

loon and others who appeared in the limelight on this proposition may now realize that while Missouri voters could be fooled in 1912, they can not be fooled all of the time.

S. D.



The Trick That Failed.

In Ohio, as in Missouri, plutocratic interests sought to push through plans of their own by appealing to ignorance and prejudice concerning the Singletax. As in Missouri, the scheme ignominiously failed. The State Board of Commerce, in order to block municipal ownership, initiated an amendment limiting the tax rate of localities and authorizing an unscientific and unreasonable form of classification of property for taxation. It endeavored to secure popular approval of this amendment by proclaiming that it would "make the Singletax impossible." But the people of Ohio either saw through the trick or do not want the Singletax made impossible, for they rejected the measure by over 200,000 majority. The State Board must now devise some other scheme to block municipal ownership.

S. D.



Wealth Without Work.

What rich man was it who said that Henry George had first shown him the one sure and safe way to wealth without work? There are others equally quick to perceive. The following advertisement appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times:

Tentative Land Value Maps of the City of New York for 1915 Prepared by the Department of Taxes and Assessments, and published today by the Record and Guide.

This issue contains 140 maps and an index map, showing the tentative front foot values of inside lots on each side of every block and of acreage where the land has not been subdivided into blocks and lots, in the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens and Richmond, upon which the assessments for the year 1915 are intended to be based, subject to correction by the Tax Commissioners. These Land Value Maps will be invaluable to any one intent upon making use of the opportunities for profitable investment that will be opened up by the new rapid transit lines.

Price, \$2.00 per copy, The Record and Guide Co., Publishers, 119 West 40th street, New York City.

Is this to be the result of pointing out to our city dwellers the immense momentary and future values in the land which belongs, or ought to belong, to them all as members of the community? Those who are to be benefited by any reform are usually less quick to see the possibilities of it than are its opponents.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

Once More: The Right to Work.

In reference to the editorial comment on page 914 on the circular of the Colorado Coal Mine Managers' Committee Mr. J. F. Welborn, president of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, sends us the following statement:

Evidently you were not fully versed in the facts of the controversy at the time the editorial was written, nor was the prominent educator and economic expert who commented on the statement of the operators in regard to the constitutional right of every man to work, where, for whom and upon such terms as he sees fit.

This strike was not the work of the managers of the mines or of any large portions of the miners, less than ten per cent of whom were members of the United Mine Workers of America. It was planned outside of the State of Colorado, led by outsiders and financed from the outside. It was brought about to shut out of employment all but miners who were members of that particular union and compel mine owners to collect for it, from the men's wages, such dues, assessments, benefits and fines, as it might levy against the workmen.

I am sure that had we yielded to the demands of the United Mine Workers of America, when their officers came into the State a little over a year ago, more men would have left our employ than for varying reasons responded to the strike call. "You must discharge every one of your 12,000 loyal and satisfied workmen unless they join the United Mine Workers of America" was the effect of the demand of the union. To have recognized it would have meant the closing of all the mines of Colorado to all workmen who would not become members of that organization.

Colorado is today turning out all the coal that the market demands. The workmen are strongly opposed to the acceptance of the truce proposal which provides for re-employment of those known by many to have been guilty of violence. Is it not our duty to protect those men who have been loyal to us and not force them into working relations with others who have murderously attacked and threatened them?



While all this is interesting it is beside the point. There was no discussion in that editorial of whether the mine owners should or should not have granted the demands of the union. The discussion concerned only their statement that in resisting these demands they were upholding a right which they claimed for every man "to work where, and for whom, and upon such terms as he sees fit." If such a right exists then it belongs to the union miners as well as non-union, and conditions must be wrong which shut them out from work in the mines controlled by Mr. Welborn. If it does not exist it can constitute no defense of the mine owners' course.



The right to work is a right that should be