supported the amendment. James H. Barry gave his Star to our cause. The Scripps papers in San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Sacramento, Berkeley and Fresno had many powerful editorials in support of the amendment, and devoted their news columns largely to it. The San Francisco Bulletin and the Los Angeles Express favored the amendment editorially and published much news of it. Mr. Percy Millbury, editor of the Lakeport Press, not only gave the assistance of his own paper to the measure, but also regularly wrote letters to the press in his part of the State explaining it. Phil Francis had some masterly editorials in his column of the San Francisco Call, in which he punctured the thick hides of the reactionaries who opposed the amendment. We had the support of the California League of Municipalities, and many of the cities of the State.

An address in favor of the amendment was issued to the Women of California by Mrs. Fremont Older, Mrs. Lllian Harris Coffin (president of the New Era League of Women's Clubs), Mrs. Elizabeth Lowe Watson (president of the State Federation of Women's Clubs), Mrs. Lloyd Osborne (daughterin-law of the late Robert Louis Stevenson), Miss Mary Fairbrother (president of the Women's Political Club), Mrs. Elizabeth Gerberding, Mrs. James H. Barry, Mrs. Hannah Nolan and many other of California's prominent women.

Much of the credit for the splendid vote the amendment received is due to the ceaseless and untiring energy of our campaign manager, Clarence E. Todd, and his helpful wife.

This election has stirred the people of California to a serious consideration of the tax question. The opposition continually charged that the amendment was "the Singletax in disguise," and also reiterated many times that "any change in our present tax system must lead to the Singletax." So thousands are now asking: "What is the Singletax?" The papers of the State are anxious to give this news to their readers. There is no prejudice against the philosophy of the Prophet of San Francisco in California.



Our campaign commenced but a few months before the election. It was almost impossible to reach all parts of the great area of California, and organize an unknown force in that short time. But now that we are in the fight and have felt the power of the enemy, we are certain of ultimate victory. The election was but a preliminary skirmish in a contest that will continue until California has adopted a just system of taxation.

EDWARD P. E. TROY.

San Francisco, Cal., 1263 Oak Street.



THE SINGLETAX FIGHT IN MISSOURI.

Kansas City, Mo., Nov. 8, 1912.

The expected has happened. We are beaten, but not to a finish. We have really won a great victory, for we have started Missouri on the road to study wealth production and distribution as it never has been studied before. The hysteria of the farmer

of the past few months will soon pass away, and I believe he will be open to reason.

In many places in this county the election officers openly gave out word that they were to know how every man voted on the Amendments. Nothing was neglected that would intimidate against voting for the Amendments. In one county the chairmen of the Democratic, Republican and Progressive central committees issued a joint call for a meeting on Monday before election to perfect arrangements not only to defeat the Amendments, but even to see that no votes were cast for them. I presume that similar arrangements were made in other counties.

Up to within ten days of the election the indications were that we would carry Kansas City, but at the last the opposition filled the city full of scare literature and frenzied appeals to the poor man to save his home, until many of them were too confused to think clearly on the question.

In Kansas City on No. 6, 62½ per cent of the total vote was cast. In the county outside of the city 57 per cent. On No. 7, 59 per cent voted on it in the city and in the county 56 per cent. The vote as now reported is as follows:

No. 6—City	Yes	12,364	No	21,575
No. 6—County	Yes	933	No	5,884
Total	Yes	13,297	No	27,459
No. 7—City	Yes	13,878	No	18,057
No. 7—County	Yes	1,095	No	5,622
Total	Yes	14,973	No	23,679
The report from St. Josep	h is	as follo	ws:	
No. 6—City	Yes	2,722	No	6,975
No. 6—County	Yes	137	No	2,645
Total	Yes	2,859	No	9.620
	Yes	2,890	No	5.094
No: 7—City		•		
No. 7—County	Yes	233	No	2.117
Total	.Yes	3.123	No	7,211

The country vote, while negligible in this election, does not necessarily indicate that the country is not open for this question. The last three weeks of the campaign showed more active interest by the farmers in trying to understand the question than appeared in the cities.

If the work of agitation can be wisely carried on during the next two years, these measures will receive as strong support in the country as the city. I confidently believe that many of the country papers will now be glad to open their columns for frank discussion.

WM. A. BLACK.

LAND VALUE TAXATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Ø.

London, Oct. 25.

Outhwaite, Raffan, Hemmerde and Wedgwood (all members of Parliament) are speaking nightly, and the Lord Advocate for Scotland (Mr. Ure) is speaking day and night, holding up the banner of the taxation of land values in his usual vigorous way.

The war in the East occupies the bulk of newspaper space. Lloyd George was quite right in hanging up his opening speech on the land question.



Until the roar of the cannon has ceased and the war fever subsided, better things cannot get a hearing.

The land-value taxation leagues are all fairly well started on their winter campaign. A new one at Huddersfield has already arranged some thirty meetings throughout their "diocese", and the Political Economy classes are at work all over the ground.

Parliament is engaged in putting through the Home Rule Bill. Yet we have an almost daily skirmish on the land question. The Tories seem determined to drag out of Lloyd George what his intentions are, and there is a good deal of intellectual "sparring" between the Tories and the hero of "Limehouse."

At Cardiff we are on the way to a thoroughly good organization of our forces. There is a band of young fellows in Wales who are determined to have something done. A representative meeting is to be held at Cardiff on the 9th of November. They want an agent or organizer, a competent man to deal with the Welsh men in the valleys and on the hillsides, almost entirely a mining population ready and eager for our ideas. Of course we have to balance this demand for an organizer against the demand in other places in view of the financial support we can command. There is little or no money in Wales -nothing to speak of for us; but there is a glorious opportunity of cultivating most fertile and inviting ground. It is the case all over. I sometimes get weary waiting on men to match Joseph Fels's generous offer, but we must make the best of it.

JOHN PAUL.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, November 12, 1912.

Election Results-The Presidency.

No official declaration of election returns has yet been made, but the unofficial reports show such decisive results on the Presidency as to preclude the possibility of important changes in the official count. [See current volume, page 1063.]



The unofficial returns (incomplete) give Woodrow Wilson (Democrat) a popular vote of 5,740,-332, Theodore Roosevelt (Progressive) 3,856,708, William H. Taft (Republican) 3,329,849, Eugene V. Debs (Socialist) 832,700, Eugene W. Chafin (Prohibitionist) 301,321. On the basis of these reports, the electoral vote will be 443 for Wilson, 77 for Roosevelt and 11 for Taft. In comparison with the Presidential election of 1908 the above returns for Roosevelt and Taft fall nearly 500,000 short of Taft's vote in 1908; Wilson's falls more

than 600,000 short of Bryan's, Debs's is more than doubled, and Chafin's is increased by about 50,000.



Election Results-Congress.

The respective parties in the next House of Representatives will be divided about as follows: Republicans 132, Democrats 292, Progressives 11.



One Socialist who holds a seat in the present Congress, Victor L. Berger, is displaced in the next by a Republican nominated on the Democratic ticket—the result of a virtual fusion against the Socialists. Mr. Berger's vote is larger this year of his defeat than two years ago when he was elected.



Henry George, Jr., and David J. Lewis, the only pronounced Singletaxers in the present Congress, both of whom are re-elected, will be reinforced in the next Congress by seven others at the least, making the Singletax group in the next Congress as follows:

Henry George, Jr., New York (Democrat).
David J. Lewis, Maryland (Democrat).
Warren Worth Bailey, Pennsylvania (Democrat)
George L. Record, New Jersey (Progressive).
Robert G. Bremner, New Jersey (Democrat).
Stanley Bowdle, Ohio (Democrat).
Robert Crosser, Ohio (Democrat).
R. E. Dowdell, South Dakota (Progressive).
Edward Keating, Colorado (Progressive).

Among the other successful candidates for Congress are—

William Kent (independent), California.
Frank Buchanan (Democrat), Illinois.
Clyde H. Tavenner (Democrat), Illinois.
H. T. Rainey (Democrat), Illinois.
Martin D. Foster (Democrat), Illinois.
J. M. Graham (Democrat), Illinois.
Charles M. Thomson (Progressive), Illinois.
Victor Murdock (Republican), Kansas.
Thomas C. Thacher (Democrat), Massachusetts.
Edward Frensdorf (Democrat), Michigan.
James Manahan (Progressive), Minnesota.
Champ Clark (Democrat), Missouri.



Although the point is not yet settled, there is fair probability of a majority of two Democrats in the Senate. [See current volume, page 1063.]



Election Results-Governors of States.

Edward F. Dunne (Democrat) was elected in *Illinois* by a plurality of 110,654, receiving 406,293 to 295,639 for Charles S. Deneen (Republican) and 277,886 for Frank H. Funk (Progressive). In *Michigan*, Woodbridge N. Ferris (Democrat) was elected by a plurality of about 10,000; but James W. Helme, his running mate for Lieutenant-Gov-