

ment house is now going up was a wilderness of blackened logs and stumps 10 or 12 feet high—a scene of desolation such as no country outside of B. C. could show.

Third. But the best thing Singletax has done for us is that it has instilled into all our citizens a feeling of Civic Pride. Vancouverites are proud of their city. Let any of your spouters against Singletax in Oregon or Missouri come up here and ask them.

And we have good cause to be proud of her. Of her splendid buildings, her broad thoroughfares, her hustling industrial and commercial activity, and the independence and vigor of her people who have wrought this miracle under the fostering influence of the exemption of enterprise and industry from taxation.

To the people of Oregon and Missouri I say you can do likewise—if you have the courage. God does nothing for people who are afraid to enter the promised land.

JOHN MACMILLAN.



CORRECTION.

By an error in editing, Mr. Hermann's letter in last week's Public at pages 966 and 967, made it appear that the incidents described by him had occurred at Savannah, Mo. They occurred at King City, Mo.—Editors of The Public.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FREETRADE PRINCIPLE.

Gottingen, Germany.

It is strange how simple facts often escape us for a long time, only to spring suddenly into our consciousness—simple facts that we should have recognized long before.

I have been a Freetrader for a long time. I recognized that as a taxation system the tariff is indefensible. I felt that, as for Protection, the capitalist got the doughnut and the rest of us got the hole. Still, in discussions with Protectionist friends, it never occurred to me to argue that capital, as opposed to capitalists, actually loses by being protected—and that, too, not only from a broad world-wide standpoint but from the narrower national viewpoint.



It is an old dodge and a fair one to take an absolutely simple case which embodies all the principles.

Let us, therefore, imagine two communities so situated, and possessed of such natural resources, that one advantageously produces cotton goods and the other wool.

Suppose that if the entire community of A—produced cotton cloth, the value thereof would be \$10,000 a year, whereas they can produce only \$5,000 worth of wool goods.

B—, on the contrary, can produce \$10,000 worth of wool, and but \$5,000 worth of cotton cloth.

Under a condition of free trade and unrestricted competition A— would devote all its time to cot-

ton, B—to wool, which they would then exchange. Each would thus have \$5,000 worth of both commodities.

But some "patriotic" citizen of A— suggests that home industry should be encouraged.

For this purpose A— carries Protection to its logical extreme and prohibits imports from B—. Half its citizens now go to producing wool, for which the community is but poorly suited. The result is \$5,000 worth of cotton as before, but instead of the \$5,000 worth of wool which B— formerly supplied, the \$2,500 which the half of its workers are able to produce.

Thus the result of this system of "protection" is that with the same number of workers, the same capital, much less is produced.

That is precisely what the nations of the world are doing today—our own land being the worst offender.



I suppose this way of looking at tariff reform is very old and I've no doubt it is elsewhere much better stated. Like many another, I haven't read a great deal that isn't required for the University course. A lot of good things "have to wait" till the strenuousness of college days is exchanged for Life's comparative quiet. The idea came to me with such force that I burned to impart it. It may be that this will catch the eye of others who have never happened to think of this phase of the matter, and another nail be driven in the coffin of an antiquated tax system.



To add a paragraph that is almost entirely foreign, free trade and land reform are pretty well bound up together now in England. Free trade has made England enormously wealthy; a system of land tenure comparable only to that of such enlightened countries as Mexico and Russia has gathered that wealth in the hands of the few. Today, as The Public's correspondents have repeatedly remarked, the land question is almost the only one which excites the English electorate.

Unless the Liberal Party adopts some comprehensive scheme for Land Reform, the Tories, knowing well the value of such a war cry, are going to advance their plan. One can easily imagine how effective a land reform the land-owning aristocracy will bring forward! But by talking of housing, city improvement and a lot of details, and parading themselves as the real friends of the workman, they may well becloud the issue and win.

One shudders to think of the condition of England with her abominable system of land tenure and a high protective tariff. Either is bad; both would be insufferable.

H. B. ENGLISH,
(Rhodes Scholar in Oxford from Nebraska.)



SENATOR OWEN.

Madill, Oklahoma.

Noticing your statement to the effect that Congressmen George and Buchanan were Singletaxers in the House, and that probably Owen was one in the

Senate, I will relate an incident which occurred that may throw light on Senator Owen's attitude. When he made a speech in this town in July last, he offered to answer any question germane to the subject of his speech that any of the audience wished to ask. One of his auditors asked him this question: "Senator, do you believe that tariff taxation is the best method of raising revenue for the general government?" To this question Senator Owen snapped out an emphatic "No." "What, then, in your judgment, is the best method of raising revenue for the general government?" asked his questioner. The Senator paused a moment and then said: "There was a man sent from God, and his name was Henry George."

DAVID RUSSELL.

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, October 15, 1912.

Presidential Politics.

Mr. Wilson replied on the 8th at Topeka, Kansas, to Mr. Roosevelt's demand for a retraction of his Colorado statement as to the relation of the Steel trust to Mr. Roosevelt's campaign. On this point he said:

He interpreted my remark to mean that they were supporting him with their money. I was not thinking about money. I do not know whether they are supporting him with their money or not; it does not make any difference. What I meant was that they are supporting him with their thought; and their thought is not our thought. I meant, and I say again, that the kind of control which he proposes is the kind of control the United States Steel Corporation wants.

[See current volume, pages 970, 971.]



The Deneen faction of the Republican Party in Illinois came out against Roosevelt on the 10th. This faction had supported Roosevelt in the Republican convention and had indicated intentions of being neutral during the campaign, thereby leaving the Presidential fight in Illinois a three-cornered one between Taft, Roosevelt and Wilson, and the State fight between Dunne and Deneen. As a majority of the Progressives of Illinois insisted upon a State as well as a national party, as a condition of supporting Roosevelt, the Deneen faction was finally forced to make a choice in national politics. This they did on the 10th at Springfield. Governor Deneen said, as reported by the Chicago Tribune, which has supported Roosevelt in national politics and Deneen in State politics:

There were only thirty-four serious contests in

the Chicago convention, and Col. Roosevelt told me so himself, asking me to modify the resolution which I offered to include only the thirty-four. I did not do so and kept the figure of contests at the number which had been agreed to originally by Gov. Hadley and the Roosevelt managers. Those thirty-four delegates, had they been seated in Col. Roosevelt's favor, would not have changed the result. He would not have been nominated. He protested against the Southern and the Territorial delegates, but to my personal knowledge it was Theodore Roosevelt eight years and four years ago who prevented a change in the system of selecting those delegates, a change for which the Illinois delegation voted solidly. Then Col. Roosevelt demanded that Illinois bolt. I refused to bolt then and I refuse to bolt now. I am for the Republican ticket and it is my judgment, after a month of active campaigning in Illinois, that the Republican nominees will carry the State.

The State organizations and all of the Republican candidates on the State ticket seconded Governor Deneen. He was replied to on the 12th by Mr. Roosevelt who said, as reported by the Chicago Tribune of the 13th:

I have not hitherto assailed Mr. Deneen. Mr. Deneen has now seen fit to assail me by deliberate and willful perversion of the truth. Mr. Deneen says I asked him to limit his resolution concerning the contests to thirty-four of them. This is a falsehood. I had no private dealings with Mr. Deneen during the Chicago convention. During that convention I became convinced of his shuffling and double dealing. I grew to feel a hearty contempt for him and entirely to mistrust his sincerity and loyalty to the people's cause. All the conversations about the contesting delegates were held with literally scores of leaders. . . . Mr. Taft was nominated by twenty-one majority, and the change of thirty-four votes, therefore, would have put him some forty odd in the minority. . . . Mr. Deneen knows this perfectly well and he is trading on the short memories of people when he tries to assert the contrary is true. Mr. Deneen's statement that I was the man who prevented the change in the Southern representation four years ago is an untruth.

Governor Deneen replied to this on the 12th, as reported in the Chicago Tribune of the 13th:

I have not had time to digest it, and am not positive as to what he said. I will state this, however, as an absolute fact, regardless of anything Col. Roosevelt may say: He asked me personally to introduce a resolution at the Chicago convention asking that thirty-four contested delegates from California, Arizona, Texas and Washington be not allowed to vote in the temporary organization. This was after Gov. Hadley had introduced his resolution where the number of contests was named as seventy-two, and after the debate had been had thereon. It was not claimed at any time that Roosevelt had a majority of the delegates in the convention, and had he received these thirty-four delegates, he could not have been nominated. I attended the Republican national conventions of twelve, eight, and four years ago and on each occasion efforts were made to change the unit rules. Roosevelt and his friends prevented the change in rules at each convention. At the last