

From the Clippers . . .

Every few days, the mail brings an envelope from somewhere in the country that contains clippings; newspaper clippings, magazine clippings, and often unidentifiable clippings. They all seem intent on substantiating what we already believe to be valid. Sometimes they are accompanied by a brief note, sometimes by a cryptic letter. Most often they are simply marked up and scratched with barely decipherable marginal notes. Because they seem to be motivated by a desire on the sender's part to share, we thought we would pass the more worthy ones on to our readers.

From Romola Swope Jacobsen; *The Oregonian*, January 15, 1973

Hardly any American had as much influence on Oregon as did George, who expounded his theories on the "single tax" on land . . . William S. U'Ren, father of the Oregon referendum and initiative system was deeply bitten with George's theories and proclaimed in his later years that all his efforts to revise Oregon government had been in order to enact the single tax.

Both U'Ren and George failed in their single tax goals, but both left their stamps on American government . . .

Mrs. Jacobsen comments: "Now I know why we moved from Fairhope, Alabama to Oregon!"

From Lancaster M. Greene; *The Wall Street Journal*, March 3, 1973

. . . Wilbur Mills . . . chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee . . . would not accept any bill that contains mandatory quotas on imports. That's the sort of across-the-board protectionism that is represented by the Burke-Hartke bill.

. . . Chairman Mills does not object to giving President Nixon the power to protect U.S. business against imports with quotas . . . the difference could turn out to be more apparent than real. Industries claiming injury from imports would press hard for quotas and there would be no similar pressure in defense of the broad national interest.

Henry George News, Volume 37, Number 5

Published by the Henry George School of Social Science, monthly except July and December. Second class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

The national interest is what especially concerns Ilse Mintz, senior staff member of the National Bureau of Economic Research and a retired Columbia University economist, in "U.S. Imports Quotas: Costs and Consequences" (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 85 pages, \$3) . . .

"Industries suffering from import competition [Dr. Mintz writes] are typically those whose productivity is below (the U.S.) average and which pay the lowest wages, whereas the opposite is typically true of export industries. What the protectionist argument in fact suggests is that as much labor and capital as possible be kept in industries with low wages and productivity instead of letting such industries contract in favor of those where both factors are high even by U.S. standards." . . .

"No matter how rough [the] figures are," says the author, "they indicate clearly that quotas impose a heavy burden on consumers. . ."

Whether quotas are imposed across the board in a more selective way, the public should recognize that they are intolerable.

From Robert Sage; *U.S. News & World Report*, March 19, 1973

Farmers — thanks in part to their city cousins who are paying the highest prices ever for food — are enjoying a real taste of prosperity . . .

Dividing up the food dollar — Where the portions go:

Farmer:	33.4 cents
Retailer:	33.1 cents
Processor:	22.1 cents
Wholesaler:	6.1 cents
Transport'n:	5.3 cents

Nonfarm workers get a big share of each dollar spent for food. Of the total cost of processing and moving food from farm to supermarket, labor gets an estimated 50%.

Mr. Sage comments: "Note how they stress labor and yet do NOT mention LANDHOLDERS!" In Mr. Sage's opinion, "about 50% of these prices goes to the landholders," he adds, "Evidently the landholders don't exist. If they did, they'd be included in these figures."