

agricultural region, the town is in many respects stagnant at the present time. There is no reason why population should not increase rapidly. But it is stifled by excessive speculation in land and the heavy taxes that fall on business enterprise of all kinds. Meanwhile the business men voluntarily subscribe to an expensive business association, the object of which is to boost the town. We have the experience of meeting would-be ventures or other industries with extremely high-priced building sites which are generally raised quickly when a new demand is suggested for them, and then, when the new enterprise actually comes, taxes are piled on good and heavy. Of course, the business association could easily be dispensed with and Wichita boomed in splendid shape if the city would only cease penalizing industry by copying the examples of Vancouver and the other cities of British Columbia that have had so great prosperity since taking taxes off of improvements. No doubt, Wichita will come to reason much quicker than if Mr. White had not been here with his most instructive address.

Wichita, Kas. HENRY WARE ALLEN.

AUSTRALIA.

We have just come through a general election, and the Labor Government has been defeated. When I speak of a general election I refer to the Federal Parliament. You will see by the report that I was run as a candidate for one of the seats. Of course, we never expected to get in. The campaign was purely an educational one. Neither of the parties in politics has any policy which gives relief to the people. Both favor high protection, both favor compulsory military training, and neither has a satisfactory policy for dealing with the land question. The labor party certainly has a progressive land tax which yields £1,300,000 per year revenue, as against £15,000,000 raised by customs and excise. And yet this party claims to be the friends of the workers.

Mr. Joseph Cook has formed a Liberal Ministry, but we do not expect any demo-

cratic measures from him. There is every possibility that we shall have a double dissolution and another election in a few months. The Liberals have only a majority of one in the House of Representatives, while in the Senate the Labor party has 29 out of 36 members. Any measure that does not receive the approval of the Labor party will therefore be thrown out. This will cause a deadlock and the Houses will be dissolved. The Labor party has had the chance of a lifetime. They have had an absolute majority in both Federal Houses during the past three years and could have made Australia a little paradise for the workers had they the knowledge of how to go to work. But instead of going for FREEDOM they went for restriction. They have more faith in Arbitration Courts and Trades Unionism than they have in giving free play to the laws governing the production and distribution of wealth. During the campaign I addressed 34 meetings and the members of the League are satisfied that good propaganda work has been done. We shall keep right on with our open air meetings and keep the protectionists going. We shall also turn our attention to the rating question. This is the time of the year to wake up the municipal councils to the need of taking polls in December at the time of the annual elections. We hope to add a few more Councils to those already rating on land values only.

E. J. CRAIGIE.

ADBLAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

MR. BALLANGEE ON FAIRHOPE.

(The following article from the *Fairhope Courier* is a reply to article in our May-June number. We deem it only fair that all our readers should see this article, presumably from the pen of E. B. Gaston, editor of the *Courier*.—Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.)

Fairhope is indebted to the SINGLE TAX REVIEW for its publication in its May-June number of an article on "Fairhope, its Problems and its Future"—by J. Ballangee—and no less to Mr. Ballangee for the preparation of the article. It strongly pre-

sents the claim of Fairhope to be recognized as a successful and valuable effort to further the Single Tax cause by actual demonstration of its benefits.

The larger part of the article, however, is devoted to presenting the writer's views regarding the policy of participation of lessees in administration of colony affairs. There is no fundamental difference between the editor of the *Courier* and Mr. Bellangee, upon this subject. Our difference is merely one of opinion about how far it is practical to go, in applying a principle to which we are both alike committed as an ideal, but which we recognize as impractical of complete application under conditions not ideal and beyond our control.

We fear that Mr. Bellangee in his article hardly did the colony justice by failing entirely to show that within the Single Tax Corporation itself most complete democracy prevails; with its modern adjuncts of the initiative, referendum and recall, available upon petition of a small per centage of the membership; and in referring to the "arbitrary authority of the Executive Council," for the Executive Council has no such authority, when its every act is subject to referendum to the membership and even its members may be removed at any time by a majority vote of the membership.

He fails also to make clear that a voluntary association for a specified purpose, such as Fairhope is, is not a "government" in the current sense at all.

He fails it seems to us to properly present the difficulty obviously arising under a condition thus stated by him: "Fairhope is growing faster than ever before, not so much by the coming of those who have mastered the Single Tax philosophy, but by increase of the number of those who accept the proffered fair dealing that it offers and who find it profitable to accept the pecuniary advantage that it affords them in restoring to them their natural rights to a share in the land." We think it may be taken for granted that those who "have not mastered the Single Tax philosophy" are not thinking much about having "restored to them their rights to the use of the earth" by the Colony, and that it is

quite unlikely that when they have secured a portion through the Colony, they will be concerned with the equal right of others to the use of land, but rather in danger of obstructing the policy which would keep all always on an equality with regard to right of access to it.

Does it not seem somewhat incongruous, too, that Mr. Bellangee should make so strong an argument for the equal participation of the people of Fairhope "without distinction of economic beliefs or relation to the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation," in the disposition of land rentals and undertakings of public services while so strenuously opposing permitting the amendment of the constitution by three-fourths of the members voting; insisting that the member without interest enough to vote, or even to keep the Corporation advised of his whereabouts so he can be reached with propositions for amendment, shall weigh against an amendment three times as heavily as an active member favoring it?

THE ASTOR FORTUNE.

None of the great fortunes are harder to justify in economic theory or in simple ethics than these fortunes based on the increase in land values attending the growth of a city. Yet thus far in this country none of the great fortunes have been subjected to less attack. The Rockefeller and Harriman fortunes have been raked by fierce criticism. The Astor fortune, while under fire from Single Taxers, has been spared, comparatively speaking. It is no extreme statement, however, that no Astor ever performed economic services to society in any way comparable to those performed by Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Harriman.—Springfield (Mass.) *Republican*.

ANTONIO ALBENDIN writes us under date of May 12: "Mrs. Albendin, her brother and myself were very pleased eight days ago to shake hands with Mr. Henry George, Jr., and family in Gibraltar."