

our officials. Our business men and toilers are slow to "catch on" to the remedy, but another year of such education may accomplish much.

ANDREW HUTTON,
Schenectady, N. Y.

NEW ZEALAND'S NEW MINISTER OF EDUCATION A FAMOUS SINGLE TAXER.

Editor Single Tax Review:

The chief event of interest to land reformers in this colony is the advent of the new Liberal Government, with Sir Joseph Ward as Premier and Hon. G. Fowlds, Minister for Education and Public Health. Mr. Fowlds had not been home from America more than a week when he was appointed to the above-mentioned high position. The land policy of the new Government is very progressive. Their land bill now before the House provides for the cessation of the sale of Crown lands and for the limitation of the value of land that any one person can hold. It also provides that all Crown lands are to be set aside as an endowment for education, charitable aid, and old age pensions. This land bill is welcomed by Single Taxers not altogether because they agree with every clause of it, but because it shows that the new Government is prepared to introduce important land reforms in the interests of people as against the land speculators. Only one victory I have to report for the rating on unimproved values. The Borough of Eastbourne on August 8th carried the proposal by 78 votes to 24.

Disappointment is expressed among Single Taxers here that Mr. Bryan has decided not to come to New Zealand. We would be pleased to see him here.

G. STEVENSON,
Auckland, New Zealand.

MR. FLURSCHEIM QUESTIONS MR. WAKEFIELD'S STATEMENTS.

Editor of Single Tax Review:

As you do your best to make your magazine a high class production, I think you owe it to the cause and to the paper's reputation to correct the statements of Mr. W. H. T. Wakefield on page 11 and 12 of the July number. I expect the gentleman will not take cover under the dramatized form in which he gives his ideas as those of a drummer at a railroad station, thus perhaps excusing himself with the unfortunately deserved bad reputation of many belonging to this otherwise respectable class, as far as exact truthfulness is concerned. I hope he will stand up for the figures he gives us and which are absolutely surprising. In the interest of the cause I ask him for the proof of the following statements:

1. "Farmers own only about ten per cent. of the nation's land values.

2. "The greatest land values are in the cities and towns.

3. "Mining lands alone are worth more than farm lands and yield a much larger net revenue.

4. "The land values of Chicago alone are greater than all the farms in Illinois.

5. "You can not buy enough land for a lettuce bed, or a seat for a dog kennel for five thousand dollars without going fifteen miles from the City Hall of Chicago.

6. "In Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania the bare land values of cities are twenty times the farm values; in Ohio ten times, and so on. Even in Kansas you have four or five cities in which land values exceed those of all your farms, as I find in your State auditor's reports."

And as a conclusion from this all:

7. "The farmers would pay under the Single Tax less than one-fifth or sixth of the proportion of tax they now pay."

Point 1.—As the statistics of 1900 are still incomplete I have to take those of 1890 and there the valuation of farms with improvements is 18.3 billions, while the value of the whole real estate of the country is 35.7 billions, which gives the farms 27 and not 10 per cent. of the total. But as the proportion of improvements is smaller on farm land than on city land the relation of the land alone is far greater, probably at least one-third.

Ad. 2 and 3.—As mining lands are only 1.3 billions in the same year they are only one-tenth of farm values and not more than these. If we add the 8.7 railroad values and deduct them together with farm lands from the total, leaving all other items out of account, which would reduce the remainder left for town and city lands still more, we only find 12.4 billions for this item which is less than the farms; but if we take account of the relative values of land and improvements, the city land figures far below the farm land, not above.

4, 5 and 6 are so evidently untrue that it would be wasting time to enter into them and the conclusion under 7 falls absolutely with the grounds it is built upon.

The worst of such articles is that they injure our cause more than anything else, for it is human nature to judge the whole by its parts, and if one fraction only of our arguments is based on such gross misstatements the whole of them will be so estimated, and this is hard, for our main faith that the land belongs to the people by divine right and that all our evils find their principal root in our existing land laws are gospel truth.

MICHAEL FLURSCHEIM.

MR. WAKEFIELD REPLIES.

Editor Single Tax Review:

Like other socialists, Mr. Flurschheim depends more on his feelings than his knowledge of economic facts for his principles, hence he uses expressions not demanded by