

lated the enslaved people on "our marvelous prosperity," and honestly believed what they said. It seems that Ohio is about to be represented in the Senate by a statesman whose ideas are about as advanced as those of the Pharaoh of Joseph's day.

S. D.



### Commercial Inconsistencies.

One of the many things that disposes a man to think better of his kind is the interchange of commercial courtesies at the falls of Sault Ste. Marie. Upon one side of the river is a great lock and canal built by the Canadian Government, and on the other side is a still greater lock and canal, built by the United States; and the ships that pass up and down the lakes enter whichever lock offers at the moment the quickest service, for both are free. Now the New Welland canal is to make a still further extension of this commercial friendship. The new canal, which is to be ready for use in 1918, will have a capacity for the largest boats. It will be 25 miles long, 200 feet wide at the bottom, and 310 feet at the water line. There will be seven locks, each 800 feet long, with 30 feet of water on the sills. Each lock has a lift of  $46\frac{1}{2}$  feet, or a total of  $325\frac{1}{2}$  feet. The cost of the construction will be \$50,000,000. The most remarkable thing about the canal, however, and the best, is the fact that it is to be free to the shipping of both countries.



When will these two peoples, living on opposite sides of an imaginary line, tear down the artificial commercial barriers that they have erected? Why offer these inducements to trade, and then, when the trader brings in his goods, fine him for it at the custom house? How long will it be before the statesman will supplement the work of the civil engineer?

S. C.



### Curtailing Property Rights.

Those ultra-conservative individuals who object to the Singletax because it has been proposed after present property rights were established; who complain that since they have paid "good money" for their titles nothing can now limit their rights; and who further maintain that to introduce such a radical change in our system of taxation would in fact be a destruction of their property rights, will be shocked by a recent decision of the Illinois Supreme Court. The City Club of Chicago, in its campaign for the city beautiful, secured an ordinance from the City

Council limiting the use of billboards in residence districts. The lower court decided against the right of the city to pass such an ordinance; but upon the appeal of the City Club the Supreme Court has reversed the decision, and upheld the law.



This is a direct limitation of the right of ownership of land to the extent to which it goes. It takes from the owner the right to say what use shall be made of his property. It also deprives him of the revenue that he might receive from the rental of the billboard. But this decision is really in keeping with the interpretation of the laws governing the ownership of land. Years ago it was the custom for municipalities to make street improvements by a general tax on all property, and land was bought and sold with that understanding. About a hundred years ago there began a practice of making certain street improvements by means of a special tax on the land only, and that according to its frontage instead of its value, as theretofore. Thus it happened that the man who had bought the land with the understanding that pavements, sidewalks, sewers, etc., were to be put in by a tax on all property, was compelled to pay for these improvements out of his own pocket, which to that extent limited the value of what he had bought. If property owners quietly accepted the shifting of the cost of street improvements from labor products to the land, will not they accept with equal grace the shifting of the cost of police, schools, and other branches of government from labor products to land values?

S. C.



### The Right to Slavery.

Answering the question as to what he meant by "The right of every man to work where, for whom and upon such terms as he sees fit," Mr. J. F. Welborn of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company wrote as follows on December 10 to Mrs. Celia Baldwin Whitehead of Denver in answer to her question on page 1139 of *The Public*:

I want and in a modest way have been endeavoring to uphold the right of workmen to take employment with the company, of which I am an officer, on such terms as are satisfactory to both employer and employed, without the interference of a labor union to which the workmen do not belong and are opposed to joining.

The strike in Colorado has been called off, and the coal mine employes, representing a large majority of those working in the mines before the strike was called, have established their right to