

and we give the original story in full as part of the history of the larger thing. The larger thing is nationalization of national property, and national operation of national industrial functions. We urge careful reading of every line of this long story, under the several successive heads we have given it, from the first words of Miss Abbott in exposure of the scandal, through every paragraph, to the last words (as reported by the Washington correspondent of the Evening News of Newark, N. J.) of Congressmen Graham and George, in explanation of constructive policies of our national government that seem now to loom large out on our northwestern coast.

\* \*

### Vancouver's Municipal Lead.

Nor is probable nationalization of national industrial property and functions the only word of cheer and hope that comes eastward from the new sources of democratic empire. As in the movement for nationalization the land question appears in two of its majestic forms—government mines and government highways,—so in the taxation experiments of western Canada the same question appears in the less obtrusive but correlated and equally necessary form of taxation of land values. The center of these experiments on the American continent is now at Vancouver\*; and in its Vancouver special number the Single Tax Review renders to the Singletax cause in the United States and Canada the highest kind of service by its report upon the Vancouver experiment in land value taxation. Probably no more useful service by anyone would be possible at the present stage of the Singletax movement in this country.

\*

When Henry George came eastward preaching his gospel of social regeneration by means of what is now called the Singletax, the first great popular response he got was in New York City. After commanding conspicuous attention there for a time, his message, echoing back across the continent, was heard by a new generation beyond the Rockies, and one of the results is Vancouver. Another is Oregon, where, on our side of the international line, Singletaxers are busy building for us that object lesson in the Singletax that our Canadian brethren at Vancouver already have. The thought that germinated in Henry George's mind along that distant coast nearly half a century ago, that was fostered in the East through the labor campaigns of 1886 and 1897 in New

\*See The Public, current volume, pages 561, 630.

York and more timidly in the interval and thereafter through tax reform movements, that found a different and stronger expression under Tom L. Johnson's administration of Cleveland, that has been visible indistinctly in many places through various forms of agitation and legislation from coast to coast, has its principal seat of influence now in the great modern Northwest.

+

Vancouver's adoption of the Singletax principle as fully as any mere municipality can, more fully than any municipality of the United States outside of Oregon may, should turn Singletax attention toward that present Mecca of Singletax development in America. It is in furnishing so fully and in detail the necessary information from a Singletax viewpoint, and in a manner calculated to arouse general Singletax attention and interest, that The Single Tax Review makes its Vancouver number one well worth while to put into the hands of everybody with Singletax tendencies or possibilities. We trust that its 50,000 edition may be speedily exhausted; and this not alone for the sake of the publisher whose enterprise and service deserve that recognition, but also for the usefulness of the number and to encourage the magazine in the similar work it has projected for the future. Luther S. Dickey, the Review's investigator and reporter for the Vancouver number, has done his work admirably, with the object not so much of interesting outsiders with superficial facts and literary touches, as definitely, fully and accurately to inform. And in his work Mr. Dickey has evidently had the hearty co-operation of the editor and publisher, Joseph Dana Miller, who has handled the material with excellent editorial judgment.\*

\* \*

### Progress in Free Trade.

David Starr Jordan strikes the true note regarding Canadian reciprocity when in a letter of June 27th, published in the Chicago Examiner of July 22, he writes:

I am in favor of the reciprocity agreement with Canada. I believe in the removal of the barriers between nations which are not natural barriers. There is nothing whatever in the conditions in

\*The Single Tax Review is published at 150 Nassau Street, New York City, and all communications, whether commercial or editorial, should be sent to that address. It is published bi-monthly. The May-June number is the one devoted to Vancouver. Yearly subscriptions are \$1. The price of single copies, including those of the Vancouver special number, is 25 cents. Our notice of this issue of the Review is at page 739 of this issue of The Public.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

Canada which justifies any kind of customs collections between the two countries. If the common plea for protection on the ground of equalizing wages has any value whatever, it does not apply here. I look upon it as a step toward the elimination of all customs barriers among the nations of the continent.

That is its true meaning; and it means more—it is a step toward the elimination of all customs barriers among the nations of the earth.

+

Those Republicans who have opposed the reciprocity agreement on that ground were right in their judgment. Protection and reciprocity cannot long survive together. Every argument for President Taft's agreement is an argument for free trade. If protection can be of any benefit to farmers, then the Taft reciprocity agreement is hostile to American farmers' interests. If protection can keep up American wages, then the Taft reciprocity agreement is hostile to the interests of American wage workers. But protection does not and cannot benefit farmers (not the farmers who farm farms as distinguished from the farmers who farm farmers); nor does it nor can it benefit wage workers. Every advantage over foreigners that either has, depends upon something else than customs tariffs. And this is the reason those Republicans who believe in protection for farmers and wage workers are right in opposing the Canadian reciprocity agreement. It is indeed probably destined to be the little trickling stream through a crevice in the protection embankment that will tear the embankment away.

+ +

### Progressive Progressives.

Since the Taft reelection-organizers have seized upon the La Follette slogan, instead of making one of their own, necessity for distinction may require the followers of La Follette to emphasize the essence of the name as they have already begun to emphasize the essence of the thing. If we have to say "progressive Progressives," as we have long had to say "democratic Democrats," it is because some Progressives, like some Democrats, are so only in name. In Illinois, for instance, where Deneen has made a compact with Taft to politicianize the game under the name of "Progressive Republicans," the La Follette forces, to be led by Jones as their candidate for Governor, may have to call themselves "progressive Progressives" in order to keep out of the wrong crowd in the public mind. The difference between the crowds is plain. Whereas the Taft-Deneen party confine their pledges to abstractions, such as good government,

the La Follette-Jones party pledge themselves to specific plans for making government good. When you vote for the latter, you know what you are voting for; but when you vote for the former, what are you voting for?

+ +

### "Oh, the Mob, the Mob, the People are a Mob!"

One of the declarations of the Lincoln Protective League of Illinois, the organization the Lorimerites are rallying by for the primaries next spring, presents a platform full of novelties. Here is a specimen: "The doctrines of Abraham Lincoln never contemplated that the right to be secure in person and property should depend upon the caprice of a mob." The "mob" in this bit of Lorimerian wisdom is an allusion, as the context shows, to direct primaries and direct legislation, both of which are condemned, and quite appropriately it must be admitted, in Senator Lorimer's platform. What, then, *did* Lincoln mean when he made his undying plea for a "government of the people, for the people, and by the people?" He didn't mean "government by Jackpots," did he?

+ +

### Direct Legislation in Colorado.

By an accident, in noting the progress of People's Power at page 659 in *The Public* of July 14, we named Colorado among the States in which the people are yet to vote upon the question of providing in their constitutions for the Initiative and Referendum. It should have appeared in the list of States whose people have adopted it. At pages 39 and 265-66 of the current volume of *The Public* the proper statement is made. By reference to volume xiii, pages 1094 and 1213, it will be seen that the amendment was carried in Colorado last fall by a majority of 60,443.

+ +

### Official Terms.

The New York legislature requests Congress to submit a Constitutional amendment lengthening the Presidential term to six years and making the President ineligible for reelection. Another instance of the traditional modesty of New York's public men. They might have made the term fifty years at one leap, but they ask for only six to start with. Yes, "to start with," for the significance of these extensions of official terms is that they are expressions of the life-term idea. When the Recall is firmly established in our system of government, proposals for longer official terms will be in order, but not before. Four years is quite long enough for even so dear a man as Mr. Taft to be