite of the city called Great Falls.

It owns the huge smelters that have been built on the river banks, just opposite to where the new city park is to be.

It owns the huge smelters that have been built on the river banks, just opposite to where the new city park is to be. It owns the huge smelters that have been built on the river banks, just opposite to where the new city park is to be. It owns the huge smelters that have been built on the river banks, just opposite to where the new city park is to be.

When the new power houses are put in at the largest of the falls, enough electrical energy is expected to supply all Montana with light and power.

The "Amalgamated" also controls the Burlington railroad. This road runs from the town of Great Falls to Seattle over the Great Northern tracks, which means at least an "understanding" with the Hill railroad.

So the word "Amalgamated" means to the townspeople of Great Falls, the town owner, the water owner, the power owner, the light owner, the railroad owner, and the smelter owner (the workers living in the town). The monster copper-mine combination casts its influence over everything.

Therefore, when I flatly proposed in my lectures to apply the single tax to the enormously valuable Amalgamated mineral, water, town and railroad lands, I was listened to with the same kind of tense silence that I experienced once in England when I made a land-values-tax speech to an audience of farm laborers without realizing that the landlord's agent was present. Silence did not betoken lack of appreciation of the point. On the contrary it indicated the very reverse—the keenest sensibility of the point in the one case as in the other. In Great Falls it raised the all-important question of who should bell the cat—who should begin the war against this enormous multi-corporate landlord.

+

Doubtless Mr. Murphy would not say so—perhaps he does not think so—but nevertheless I think the thin end of the wedge of this taxation is his proposal to compel the vacant lot owners to pay for the benefits they receive in improving the streets of the city of Great Falls. A pebble started at the mountain-top may land an avalanche at the bottom.

These times are electrical and most men are thinking—thinking deeply. Surely my lecture in Carnegie Hall before prominent men and women (one plain man was there, a colored shoemaker who came forty-five miles to attend that lecture), my address Sunday morning before Rev. Mr. Beers' Unitarian congregation, and my afternoon and evening addresses in Rev. Mr. Giboney's Presbyterian church (under the auspices of the Young Men's Association)—surely these were listened to with the intense interest of people who are morally aroused.

Nor was a little complimentary luncheon just before I left less significant. It was given by Mr. John A. Curry, city editor of the Great Falls Tribune, an Eastern man by birth and newspaper training. Concededly first of those he had at his board was Ex-Senator Paris Gibson, by common consent the Father of Great Falls—81 years old but as hale and active as if 25 years younger, a man of the broadest and most far-sighted views, and from his New England birth, his varied experience, his scholarship and familiarity with books, offering to this present hurry-and-bustle generation an admirable type of the old style American gentleman, who, for all his modest, courtly manner, can nevertheless be a pioneer and a builder of empire. Then there was the determined, progressive type of new Democrat, Mayor Murphy; the liberal-viewed minister, Rev. Ezra Giboney; and several of the staff of the Tribune, including its keen and courageous president and editor, Mr. William M. Bole.

I take added pleasure in naming Mr. Bole and his paper, because, as I am informed, it was upon that same Great Falls Tribune that Dr. W. G. Eggleston, now doing such valiant work for fundamental democracy and the Single Tax under the auspices of the Fels Fund, did the early and persistent editorial spade-work which is coming now to its harvest in Great Falls and all that part of Montana.

+

In a later letter I shall have something to say about the new United States Senator from Montana, Henry L. Myers; and also about the valuation of mines for taxation purposes, a subject suggested by my going down one of them in Butte.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

+ + +

THE FELS TOUR—FROM CINCINNATI TO PORTLAND.

Portland, Ore.

The speaking tour that Joseph Fels made through the United States and Canada was significant in more than one respect. First, here was a "protected" manufacturer protesting against protection and demanding absolute free trade; second, a land owner—an owner of valuable city land that has increased in value 300 per cent in six years—he told his audiences that it was a moral crime for him or any other man to pocket land values created by the people; third, a millionaire, he told the people that they should abolish the system that enabled him to become a millionaire; and, fourth, the men and women who heard Fels were much interested and largely sympathetic.

Of course, many who heard him did not agree with him. That was to be expected. But the fact that he had such good audiences in most of the places where he spoke, and had the sympathy of such large percentages of his audiences, is significant of the growth of democracy and of democratic ideas in the last few years.

That growth has been astonishingly large, and even the daily newspapers have discovered that Joseph Fels and his speeches are news. As a rule, this is more true of Canadian than of American newspapers. Canadian newspapers print the essential and

omit the sensational, which is the reverse of the usual American newspaper policy.

+

From East to West the people, as far as could be judged from the audiences, are much interested in taxation, in the initiative, referendum and recall, and in the election of Senators by popular vote; and deeply interested in what is known as the "Oregon system." Fels spoke on land value taxation in its relation to government, the people, the growth of cities and the abolition of poverty; I spoke briefly on direct legislation, the recall and direct election of Senators. "We have heard of these things," the people said, "but we get very little information from our newspapers." Yet they understand that private ownership of public utilities is not only the chief source of political corruption, but also the reason for the tainted news they get. In America and in Canada public ownership of public utilities of all kinds is looming up as an issue.

+

We three—Joseph Fels, Daniel Kiefer and I—began our trip in Cleveland on January 5, with a fine meeting in the Chamber of Commerce hall, where Tom Johnson spoke with his old enthusiasm and fire.

Kiefer, under the mistaken impression that he can't make a speech, remained always in the background, and pushed me forward under the mistaken impression that I can make a speech, or could at least get out of town before the wrath of the populace fell upon me.

January 7 we had a good meeting at a businessmen's club in Toledo, where Mayor Brand Whitlock presided, and that night we had a meeting in Detroit. Sunday, January 8, Mr. Fels spoke in the Unitarian Church at Oak Park, Chicago. The next day we had good audiences at the Advertisers' Association club rooms and at the University of Chicago; and in the evening Mr. Fels spoke to a large meeting of the B'nai B'rith.

Tuesday evening, January 10, we had a very attentive audience of 800 in the assembly hall of the University of Illinois at Urbana. Wednesday evening we had an interesting meeting before the City Club in Milwaukee, where we had the pleasure of meeting Mayor Seidel, an earnest, sincere man who wants to know what is true rather than what is politic. Also, we met Congressman-elect Victor Berger, who does not permit himself to remember that Karl Marx considered land monopoly the mother of all other monopolies, or at least the foundation of capitalistic monopoly. The next day we spent with Herbert Quick at Madison, Wis.

Friday and Saturday, January 13 and 14, we had two very strenuous days in Minneapolis and St. Paul, where S. A. Stockwell had charge of us. Friday forenoon we spoke at the Agricultural College, having a few minutes at our disposal after a cleric had delivered to the students a Gospel message about "Old Glory," the "Grand Old Flag," "Uncle Sam's Navy," and some other matters not mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount. Let a vaudeville performer wear the same clothing and make the same speech, and how some of the good brethren would shout, "Sacrilege!" At noon we spoke before the City Club of St. Paul, and in the evening at the Jewish

Temple to Rabbi Deinard's congregation—an unusually attentive audience of about 1,000 men and women. Saturday forenoon Fels spoke at the University of Minnesota and made an excellent impression. At noon we spoke to about 250 very earnest and progressive men at the Saturday Lunch Club, where Mr. Fels had the audience with him all the time. That night we left for Winnipeg.

+

En route to Winnipeg we saw something of the absurdity of the "system of protection," and in Winnipeg more of it. Before going to bed on the train we were advised to leave our hand baggage unlocked in the aisle where the Canadian customs officers could "go through it" without disturbing us. In the baggage car we had a trunk filled with an assortment of single tax literature—about 100 pounds of it—all of which was to be given away. But to "protect" Canadian workmen and insure high wages for them, that literature was dutiable at 15 cents a pound. I wanted Kiefer to sell it to the Canadian government at that price, because the gentlemen at Ottawa need it. Each piece of it could have been sent by mail from Minneapolis, and there would have been no duty in that case.

In an opera house in Winnipeg, on Sunday afternoon, January 15, we spoke to a crowded house—an audience interested in the initiative, referendum, recall and the taxation of land values. Fels made a splendid, impressive address. The next day at noon we spoke at a Canadian Club luncheon to a large audience of men, and that evening we had another good audience, where Robert L. Scott and F. J. Dixon, of Winnipeg, also spoke. Dixon is a very impressive speaker, and will assuredly make his mark in the great democratic movement in Canada.

At Regina, the capital of Saskatchewan, Fels spoke at a Canadian Club luncheon on January 17, and in the evening we spoke to a small audience at the City Hall. The next day at Calgary, Alberta, Fels spoke at a Canadian Club luncheon to a large audience, and in the evening we spoke to an audience composed largely of farmers, who were holding a convention in the city. Those farmers know what the single tax is, and most of them want it. Being already exempt from taxation on their improvements and personal property—as are all farmers in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—they understand how the single tax would benefit farmers who farm the land. January 19, Fels, Kiefer and Scott went to Edmonton. I remained in Calgary to talk on direct legislation. The Canadian progressives in both parties want the initiative, referendum and recall; they say they need it to govern themselves.

January 22 we arrived in Vancouver, where R. J. Deachman met us at the train. He is a young democrat who knows exactly what he wants and how to get it. The next day we spoke at a business men's luncheon, at which Mayor Taylor presided. He is the single tax mayor who owns a progressive daily paper. Business men in Vancouver are too busy to growl about the single tax, and too well satisfied with it. In the evening, Fels, Scott and I spoke to a good audience in a church—an appreciative, applauding audience.

We arrived in Victoria on January 25, spoke that

evening to a large audience in a theater, and the next day at a Canadian Club luncheon. Two weeks before we arrived there, the people of Victoria had given a vote of almost 6 to 1 in favor of raising municipal revenues by a land value tax, as has been stated in *The Public*.^{*} When that tax is put into operation, the Hudson's Bay Company will begin to use some of the vacant lots it owns in Victoria.

+

Arriving in Seattle at 9 p. m. on January 26, we fell into the arms of the men employed by the United States government to discourage trade and encourage perjury and smuggling. Smuggling is pursuing happiness and gratifying desire in a moral way contrary to law. All the passengers that came on the Princess Charlotte from Victoria were run through a cattle chute to a corral on the dock, where Uncle Sam's round-up men awaited us with a classified list of fines. They went through our belongings with the skill of the old-time Rocky Mountain road agents, and held a caucus over two sets of mounted horns that Kiefer had bought in Canada. He bought them under the hypnotic impression that they were real buffalo horns; but it was finally decided that they were "old wearing apparel in use," and there was no fine for importing them.

+

Not knowing that we were to be in their city at that time, the people of Seattle were holding some recall festivities over Mayor Gill.† Still, we had two interesting meetings in the Y. M. C. A. auditorium, one at a high school where we spoke to 1,700 students, a small meeting in a restaurant, and a very enthusiastic meeting at a luncheon. Fels also had a B'nai Brith meeting, which I didn't attend.

The most interesting fact learned in our visit to Seattle was that the exemption of improvements and personal property in Vancouver is worrying Seattle, and the worry isn't decreased by the fact that Victoria will soon adopt the same system. Carpenters and other builders are leaving Seattle for Vancouver; more will go to Victoria; and builders buy goods from merchants; therefore, the "booster" business is bad in Seattle.

In Portland, on January 31 and February 1, there were two good meetings, addressed by Fels, Scott, U'Ren and McAllister; and Kiefer and Fels left me behind, while they completed the circuit of the continent.

+

I am sure the trip was more than worth while. We met many earnest workers for democracy, men whom it is profitable to know; and the unselfish earnestness and sincerity of Fels and Kiefer are "catching." The times are not so much out of joint since two such men answer "present" when democracy calls for men. They are not literally obeying the injunction, "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor." They are doing better than that; they are giving themselves, to bring the justice that will abolish involuntary poverty.

W. G. EGGLESTON.

^{*}See *The Public*, page 83 of this volume.

[†]See *The Public*, page 134 of this volume.

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, March 14, 1911.

United States Forces Appear to Threaten Mexico.

The precipitation of United States troops and ships toward the Mexican border and coasts, reported last week (p. 230), has continued during the days following the first announcement. San Antonio is the chief army headquarters, with Major General Wm. H. Carter commanding. The explanation of the mobilization, that it has been arranged for practice maneuvers solely, has been met with incredulity; the Chicago Record-Herald, for example, remarking that "troops are not assembled for 'maneuvers' with ammunition trains fully loaded with ball cartridges." The surgeon general issued an order on the 10th to have all the soldiers being mobilized in Texas vaccinated against yellow fever, which, it is noted, is prevalent in the heart of Mexico, with no appearance of it in Texas. The War Department sent invitations to all of the States to send officers to "observe the maneuvers." On the 13th it was reported that applications had been received from 1,950 officers of the National Guards of the different States who wished to participate, and that they were to be given practice stunts of two weeks each.

+

Representatives of the Mexican government were at first apparently perfectly satisfied that the advance of the American forces had no sinister significance for their country, but on the 10th, Mr. de la Barra, the Mexican minister at Washington, announced that Mexico would resent any intervention in its affairs by the United States or any other nation. The Mexican minister also denied that the insurrection in Mexico has any strength or importance.

+

The United States cruiser Chester arrived from Guantanamo, Cuba (p. 230), off Tampico, Mexico, on the morning of the 11th, and it was asserted in the dispatches that American war vessels were patrolling both Mexican coasts. It was also announced that a second detail of 15,000 troops was ready to be rushed to the Mexican border so soon as the 20,000 already massed there