



SECOND ANNUAL

Singletax Conference

Held in CHICAGO

November 24, 25 and 26

— 1911 —

At the LaSalle Hotel

UNDER THE AUSPICES
OF THE
JOSEPH FELS
FUND
COMMISSION



PUBLISHED BY THE COMMISSION

CINCINNATI

1912

SECOND ANNUAL
Singletax Conference

HELD IN CHICAGO
NOVEMBER 24, 25 AND 26
===== 1911 =====
AT THE LASALLE HOTEL



UNDER THE AUSPICES
OF THE
JOSEPH FELS FUND
COMMISSION



PUBLISHED BY THE COMMISSION
CINCINNATI
1912

PROCEEDINGS

— OF —

Second Annual Singletax Conference

*Held in Chicago, at Hotel La Salle, November 24, 25 and 26, 1911,
Under the Auspices of the Joseph Fels Fund
Commission of America*

MORNING SESSION, NOVEMBER 24.

The Conference was opened by Daniel Kiefer, Chairman of the Fels Fund Commission, who said in his address that notices of the meeting had been sent to all contributors to the Fund and to all other parties whose names we had and who were believed to be interested. Notice was also published in "The Public" and other papers. While the call referred to the meeting as a general unofficial conference, it was, in fact, as near to being thoroughly representative of Singletaxers of the United States as any gathering in the present state of the movement could possibly be.

One reason for the meeting was to invite suggestions, all of which would receive careful consideration, since "some that may appear at first glance impractical may turn out otherwise on investigation."

Mr. W. H. Holly, of Chicago, was elected chairman of the Conference, and **Messrs. Stanley Bowmar** and **Luther S. Dickey**, both of Chicago, secretaries.

On motion of **Mr. C. M. Koedt**, Mr. Joseph Fels was elected honorary president of the Conference.

Mr. George A. Briggs, of Elkhart, Ind., member of the Commission, explained the position of that body. He said:

"When the Fels Fund Commission was organized, Mr. Fels volunteered to match every dollar that was raised by the Singletaxers of the United States, with the object of getting the Singletax in some State within five years. Now it must not be understood that the Fels Fund is to further all kinds of Singletax work. . . . Up to the time the Commission was formed the chief work of the Singletaxers of the country

had been along propaganda lines, but it was the Commission's policy to try to secure the adoption of the Singletax in some one place. That was the condition on which it was formed. To accomplish that, the Commission thought, would be the biggest kind of propaganda work. It followed, therefore, that the first call to be considered was the call from those States where the chances to get the Singletax are best. This is in States that have Direct Legislation. With the present kinds of constitution and the present kinds of representative government, the powerful interests can easily defeat the will of the people. But efforts must be directed not only on a State that has Direct Legislation, but which also has an earnest body of Singletaxers to carry on the work. This condition exists in Oregon, and also in Missouri."

Mr. Briggs then went on to show that money should principally be expended in Oregon and Missouri. After that they wanted to do other things for the Singletax; to take part as far as possible in other activities.

They helped to secure Direct Legislation in Arizona and Colorado because, in order to get the Singletax (which means industrial democracy), we must first have political democracy.

Concerning propaganda work they felt that the best kind is what will reach the greatest number who are now Singletaxers. They thought it more important to carry a message to these in a form not strictly academic and that would appeal to and "hook up" those who are interested in other things. The chief medium of this work is "The Public." That paper goes to more public men who are not directly interested in our cause, but who read and enjoy Mr. Post's editorials, than is the case with any other paper in the country.

After that perhaps the most important is the Press Bureau, which does its work under the name of **The American Economic League**. This is sending out editorials to the city and country press all over the United States. These editorials are not all straight-out Singletax, though they involve the Singletax principle. They are pure democracy, and the country papers using them are steadily molding public opinion.

After that there is work of many different kinds. The limitations of the Fund prevent it from assisting many desirable agencies. If the relative values suggested seemed well to the Conference, the Commission would be glad to know it. If they seemed wrong the Commission stood ready and would be grateful to receive all suggestions that would be submitted.

On completion of Mr. Briggs' address, Mr. Louis F. Post, of Illinois; Mr. Warren Worth Bailey, of Pennsylvania; Dr. Mary Hussey,

of New Jersey, and Mr. Bolton Hall, of New York, were made a committee to prepare the program of proceedings.

The Conference adjourned until 2 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION, NOVEMBER 24.

Mr. Post reported that on account of a complication which had arisen with the management of the hotel, it would be necessary to find other quarters, and moved that a committee be appointed to procure a place of meeting for the remaining days of the Conference. After considerable discussion it was finally decided to continue meeting at the LaSalle, but to abandon the banquet and have a supper at the Kimball cafe instead. It was further decided to hold the Sunday public meetings in Willard Hall.

On motion of **R. B. Blakemore**, of North Dakota, it was decided to provide a roster for each member to sign, and to present this roster to Mr. Joseph Fels after final adjournment.

The Committee on Program reported the following order of business for the afternoon session: First, submission of the financial report of the Commission and action thereon. Second, report on activities of the Commission and action thereon.

Mr. A. B. duPont, of Ohio, moved that the report of activities be taken up before the report of finances. Carried.

Mr. Kiefer then read the following report:

Report of the Chairman of the Joseph Fels Fund.

The purpose of this meeting, like that of one held last year in New York, is to take account of what has so far been accomplished and consider what best to do in the year to come.

Oregon—It was not until after adjournment of last year's conference that we definitely learned that the preliminary campaign in Oregon had resulted in victory. The amendment granting home rule in taxation to counties had carried. The next step is to make use of this power. To this end petitions have been prepared to put the question before the voters of the various counties whether or not the Singletax for local purposes shall be adopted. Victory in some, if not all of the counties is quite possible of attainment. But the special interests are not inclined to sit idly by and see their privileges voted away. They have framed a technical pretext on which they are now contesting in court the placing of this question on the ballot. They have, furthermore, gone to the legislature and secured the re-submission of the amendment by that body, and are also pushing proceedings before the Supreme Court of the United States in the hope of having the Initiative and Referendum declared contrary to the clause in the Federal constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government to the States. Difficulties of this kind have long been foreseen by most

of us. The fight in which we are engaged is no child's play. Plutocracy will die hard, and is sure to stubbornly contest every inch of ground. However, it does not seem probable that the people of Oregon, who have just voted in favor of home rule in taxation, will oblige monopolistic interests by now voting against it. Neither is it reasonable to suppose that the absurd legal contentions of the interests will be upheld by either the Oregon courts or the United States Supreme Court.

With so able a manager at the front as W. S. U'Ren, who has still his first defeat to experience, we may confidently look for the adoption of the Singletax in Oregon on schedule time.

Missouri—In Missouri a measure has been prepared providing for a gradual and state-wide application of the Singletax. This is being pushed by the Equitable Taxation League, of which Dr. Wm. P. Hill is the head and S. L. Moser the secretary. This will be voted on at the election of 1912. It speaks well for the tact and good generalship of our Missouri friends that prominent representatives of agricultural, labor and business interests are working in harmony for the measure and giving it active and enthusiastic support.

Rhode Island—In Rhode Island the work of influencing the legislature is proceeding slowly. The Commission sent John Z. White into the State to co-operate with ex-Governor Garvin and other workers. Mr. White devoted many months not only to lecture work, but to looking up facts in regard to assessments and preparing statements from official figures showing how a change from present methods to land value taxation would affect all taxpayers. One particularly important result of his long and painstaking research was the production of a pamphlet containing a complete list of taxpayers in the City of Woonsocket, and showing the amount which each one would pay should the change asked for by the Rhode Island Tax Reform Association be granted. Mr. White's pamphlet is a most valuable propaganda document—one that can be used with good results in other places than Woonsocket.

Ohio—In Ohio the calling of a Constitutional Convention offered an opportunity which we could not well afford to neglect. The progressive forces of the State, organized under the leadership of Brand Whitlock and Herbert S. Bigelow, decided to make a fight for the election of delegates pledged to favor the Initiative and Referendum. They were forced to meet the vigorous opposition of the forces of reaction. Public service corporations and other monopolistic interests, composing the so-called Ohio State Board of Commerce, argued that the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum would inevitably lead to the adoption of the Singletax. The manager of this plutocratic campaign, Allen Ripley Foote, was extremely bitter in his denunciation of Singletaxers and the Singletax, and in his paper, the "Ohio Journal of Commerce," deliberately misrepresented our principles and tried his utmost to arouse prejudice against us in the hope of thereby discrediting the Initiative and Referendum.

The Commission contributed \$500 to the progressive campaign fund. No money was ever spent with better results. Two-thirds of the delegates elected are progressives, and a clear majority is pledged

in writing in favor of a satisfactory Initiative and Referendum measure. Herbert S. Bigelow was elected a member, and will certainly take a very prominent part in its work, and likely be chairman of the convention.

"The Public"—"The Public" is still in need of a sustention fund. Mr. Emil Schmied did excellent work in securing new subscribers, and it caused the Commission great regret that circumstances rendered it necessary for him to sever his connection. Since September 1 Mr. Stanley Bowmar, who has ably assisted the work of the Cincinnati office, has undertaken the task of increasing circulation and obtaining advertisements, and has already some most encouraging results to show.

Publicity Work—Dr. W. G. Eggleston, who was originally engaged to take charge of publicity work, is needed too badly for special work in Oregon to be allowed to go elsewhere. Any suggestion to that effect invariably brings a protest from our friends in that State, where his exceptional ability in the preparation of educational matter makes him indispensable.

Since April 1 of this year a press bureau has been conducted under the name of American Economic League. This bureau furnishes matter to papers whose editors have expressed a desire to receive it. The work of preparing the matter has been assigned to Samuel Danziger. The number of papers now receiving the service is 580, and most of these publish what they use as original matter. The papers served include some metropolitan dailies as well as dailies published in small cities and towns, and a number of weekly and monthly publications besides.

We started the press bureau with a list of 600 papers, whose names we took, for the most part, from a newspaper directory. After the service had been going to these papers for several months, we wrote the editors, asking them whether they found the articles of any interest or use to them. To those who did not reply to our first letter we wrote again and then a third time. In this way we trimmed down our list to 340 papers, every one of whom have written that they want the service continued.

Mr. U'Ren sent us a list of 160 odd papers in Oregon—every paper in the State, I understand—suggesting that we send the service to them, and these were added to our list. A couple of months ago Mr. E. P. E. Troy, of San Francisco, sent in the name of the progressive papers in California, and on his recommendation we are serving 62 of these; so that, all told, we are now sending copy to some 580 dailies and weeklies. Fourteen of these are straight-out labor papers, and six or seven of them publications that go exclusively to farmers.

Our greatest difficulty is, of course, to know to what extent the service is being used. Something like 130 papers have put us on their exchange list. We go over these exchanges hastily and clip from them our press bureau articles, which are filed. These files show that 111 papers have used the stuff; many of them only 1 or 2 articles; some of them from 12 to 20. Others have used over half of what we have sent them.

While those we see and clip are some indication of the extent to which the service is accepted and used, it is really very little, for many of the editors take the thoughts of the articles and trim them up in their own way. This, of course, makes the matter exclusive, which is absolutely necessary for many of them. Take the "Nebraska Farmer," for instance, the editor has more than once written of the usefulness of the service to him; but they use none of our articles just as they get them, and it is very likely that those papers that take the thoughts and trim them up to suit their own particular needs are helping us as much as those that use the articles as a whole.

These various activities of the Commission do not, by any means, exhaust the list of opportunities for good work. Insufficiency of income has prevented us from giving assistance in a number of places where the cause needs it badly. Thus in New York the Committee on Congestion of Population is striving to secure the passage of an act cutting in half the rate of taxation on buildings. In Seattle there is a movement afoot to exempt improvements from taxation and place that city in a position where it can meet the competition of untaxed labor in Vancouver. In California there is a movement led by J. Stitt Wilson, the broad-minded Socialist Mayor of Berkeley, to secure the Singletax for cities of the State; and now, with the power of the initiative in the hands of the people, California will be able to undertake programs such as are now being pushed in Oregon and Missouri. The number of such opportunities is constantly increasing. It is, indeed, tantalizing to the Commission to hear of them and to be forced to confess inability to grant aid requested. If this meeting can devise means whereby the funds may be raised to enable the Commission to respond promptly to all such calls, it will do much to hasten the complete triumph of our cause.

Mr. Bolton Hall thought the reference to the New York Committee on Congestion of Population and to Mayor Stitt Wilson should be stricken out.

Ex-Congressman Robert Baker, of New York, moved that speeches be limited to five minutes. Adopted.

Mr. Kiefer reported that the total number of pledges registered to date was 1881, amounting to \$20,191.56. Included in this were 568 delinquents considered good, whose pledges amount to \$7,661. and 507 doubtfuls and dropped ones amounting to \$6,879.50.

The financial report was then read by the treasurer, A. B. duPont, of Cleveland. (Report in full given on page 30 *et seq.*)

Mr. Chas. H. Ingersoll, of New Jersey, suggested that Mr. Kiefer explain the amounts charged against personal names to prevent a wrong impression concerning them. Mr. Kiefer explained that the amount against the name of Bolton Hall was to be used in Rhode Island for which Mr. Hall was fiscal agent. The amount against John Z. White's name was for work done in Rhode Island. The

amounts against Emil Schmied and Stanley Bowmar were in connection with work done for "The Public." Billy Radcliffe had been given literature, at Tom L. Johnson's suggestion, for sale and distribution in Ohio. H. W. Stone had been paid as Treasurer of the Oregon Committee. The amount paid Henry George, Jr., covered the cost of printing 50,000 copies of his speech, "The Road to Freedom," which has been mailed from the Fels Fund office.

Mr. Jacob C. LeBosky moved, and Mr. Chas. Ingersoll seconded, that the report be approved. Carried.

Report of New York Singletaxers' Meeting.

Mr. Bolton Hall then read the minutes of a meeting of New York City Singletaxers, which had been held on Nov. 18th, for the purpose of discussing the work of the Commission. This meeting was held in accordance with the request of the Commission. F. C. Leubuscher was Chairman and E. M. Murray, Secretary. The discussion was mainly on the advisability of extending further aid to the Initiative and Referendum movement. Mr. Hall proposed a resolution as follows: "That in those places where the Initiative and Referendum appears in the judgment of the Commission to have a good chance, and where it appears that its adoption would facilitate the immediate adoption of the Singletax, it would be wise to support it."

In the discussion that followed, Mr. William Ryan stated that \$3,500 had been spent by the Commission for Initiative and Referendum work in Ohio. He also read a letter attributed to "an employee of the Fels Fund," in which California Singletaxers were advised to work for the adoption of the then pending Initiative and Referendum without confusing the issue by dragging in discussion of matters which were not the question immediately "before the house." Mr. Ryan considered such advice reprehensible, and said, "if these are the kind of men to whom we must contribute money—if we are to sneak around and hide any mention of the Singletax, then the campaign is no credit to Singletaxers."

Mr. Ryan's views were upheld by Mr. Bastida, Mr. Weyman, Mr. Darling and Mr. Wallace. Mr. Bastida offered a substitute motion for Mr. Hall's, as follows: "As there are a great many States which already have the Initiative and Referendum, it is the sense of this meeting, and we request that no further money be spent for that movement, but that the fund should be spent exclusively for the Singletax." Speaking in defense of this motion, Mr. Bastida said that at a recent dinner of the Manhattan Singletax Club, a census was taken of those present with the following result:

Thirty-one had become Singletaxers between the years 1880 and 1890.

Sixteen had become Singletaxers between the years 1890 and 1900.

Fourteen had become Singletaxers between the years 1900 and 1910.

Dr. Mary D. Hussey, of East Orange, N. J., stated: "I would like to say that anybody who reads *Equity* would find that most of those States which are supposed to have the Initiative and Referendum, do not really have it at all. It is, in many cases, surrounded by so many restrictions as to make it valueless. In some cities, for local purposes, fifty per cent of the voters is the requirement for initiative petitions. The Oregon law seems to be the best we have, and it is better to spend our money to get a real good law, than to blame the States that now have the Initiative and Referendum in a bad form for not getting the Singletax."

Mr. Doubleday, Miss Schetter, Miss Colbron and Miss Hicks spoke in support of the Commission's policy.

Mr. John S. Crosby said in part: "We all agree that money should be spent for the Singletax, our only difference is how to get it. As for the Initiative and Referendum, I believe that we should work for it where we think we may get the Singletax through it."

Mr. Benjamin Doblin said that he did not agree with all that the Commission had done, but that was no reason for criticising them. "Let them do their job in the five years that they have, and then report what they have done." He did not believe in the Initiative and Referendum as a door to the Singletax. He believed the way to work was to get half a step and then the whole. The Fels Fund was democratic enough. "If you don't like it you don't have to subscribe." He thought a mistake had been made in not supporting the American Singletax League. He believed that New York was the place to work. The country at large won't follow Oregon, where it would follow New York. But he urged against acrimonious discussion and criticism. "It is easy enough to narrow it down to 'one simon pure Singletaxer and that's me,' and we are often tempted to do it."

On being put to a vote Mr. Bastida's substitute motion received 12 votes as against 6 for the original motion of Mr. Hall. On the final vote the substitute carried by a vote of 14 to 12. By a further vote of 18 to 3 it was decided to send the resolution to the Chicago conference as expressing the wish of New York Singletaxers.

After reading the report of this meeting Mr. Hall said he thought that it reflected pretty accurately the feeling of New York Singletaxers.

Mr. Baker disagreed with Mr. Hall. He did not think the meeting was a representative one. The most active New York Singletaxers were willing to support the Initiative and Referendum in a full but not in an emasculated form.

Mr. Joseph Fels said that he had never given any advice, but he could not say to what great extent he approved of everything the Commission had done so far. Everything had been absolutely above board. He had received many letters asking him to give his advice, but he had always said that he had no opinion. He wished he could say that every one of the Fels Fund Commission in other parts of

the world had worked as satisfactorily and with as little friction. He was delighted with progress made and there was not one thing he would wipe out.

Mr. Robert Cumming, of Illinois, said he hoped that there was no Singletaxer in the United States who was not in favor of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. These movements were receiving general support from men of all parties and the Commission had made no mistake in giving them what assistance it could. He thought the Commission could be trusted to use their judgment in the matter.

Daniel Kiefer then read a letter from Mr. George H. Duncan, Secretary of the New Hampshire Direct Legislation League, in which emphasis was laid on the great importance of the Initiative and Referendum.

Mr. W. A. Douglass, of Toronto, Canada, said that in the discussion it had been stated that there is no Initiative and Referendum in Canada, but British Columbia has local option in taxation and, in consequence, has been able to make the advance it has.

Mr. John Z. White asked how much had been spent during the past year on Direct Legislation work.

Mr. Daniel Kiefer answered: "\$500 on the Constitutional Convention campaign in Ohio; \$500 out of a total of \$39,000."

Mr. J. R. Hermann, of Colorado, said it was not the money spent by the Commission so much as the moral force of it that constituted its real value. Speaking of the Initiative and Referendum in Colorado, he said that they had it there in a defective form. Instead of the Oregon pamphlet system arguments for and against, initiative measures must be published as advertisements in newspapers. This gave enemies of the measure the opportunity to make its operation exceedingly expensive and also made it easy to influence and corrupt the press. They wanted the moral force of the Commission and of all Singletaxers in their fight for the Oregon pamphlet.

Mr. Chas. H. Ingersoll moved:

"Whereas, The report of the meeting of the Singletaxers in New York has been read and resolutions adopted duly considered, be it

"Resolved, That this Conference convey to our New York friends the assurance that there having been but \$500 of the Joseph Fels Fund spent upon the Initiative and Referendum or any other than Singletax work during the current year, the administration of the fund is entitled to their confidence."

Mr. Ingersoll said that at the last meeting he had made a point that if the Commission had made any mistakes in the past, these mistakes would not continue in the future, and the program had been lived up to. If this had been taken into account by the New York friends it would have saved them a lot of heartburn.

Mr. Joseph Fels said that the resolution was too apologetic. He did not want to apologize to any one.

Mr. George V. Wells said that he did not believe that the Commission had any apology to make to anybody. The Commission came to ask advice and to take orders, if orders in their opinion were needed. He believed that this motion should not pass. Singletaxers should stand together and allow the Commission to go ahead and do its own splendid work.

Mr. Charles A. Brothers, of Saskatchewan, Canada, said that he favored the support of the Direct Legislation movement in the United States and he thought a grave mistake would be made if Singletaxers turned aside from their support of the Initiative and Referendum.

Mr. C. J. Buell, of Minnesota, moved a substitute motion, but accepted the following substitute by Mr. Post:

"Resolved. That the report and resolution from New York Singletaxers be referred to the Joseph Fels Fund Commission with the advice of the Conference that promotion of the Initiative and Referendum is, in our opinion, an appropriate object for its support."

Mr. Ingersoll said that he did not intend to make his motion apologetic. The resolution from New York was a courteous one, and was invited in the call to the Conference. The Commission may have been to some extent contributory to a schism between New Yorkers and Western Singletaxers in that it had not made clear what amount was used in Direct Legislation campaigns.

Mr. Post thought that accepting the resolution submitted by Mr. Hall, advising our New York friends that their suggestion had been received as part of the advice that had passed through the Conference, did not imply that we agree with the resolution. It could be accompanied with our own advice. The Conference believed that the promotion of the Initiative and Referendum in places where it seemed wise, was a step entirely appropriate in the Singletax movement.

Mr. Ingersoll's motion was seconded by Charles S. Prizer, of Connecticut, who said that he believed Mr. Post's resolution could

be added to Mr. Ingersoll's, which would make an excellent composite resolution to be submitted to our New York friends.

Mr. Hall moved that Mr. Ingersoll, Mr. Prizer and Mr. Post be empowered to frame a resolution that would express the feelings of the Conference. Mr. Mills seconded the motion, and it was carried.

Conference then adjourned until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION, NOVEMBER 24.

After calling the roll Mr. Post read the following resolution prepared by Mr. Ingersoll, Mr. Prizer and himself:

"The report of a meeting of Singletaxers in New York and the resolution adopted thereat, as submitted to this Conference by Bolton Hall, having been duly considered, be it

"Resolved, That this Conference conveys to our New York friends the information that there has been but \$500 of the Fels Fund expended directly upon the Initiative and Referendum, and only small amounts in any way indirectly during the current year. Also that the administration of the fund is, in our judgment, entitled to their confidence. And be it further

"Resolved, That the said report and resolution from the New York Singletaxers are hereby respectfully referred to the Joseph Fels Fund Commission of America, with the advice of this Conference that promotion of the Initiative and Referendum has been, and still is, in the opinion of this Conference, an appropriate object for the support of said Commission at their discretion."

Mr. Emil Ritter, of Chicago, moved that the Conference voice its approval of the work outlined in the report presented by the Commission for the year. Mr. George A. Schilling of Chicago, seconded.

Mr. Post moved that the Conference go into Committee of the Whole to enable free discussion. Carried.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.

In Committee of the Whole the officers of the Conference were made officers of the Committee.

Mr. George C. Olcott, of Chicago, said that the Commission should have power to do whatever seemed best. He quoted a statement of Tom L. Johnson to the effect that the first thing to be considered in framing a constitution is how it can be amended if necessary. His idea was that the course adopted at first should be easily changed if later events seemed to show this desirable. The only wise course to follow in regard to the Commission was to leave future progress in its own hands.

Dr. C. L. Babcock, of Wisconsin, considered the work of the Commission admirable. The time might soon come when Wisconsin would offer a good field to work in. The last Legislature had passed an income tax bill to go into effect on January 1st. It had already stirred up a good deal of protest on the part of some, and it was at present before the Supreme Court of the State as to its constitutionality. He hoped the Supreme Court would uphold it for it made people stop and talk about the Singletax. The Initiative, Referendum and Recall were also live questions in Wisconsin. They would vote on the constitutional amendment involving these measures next Fall. They already had them municipally. It seemed to him that this would lead to the Singletax and he hoped the Commission would continue and perhaps increase its support of the Initiative and Referendum. In conclusion, he hoped they would keep their eye on Wisconsin.

Mr. A. B. duPont, of Ohio, said that as most of them knew, he was treasurer of the Fund. He was grateful to see that the Commission's work in the past had the Conference's unanimous endorsement. Since all agreed that it was best to work in the States where conditions were most favorable, it seemed to him that the most profitable discussion for the Conference from now on would be how to raise more funds. They had seen that Mr. Fels was doing more than his share. They ought to be ashamed of themselves. Dan Kiefer had been doing all the work of raising money to match Mr. Fels'. They ought to do something in each community. It was absurd to expect Elkhart, Indiana, from where one of the members of the Commission came, to do as much as Chicago, and he thought it well to start out to get money on a per capita basis, say one-half cent per inhabitant. He felt sure that he could do that in Cleveland. In 1886 he had become converted to the Singletax and he wanted to see it in operation somewhere while he was alive.

He believed that men like U'Ren on the firing line were doing more for the Singletax than the Fels Fund. He was too selfish himself to go out there to fight on the line, but still he wanted to see the Singletax. Those who were not doing anything should raise dollars.

Mr. Charles S. Prizer agreed with Mr. duPont. The only way to help the Commission was to devise ways to give it more money. It was amazing that more money had not been collected. The Commission had done excellent work in spending money, but had fallen short in collecting. The raising of money was the real, practical thing for the Conference to discuss. A year ago in New York he

had drawn up eight different propositions for the getting of more money, the most important of which was that in every town there should be a committee charged with the duty of raising funds for the Commission. In every town they should have a man to canvass for the money. The present system did not reach Singletaxers and they could be reached by proper means. For instance, he had taken one town and called upon a few Singletaxers. He selected one man to issue a call for a meeting, present this proposition and get subscriptions. In that town the result was an increase of 290 per cent in the money subscribed that year over any previous one—\$79 as against \$20. If the Commission took the same steps that a business man would take, they could raise at least \$30,000. Singletaxers have never had the case put properly before them.

Mr. George A. Briggs expressed pleasure at the preceding remarks. He was sure the Commission had made a wise move in calling this Conference and was sure also that as a result of it ways and means would be devised to vastly increase collections for the fund.

Mr. Thomas Wallace Swann said that in Chicago they had "The Public" to thank for keeping alive the Singletax spirit. Raising money was not so difficult a problem as some imagined. He had himself succeeded a few days before in raising some money for a big meeting amongst his own people who had, without hesitation, put up the necessary amount.

Mr. George Tideman, of Chicago, said he had traveled considerably in Missouri and he felt that the one great need there was speakers. Many people did not read and these could not be reached with literature. If they did not know what the proposition meant they would vote against it and for this reason he was convinced that more speakers should be sent to Missouri.

Mr. C. J. Buell described progress of the movement in Minnesota. A tax commissioner had been appointed to study the question in the Canadian Northwest and there was a great deal of Singletax sentiment in the State.

Mr. A. P. Canning, of Chicago, said that he did not feel the impulse to give as much as he ought and the explanation was, as Mr. Prizer had said, that he had not been properly solicited. There should be sub-committees. As an executive of the committee a person could collect more than as an individual. He believed there would come a time when they would have to ask Fels to stop contributing. He himself could give a hundred times as much as he had done. He only gave a little to keep his name on the book. They must get more money before they spend it. It was never more needed.

Mr. R. E. Blakemore, of North Dakota, described the situation in his State. They had four Initiative and Referendum bills before the voters. Three of them were backed by the Interests. The fourth had been described by Mr. Judson King as the best of its kind. He believed Oregon and Missouri should be supported before anything else, but he did not want North Dakota lost sight of.

Mr. A. B. duPont suggested getting back to the subject of raising money.

Mr. W. A. Douglass, of Canada, said he was surprised that the Commission had no collecting agent. In one church to which he belonged they collected in one year more than the amount that had been collected from all the Singletaxers in the United States.

The Chairman asked those opposed to the Commission's program to let themselves be heard from.

The motion on which the Conference had gone into Committee of the Whole was then put and carried.

When the Committee rose, Mr. Post moved the adoption of the resolution. Carried.

Mr. George A. Schilling moved that the Commission appoint an auxiliary committee for raising funds.

Mr. Kiefer said that the Commission had had solicitors out and had sent out a number of circular letters. The trouble was that so many interested in the cause did not subscribe. Right in this room there were people not on the contributors' list.

Mr. Jacob LeBosky explained the method of the Chicago Jewish Charities in collecting funds. These charities secured subscriptions for a certain amount for a certain number of years and the name of each subscriber was published in a small book.

Mr. W. W. Mills thought the best way would be to get a pledge card printed promising twenty-five cents a month. This did not sound like much, but it was three dollars a year. Church organizations worked similar schemes successfully.

Mr. Post said he was not amazed, as Mr. Kiefer had been, that there were only 1,800 people on the lists and only \$32,000 collected in two years to offset Mr. Fels' \$65,000. He considered the number of persons was great and that under the circumstances the amount was phenomenal. There never before had been collected in the United States so large an amount for the Singletax. He ventured to say that in Great Britain less had been done to match Mr. Fels' money. Besides, in Great Britain they had the spectacular effect of a great election. They had been raising money to spend on themselves, not to send away to fight campaigns over the Rockies, as

had been done here. When the fund was started the members of the Commission were practically unknown. Mr. Briggs was known in Chicago, that was all. Mr. Ralston was almost forgotten. Few were acquainted with Mr. Kiefer. Mr. Fels had put his money into the hands of the five best men that could be picked in the United States, but from the start they had been up against the difficulty of making their work and purpose widely and clearly understood.

Mr. Post then moved as an amendment to Mr. Schilling's motion that the Conference select an auxiliary committee and instruct it to report to the Commission during the year and to the next Conference for discharge.

Mr. Schilling accepted the amendment as part of his motion.

Mr. H. H. Hardinge, of Chicago, said that while the public knew of the existence of a Fels Fund, that was all. It should be kept in touch with all that was proposed to be done.

Mr. J. B. Ellery, of Chicago, said local money raising organizations should be under State control and State organizations under national control.

Mr. Emil Ritter, of Chicago, referring to Mr. LeBosky's suggestion, said that it pays to advertise one's contributions to charity, but it did not pay to advertise contributions to radical work. A large number would contribute if positive assurance could be given that their names would be kept secret.

Mr. William C. Wulff, of Chicago, said Singletaxers make a mistake in trying to impress others with the notion that they are the most intelligent people on earth. Singletax is not complex, everything else is, and if this were emphasized we would induce more to study our subject.

The Conference adjourned until Saturday, 11 a. m.

MORNING SESSION, NOVEMBER 25.

The meeting was called to order. Daniel Kiefer suggested that time be devoted to hearing from those who had something of especial importance to tell—W. S. U'Ren and Dr. Wm. P. Hill.

Dr. Wm. P. Hill spoke on the situation in Missouri. The purpose of the Fels Fund was to establish the Singletax somewhere within the United States within five years. In Missouri they were on the firing line and were trying to bring that purpose into effect within a year. They had the question directly before the voters. They had worked for this for 18 years. It took 15 years to secure the Initiative and Referendum against great odds, and their only purpose in securing the Initiative and Referendum was that they knew it to be the first step toward the Singletax. Without it the Singletax was impossible of attainment. An amendment to the Constitution had been prepared and would be submitted to the voters in 1912. It had been most carefully drawn, after months of study and consultation with the brightest minds and leading lawyers of the State and nation. More than fifty people had collaborated in its preparation and more than 100 changes had been made since the first draft had been prepared. Their experience in Missouri had demonstrated the absurdity of claims of opponents of the Initiative and Referendum that these petitions would be loosely and carelessly drawn. All amendments presented under the Initiative had been drawn after months of study and averaged much higher than any act of the Legislature. The reason is that it involves great expense to get up one of these initiative petitions and the parties willing to incur this expense are naturally interested in seeing that they are without defects and will stand the test of the courts. That had been the case with them and they believed they had an amendment that would stand any test in the future. They had the leaders of business, of banking and manufacturing back of their measure. They had behind their movement a more powerful organization than had ever been behind any movement in Missouri with the possible exception of the Prohibition movement.

"Now, what are the chances of carrying this amendment at the election? We have the leaders of industry behind us, the endorsement of organized labor, all the leaders of the farmers' organization, the American Society of Equity, the State Grange, the State Teachers, the Merchants' Exchange, and the endorsement of more than fifty other organizations."

Continuing, Dr. Hill said that the State University had adver-

tised for subjects for debate. They submitted their amendment, but it was returned by the faculty who said there was no negative to it.

There are about 700,000 voters in Missouri. About 60 or 70 per cent of these usually vote on constitutional amendments. Only a majority of those voting on amendments are required to carry it. There are 150,000 voters in Missouri whose interest in taxation is merely in the fact that they pay a poll tax. Their measure abolished the poll tax and they counted on getting this vote. There are 125,000 voters who pay a personal property tax and nothing more. They ought to get this vote. Fifty thousand voters pay merchants' licenses and these will be active supporters. They will not only vote, but give money. In addition, they have the ranks of organized labor and small property owners whose improvements exceed in value the value of the land they hold. These people would save directly in dollars and cents. So their votes can legitimately be counted on.

The only danger is that the voters might not understand what they will be doing in casting their vote. To meet this contingency they are making a special campaign. They are having a list made of all the voters of Missouri. After each man's name they are noting whether he pays a poll tax, a personal property tax, or a merchants' and manufacturers' license.

In conclusion, the Doctor said, "We have all been working to see the Singletax established in one State of the Union on November 14, 1913, and are proud to think that Missouri will be the first State to hold aloft the inextinguishable torch of Justice lighted by Henry George that is guiding the footsteps of mankind toward a higher and nobler destiny."

Mr. W. S. U'Ren, after paying a tribute to the work done in Missouri, said that if they in Oregon lost the case then before the courts, they would offer a State-wide amendment for the Singletax. There were about six counties which they had every confidence of carrying at the next elections, with the chance of carrying several more. If they carried only one county, they figured that others would be forced to come in. They had made in Clackamas County a Singletax assessment, and he quoted the following figures to show the result of their investigation:

Total valuation of all property for 1910....	\$24,234,017
Total valuation of land values, franchises and rights-of-way	15,659,685
Total exemption of labor values.....	8,574,332
Of the assessed values that would be exempt	

under the bill proposed for Clackamas County—farms, personal property and improvements—amount to.....	6,006,945
Personal property and improvements in towns and cities	2,407,580
Net exemption of public service corporation property, as compared with 1910....	157,807
	<hr/>
	\$8,574,332

In Clackamas County, in nine villages and incorporated towns, there were 1,799 improved lots, assessed for \$799,515 and the improvements assessed for \$779,680.

In the same towns and villages there were 8,155 unimproved lots, assessed for \$746,745, and more than four-fifths of the lots are unimproved, and they are assessed at less than the one-fifth that is improved, and at barely one-third of the total value of the lots and improvements.

In addition to the town and village lots, there are a number of lots platted but not included in the above, chiefly because they are suburban acreage. The lots ranging from one to ten acres, though they are classed in the assessment summary with town and city lots.

The rate for State and county purposes was 15 mills in 1910. Under the proposed Singletax bill it would have been 23.22 mills. The rate in Oregon City, a town of about 5,000, was .0085 mills, and under the proposed Singletax bill it would have been .2441 mills for city purposes.

The abolition of liquor licenses increases the rate in Oregon City nearly 100 per cent.

Fewer than 4,000 speculators own more than 265,000 acres of the 620,000 owned in Clackamas County, and six of these own more than 150,000 acres. Under the general property tax the O. & C. Ry. paid state and county taxes of about \$16,600 on 89,370 acres, and would pay an increase of more than \$9,000 under the proposed Singletax bill. About the same proportion applies to all the speculators. Their tax would be increased about one-half or more. Farmers, home owners and business men would really all obtain a reduction, in some cases even as much as one-half.

In reply to a question as to the point raised in the case before the Court. Mr. U'Ren said it was not a question of the constitutionality of their local option amendment, but a question of the lack of electoral machinery in carrying it out.

In reply to another question, Mr. U'Ren said that in the Oregon campaign they did not confine themselves to the fiscal side of the Singletax. In all their talks they took up the moral side first. They realized that they had first to convince that it was right. At the same time they did not say they were voting on the Henry George Singletax. They did not care to talk about the Henry George Singletax—that was not the question before the house. They were not voting on the question as to whether the land belonged to all the people, but as to whether improvements were to be exempt. They were depending more on what the Singletax would do when it was in operation than what they said it would do.

Referring to the Initiative and Referendum, he said that the Singletax would never have been thought of in Oregon unless they had had the Initiative and Referendum, adding, "You can not do anything in the United States in any Legislature I know of with a measure that touches the pocket books—until you get the Initiative and Referendum."

A letter was received from **Mr. J. H. Ralston**, of Washington, D. C., a member of the Commission, regretting his inability to attend.

Mr. John Z. White presented the following resolution:

"When Direct Legislation and other forms of popular government were attacked by monopoly interests in Oregon, the Fels Fund Commission devoted considerable sums to the support of the popular cause.

"At the same time the effort to secure further popular power in the form of county control of tax laws in Oregon received support from the Commission.

"The struggle to secure Direct Legislation in New Mexico, Arizona and Colorado received very moderate assistance from the Commission.

"During the year just closed Direct Legislation has received financial aid from the Commission in the sum of \$500 only in Ohio.

"The Commission has spent and is spending considerable sums in Oregon in preparation for and in prosecution of the tax battle of 1912. The same activity on a lower financial scale is taking place in Missouri.

"The Commission has aided the work of Direct Legislation because it opens the way to all other reforms—land value taxation among them, further, without reference to other matters, because Direct Legislation accords with common honesty in politics.

"In the judgment of the Commission definite political results, besides being of concrete advantage, are more highly educational than are books, pamphlets, lectures, etc. In fact,

such results are the objects of purely educational efforts. The Commission, therefore, gives its first efforts to the attainment of political results, but does not ignore efforts of a wholly educational character.

"Understanding the above to be an outline of the activity and purpose of the Fels Fund Commission, we hereby give to that Commission our unqualified endorsement."

Motion to adopt these resolutions was seconded by Warren Worth Bailey, of Pennsylvania, and carried. The Secretary was instructed to prepare the resolutions that those who wished to do so might sign them.

Mr. S. A. Stockwell, of Minnesota, spoke, endorsing the work of the Commission, and said that getting a subscription to "The Public" helped the Singletax cause more than the handing out of tracts.

Mr. Robert L. Scott, of Winnipeg, gave a sketch of the Grain Growers' Guide and the Farm and Ranch Review of Calgary. He also reported that Lethbridge, Alberta, was the latest Canadian city to exempt improvements from taxation. A majority of the city council was pledged in favor of such exemption.

Adjourned until 2 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION, NOVEMBER 25.

The Chairman announced the appointment of the Auxiliary Committee as follows: Charles S. Prizer of Connecticut; George A. Schilling of Illinois; James B. Ellery of Illinois; Robert E. Blakemore of North Dakota; Charles R. Eckert of Pennsylvania; R. F. Devine of Pennsylvania; Chas. H. Ingersoll of New Jersey; H. W. McFarlane of Illinois, and S. A. Stockwell of Minnesota.

Mr. Herbert Quick, of Ohio, author of "The Broken Lance," spoke in favor of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, which he called "The Gateway Amendment." He said that he hoped to lay before the Conference a work which must be done before any democratic work can be accomplished in this country. This was to amend the Constitution so that it would yield to popular will. The progressive movement in this country today is a big thing. Unfortunately, it is divided into two parts—the Democrats and the Progressive Republicans. These two bodies, when it came to a practical program, have, curiously enough, nothing to say worth while beyond the mere matter of State legislation. They worked for many State reforms, but what was in the national program of either embodying the principles around which they had so splendidly rallied in the domain of State politics? When it came to economic reform the progressives

in neither party could agree. Some are protectionists, some tariff reformers. As honest men, they can not agree on an economic policy on a national scale. They can agree on only one thing—the restoration of power to the people. Now there is no program of carrying people's power into the national Government. What have we in the national Government? A Supreme Court and a Senate, elected in an oligarchical manner. How is this situation to be changed? Amendments to the Constitution after getting two-thirds vote in both houses of Congress, after running the gauntlet of public opinion, must run the gauntlet of ratification by three-fourths of the States. We have reached a point of practical unamendability of the Constitution. Turkey has been called "the Sick Man of Europe." He wanted to nominate Uncle Sam as "The Ossified Man of the World."

The thing to do is to fight for an amendment which, if won, wins not only for itself but for all future amendments as well. That is the strategic point. The fight for the "Gateway Amendment" is the most important thing to engage our attention today. It is important to get the thing started to make reform easier for all time.

A written constitution holds people back. It prevents their doing either a good thing or bad thing. He stood for the right of the people to make their own mistakes. A popular law should be enacted over the heads of senates, congresses and constitutions. "The Gateway amendment" would cut the Gordian knot of constitutional difficulties and make this country a true democracy at last.

Mr. Charles S. Prizer moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"Whereas, The cause of industrial and political liberty has lost one of its staunchest champions and ablest leaders in the death of **Mr. Tom L. Johnson**, whose activities for nearly thirty years were inspired and governed by the fundamental principles of human freedom, set forth by Henry George. Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this conference records its profound regard and admiration for the man; its grateful appreciation of his unswerving fidelity to those principles, and of his heroic services and the magnitude of the work he performed to establish them."

The resolution was put to a rising vote and unanimously carried.

Mr. Louis F. Post spoke of Ella Buchanan's statuette on the Chairman's table, "Votes for Women" as " "Womanhood's Clarion Call to Women." He said it represented the spirit of democracy in the woman suffrage movement.

Mr. Bolton Hall spoke in commendation of Mrs. M. L. Johnson's Organic School at Fairhope.

Mr. Joseph Fels endorsed Mr. Hall's remarks. He also described a Singletax meeting he had held on board of the "Mauretania" during his latest voyage from London to New York. The meeting was attended by Chas. M. Schwab, Richard Croker, and others "more or less covered by bank notes." The subject of his address was "What Can a Rich Man Do?"

Once during the voyage, he had embarrassed Mr. Croker by asking him why he had been one of the crowd that killed Henry George. Croker answered, after some hesitation, "If we hadn't killed him, he would have killed us." Mr. Croker then went on to say that if he had not been bound by political ties he would have supported Mr. George.

A letter from **Mrs. M. L. Johnson**, of the Fairhope Organic School was then read.

Mr. Fay Lewis appealed for funds to help carry on this school.

Mr. Fels seconded Mr. Lewis' appeal and called for ten-dollar subscriptions; \$182 was raised within a short time.

Mr. Kiefer read a letter from Congressman Henry George, Jr., regarding the printing and circulating of one million copies of "Protection or Free Trade." In this letter the suggestion was made that the edition could be printed if thirty people would contribute \$50 each.

Mr. Fels said he knew a man in Philadelphia who would give \$500. **Mr. Kiefer** said that Mr. Fels meant himself thereby. Further subscriptions were then called for and in a short time \$1,700 had been either paid in or pledged.

Mr. A. B. duPont again brought up the matter of collecting funds for the work of the Commission. He would guarantee to raise one-half cent per capita of population in his home city of Cleveland (which would be \$2,500), and he would like to see Chicago, for instance, do the same.

Mr. George A. Schilling accepted the challenge in behalf of Chicago.

Mr. Daniel Kiefer spoke of the many calls for assistance that the Commission received. In the last mail one had come from San Francisco, and this sort of thing was going on all the time.

Mr. Fels said that the work of the Commission would get along better if no personal name were attached, and moved that his name be eliminated. He did not expect to buy fame so cheaply, he remarked.

The Chair ruled Mr. Fels out of order.

Mr. J. B. Perkins, of Springfield, Illinois, suggested that a fund

be raised to circulate "Progress and Poverty," provided it be got into the Congressional Record, as had been done with "Protection or Free Trade." He could promise \$50 from Springfield towards expense of printing and distribution.

Mr. Post showed that Mr. Perkins' suggestion was impracticable. Tom L. Johnson had needed the help of five other members to get "Protection or Free Trade" in the Record, and if the opposition had been aware of what was being done, objection would have been raised and the plan blocked. They could not be caught napping in that way again. It would require many more members to get "Progress and Poverty" in.

The matter was thereupon dropped.

Mr. Frank Parker Stockbridge told how W. S. U'Ren had convinced Governor Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, of the expediency of the Initiative and Referendum.

Mr. W. A. Douglass read an excellent poem of his own, satirizing the argument of "loyal" Canadian opponents of reciprocity.

Conference then adjourned sine die.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 7:00 P. M.

Kimball's Restaurant, Monroe and LaSalle Streets.

At the close of the supper **Mr. Louis F. Post**, Chairman of the Banquet Committee, called the meeting to order. He said that on account of some misleading statements in the press, he felt it necessary to explain why the banquet was not being held at LaSalle Hotel as planned. The management of the hotel had served notice that negroes would not be admitted as guests to the banquet hall, and suggested that the committee withdraw invitations to colored co-workers. This the committee refused to do, and as the hotel management would not recede from the stand taken, it was necessary to hold the banquet elsewhere.

Mr. Post then announced that William Marion Reedy, editor of the St. Louis "Mirror," had been selected as toastmaster, but Mr. Reedy had requested him to introduce the first speaker. In doing this he said:

"I am carried back in memory to my first year in Chicago, and to one of the most agreeable incidents of my life.

"I had been at a mass meeting in the old Music Hall, where the Field store now stands. Upon coming out, I was introduced to a lady of eighty years, whose commanding personality and democratic opinions drew me closely to her. Ever since that time, while both of us have been getting on toward eighty, I in one direction and she in the other, I have been favored with her confidence and have cherished her friendship. If we had had woman suffrage fifty years ago, and better electoral methods, she would have been a leading Senator of the United States. So at least I have often thought when I have been with her.

"This woman, and she is with us here tonight, is of the blood of old New England, democratic New England. In her early life she went to Kentucky, democratic Kentucky, the State from which we have got such other fundamental democrats as Tom L. Johnson, and Judge Tuley, and Raymond Robins. She was a democrat then, even as she is a democrat now. And she was then as now one of those democrats in principle who can recognize democracy in the concrete, no matter what kind of overcoat it may wear at the moment.

"In that democratic State of Kentucky which was nevertheless a slave state in her younger days, this woman's democracy made her an Abolitionist. This was before the Civil War, in the midst of slavery, and in the heat of the struggle over slavery. She became a woman suffragist, also because she was a democrat, when she knew of no others in Kentucky; and she is a woman suffragist yet—not because she is a woman, but because she is a democrat. When she was a Republican, she was a democratic Republican; as a Democrat she is a democratic Democrat. She was always a Free Trader, and that, too because she believed in democracy.

Her democratic principles and her acuteness at distinguishing democracy from its opposite under all circumstances, made her a Greenbacker, then a Populist, and at a still later period a Bryan Democrat. This is the reason also that she comes among us as a Singletaxer. Beneath the surface of what to some may seem like a new tax reform, she sees the bearing of the Singletax upon the social question—she recognizes its inherent democracy. No wonder, then, that she is enrolled among those who have given constant aid and encouragement to Daniel Kiefer in the difficult task he is so laboriously and efficiently performing as Chairman of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission.

"The woman of whom I have been speaking sits at my right. She has just entered upon her ninety-fifth year. Although age has dulled her hearing, her spiritual vision is undimmed. As the member of this Conference invited to nominate Mr. Reedy for Toastmaster, I am honored by him with the pleasant duty, before I make his nomination—and personally this gives me affectionate satisfaction—of introducing to you the inspiring democratic woman of whom I have tried to tell you. Ladies and gentlemen: Let us listen to Susan Look Avery:

Mrs. Avery said:

"I am incidentally asked to define money. A prize was once offered for the best definition of money. It was awarded to Mr. Henry E. Baggs of Sheffield, England, who said:

"'Money is the universal provider of everything but happiness; the universal passport to everywhere but heaven.'

"While this is strictly and literally true, it is neither a definition nor a description. Money is anything on which a Government places its stamp and makes full legal tender for debt.

"I wish to express my hearty approval of the attitude this organization has taken on the color line. We can never be prosperous and blessed as a nation until we are just to the colored man.

"We have many problems of deepest interest to be solved, to which we cannot too soon or too earnestly address ourselves. Not only the Singletax on land values, but woman suffrage, free trade the world over, and I am very desirous that honest commerce shall perform the Christian missionary work of the world. At present we are at vast expense of life and treasure sending missionaries to people who are better than we—and who would be justified in sending missionaries to us. For example, the Filipinos and the Chinese, who live up to their idea of the precepts of the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount better than we do.

"I am a lover of aphorisms. The one that oftenest appeals to me is: 'It is bad for the ignorant and the vicious to do ill, but it is worse for the educated and the honest to do nothing.' Another: 'The strongest force in human affairs is

inertia.' And Voltaire was quite right when he said: 'It is more difficult and more meritorious to win men from their prejudices than to civilize barbarians.'"

Mr. William Marion Reedy, editor of the *St. Louis Mirror*, was then introduced as Toastmaster by Mr. Post. He set out to have fun with everything and everybody and apparently succeeded. His method of introducing the speakers was informal and somewhat ironical. It consisted in remarks which might be designated as "roasts" except that in the manner there was something that indicated the matter to be but friendly exaggeration. The toastmaster prodded everyone he called upon into saying something in the nature of a "come back," and so the presiding officer got very often as good as he gave. The victims of his introductory remarks were mostly as good humoredly caustic as himself and this gave to the proceedings something of the touch-and-go quality of informal banter, as an adjunct of the more serious matter of the speeches. Mr. Reedy was very colloquial in his talk, and sometimes shockingly near irreverence, but his point of view was interesting particularly because it was not academic or cloistered. His stories had a flavor of wide experience of the world and a certain dash of cynicism, but they were relieved by patches of seriousness which also helped to give the speakers the key for their own remarks. The result was a succession of brilliant responses and a continued stirring of the audience to applause and laughter, which is the main reason for the existence of the toastmaster as a social institution. Mr. Reedy accomplished his purpose of "bringing out" others rather than exploiting himself, and on that score particularly he was voted a great success. When not witty himself he was the cause of wit and wisdom in those he goaded to their feet.

The following speakers were then successively introduced and short addresses delivered by all: W. S. U'Ren, of Oregon; Herbert Quick, of Ohio; Joseph Fels, of the United States and England; R. E. Dowdell, of South Dakota; Governor R. S. Vessey, of South Dakota; Mrs. Raymond Robins, of Chicago; Dr. Mary Hussey, of New Jersey; Mrs. Alice Thacher Post, managing editor of "The Public;" Dr. Leonora Beck, of Chicago; Robert L. Scott, of Manitoba, and A. P. Canning, of Chicago.

Bolton Hall requested that a census be taken to ascertain at what period those present had become Singletaxers. Those who had become Singletaxers prior to 1890 were requested to rise. The count showed that there were 52. Next those who had been converted between 1890 and 1900 were called upon to rise. There were 60 of them. Lastly a count was taken of the converts made since 1900. There were 81. This showing of an increasing rate of growth was received with cheers and applause.

Adjourned at 11:30 P. M.

*SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2 P. M.—PUBLIC MEETING
AT WILLARD HALL.*

Mr. W. H. Holly, Chairman.

Mr. A. B. Farmer, of Toronto, Canada, was the first speaker. He described the progress of the movement throughout the Dominion.

Mr. Robert L. Scott, of Winnipeg, spoke particularly of conditions in that city, and declared that the land value tax for local purposes is about to be adopted there.

Mr. Samuel Danziger, of Philadelphia, called attention to "My Story," the newly issued posthumous work of Tom L. Johnson, and urged all present to help in pushing its sale.

Mr. W. S. U'Ren, of Oregon, spoke on the fiscal side of the Singletax, and briefly reviewed progress in Oregon. He expressed utmost confidence in the early triumph of the movement in that State.

Mr. John Z. White, of Chicago, spoke on the Initiative and Referendum, showing the great importance of these measures.

Adjourned.

*SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 8 P. M.—PUBLIC MEETING
AT WILLARD HALL.*

The meeting was largely devoted to a discussion of the moral side of the Singletax. Speakers were Mrs. Raymond Robins, Mr. Joseph Fels and Mr. W. A. Douglass.

A paper written by Frederick C. Howe, of New York, a member of the Commission, was read by Louis F. Post.

Robert Cumming, of Peoria, read an original poem, entitled "The Parliament of Man."

The meeting then closed.