

nearly all eastern people.) The other statement needing qualification concerns the height of the mountain. It is down in the books as about 14,444 feet, but I am assured that the latest surveys make the height 15,003 feet.

The location of Seattle is only less beautiful than that of Tacoma, while as a commercial center it is already apparently in the lead. Portland has about 100,000 population, and the other cities about 50,000 each, Seattle being a little the larger. No cities of equal size that I know in any part of the world are more beautifully located, and none except Geneva and Zurich can be compared with them. The Swiss cities, however, have no outlet to the sea, while those in our northwest have already a large and growing trade both with Europe and Asia. If, in the future, the Pacific becomes the great waterway of the world, these cities must grow in influence and importance. Their location compels them to be cosmopolitan in character; and the beauty of their environment makes itself manifest even in the thought and speech of their citizens. Turning from what nature has done for this region, we find that the people have already accomplished much for themselves. Their business houses would be a credit to any eastern city. Their homes are attractive, and show the same evidences of culture and refinement as are found in New York and Boston. Even the spirit of bravado and boastfulness which was common 20 years ago has almost entirely disappeared. The faces of the men do not have that eager and worn look so frequently seen on the streets of cities like Chicago and St. Paul. In one respect, however, there is a decided difference. The northwest Pacific coast shows traces of oriental and aboriginal life not found elsewhere. The Chinese and Japanese jostle the American Indian, and the comparison, in some respects, is not unfavorable to the latter. The Indians are given to practical joking and indulge their propensity in ways that the more demure Chinese greatly dread. On a steamship on which I was a passenger were many Indians and Chinese, and the former gave their oriental brethren little peace. There was no malice, but there was exquisite ingenuity in the mischief. In what may be called "the higher life" of the northwest coast, great progress has been made; as will be seen from the following illustrations: The newspapers of these cities are unsurpassed and rarely equaled in the interior or the east. The Portland

Oregonian is the oldest, and the peer of any paper in New York, and better than most that I know in Boston or Chicago. The late Charles A. Dana, of the New York Sun, is reported to have said that Mr. Harvey Scott, of the Oregonian, was one of the three greatest of American editors. This estimate is frequently repeated to strangers by Oregonians. A former associate of Mr. Scott is now editor of the Leeds Mercury, one of the greatest of the newspapers of Great Britain. The Post-Intelligencer, of Seattle, is a worthy rival of the Oregonian.—Dr. Amory H. Bradford, in The Outlook.

HOW THE SINGLE TAX WOULD AFFECT THE FARMERS.

An extract from Judge James G. Maguire's opening campaign address, made in San Francisco, September 14, as reported in the Call. Judge Maguire is running for governor on the nomination of the democrats, the populists and the silver republicans.

Although the single tax is not and cannot be an issue in this campaign, for the republican party by declaring negatively against a principle cannot commit the other party to the principle—it can only act for itself; yet I am not willing that my personal opinions on the question of taxation should be misrepresented in this campaign for the purpose of creating prejudice. They say that the single tax is intended to shift the burden of taxation from the wealthy people to the farmers. Their sympathy for the farmers may be questioned, but I shall not stop to question it now. I shall attribute the statement to ignorance. Let us see about that. The farmers of this state now pay more than 50 per cent. of the taxes for the support of the state in their direct taxes upon their homes and personal property, and indirectly upon the commodities on which the taxes paid by merchants and others are passed to them. If the farmers could have their share of the state taxes reduced to 25 per cent. on the whole they would be doing well. Let us see how they would fare under the single tax system. Land values are now assessed separately from improvements in this state, and the total amount of the land values assessment for 1897 was, I believe, \$654,000,000—the figures will be found in the reports of the state controller. Of that amount of land values assessed the city of San Francisco alone contains nearly one-third. Seven cities of the state contain more than 55 per cent. of all the land values in the state. The other cities and towns certainly contain another 20 per cent., making 75 per cent.

Of the remaining 25 per cent. not half, nor nearly half, is owned by occupying farmers; more than half is owned by speculators, by others, domestic and alien, who farm the farmers. (Applause.) Under the single tax system the farmer would pay not exceeding 12½ per cent. of the state taxes, as against 50 per cent. that he now bears. His proportion of the tax would not be more than ten per cent., because his exemptions would amount to vastly more than the increased tax upon the land value, and to the farmer the single tax would be a beneficence (applause), and it can be demonstrated from the official records, and tax rolls, I am not now advocating the expediency of adopting the single tax, because I will not be drawn aside from the issues of the present campaign to discuss questions that are not in issue. But I do say that the statement which I have just controverted is glaringly untrue.

Leading republican organs are declaring and have repeatedly declared that the single tax would drive capital from the state. Let us see about that. What is capital? Capital is movable property applied to the production of new wealth. Now all such property would be exempt from taxation under the single tax system. Would exemption from taxation drive capital out of the state? Is there any man who thinks so outside the editorial room of a railroad paper, or outside of the platform committee of a republican railroad convention? It would not drive capital out of the state. It would bring capital into the state; whether it is good or bad it would bring capital into the state instead of driving it out. Would it drive other forms of movable wealth out? No, they would be exempt, and they would flow into the state upon the same principle.

Exemption from taxation never drives wealth out of a state. But they say—they don't say it, but they intimate it—oh, it would drive the land out, there is nothing else that is useful to be driven out. So the utter fallacy of that statement becomes perfectly apparent. The trouble with all these people is that they are ignorant of the subject they are discussing, utterly ignorant of it; so ignorant that men who understand it dislike the simple task of answering them.

But they say it is a measure for the confiscation of land. Not at all. It is not a proposition to confiscate land. The confiscation of land would put an end to the single tax. Can the single tax apply to land belonging to the state? Certainly not. If it is to be taxed it must be in private occupation, and it must be

in private occupation under a tenure that will admit of taxation. If the single tax is to be continued the segregation of land into private holdings, with exclusive right of control of the private holdings, such as gives the basis and foundation for taxation, must continue to exist. And that is the purpose; that is the purpose. But I will tell you what it would stop. It would stop two men like Miller & Lux from holding 14,000,000 acres of the land of these three or four Pacific coast states and territories in comparative idleness for speculative purposes, while barring hundreds and thousands of American families from the opportunity to make homes upon the land. (Applause.)

It would distribute the burdens that are now borne by the farmers and by the manufacturers and by the merchants and by the laborers upon their homes and business and industries over all these holdings, including the holdings of the speculators, and it would impose less taxes upon the homestead owner, be he farmer or the owner of an urban home, than falls upon him now. Have you thought what a princely possession Miller & Lux have—one of them is dead, but the firm goes on—have you thought what a princely possession they are barring the people of this country away from for the mere purpose of speculation?—14,000,000 acres of land, 23,000 square miles of land nearly; 23,000 square miles of land extending across the earth at the equator would form a belt around the earth, or within a thousand miles of reaching around the earth, a strip a mile wide.

Now, if the single tax were in issue in this campaign I would point you to that kind of land monopoly on the one hand, and to the degradation of the people excluded from the land by this monopoly as one of the things that the single tax is intended to extirpate.

Cubans are incapable of self-government, say their American champions now. They will not work, it is said; but for many decades they have raised two crops annually on their soil and supported an army of officials and soldiers, besides sending many millions of dollars every year to Spain. They will not fight, it is said, also. Those who say so are defamers. The bravery of Cubans in the battle field, unarmed, unfed and unclothed during months and years of hardship and disaster, has excited the admiration of the world. Cubans can govern themselves better than Americans will be able to do; and if they are not permitted to do so, it will be an enduring shame to those who have so woefully deceived

and betrayed them.—Citizen and Country, Toronto, Canada.

Lord Glenelg told a story of Mr. Labouchere, father of the first Lord Taunton. He was employed as a young man in the great mercantile house of Hope. He applied to Sir Francis Baring for leave to pay his addresses to his daughter. Sir Francis demurred, as Labouchere, though a rising young man, had no fortune. "But if Hope takes me into partnership?" said Labouchere. "Oh, yes, if Hope takes you into partnership." Labouchere then went to Hope and intimated his wish for this arrangement. Hope in his turn demurred. "But if I marry Baring's daughter?" "Oh, if you marry Baring's daughter—" So Labouchere married Baring's daughter and became a partner in Hope's.—London Spectator.

I understand that St. Thomas' hospital is the only one of the large hospitals in London which has not suffered a considerable loss of income on account of the general depression in land values. The trustees of St. Thomas' were shrewd enough to invest their money in city property, which has steadily increased in value, yielding a corresponding income; while Guy's hospital, St. Bartholomew's and others had their property invested in rural farms, the rents of which are so much reduced that the managers find it difficult to make both ends meet.—Dr. W. S. Brown, in American Practitioner and News.

Both Saint Ambrose and Saint Augustine believe in the common ownership of land as a basis of spiritual liberty. The feeling of Saint Francis for the land, and for all the natural elements, amounted to a religion. Among thoughtful economic and religious students the conviction increases that the land problem lies behind every other problem—the problem of society, the problem of art, the problem of culture, the problem of morals, the problem of healthy living and ultimate liberty.—Dr. Geo. D. Herron.

Residents of Ponce are changing the pronunciation of the name of the town to one syllable, "Ponce," because that's United States, and they want to be like us. At the same time, people of the United States are changing their pronunciation to "Pon-tha," because that's Spanish, and they want to appear well educated.—Hartford Courant.

In a recent annual report of a benevolent society having its headquarters in Dublin, the following delightful

sentence occurs: "Notwithstanding the large amount paid by the society for medical attendance and medicine, very few deaths occurred during the year."—The Kingdom.

Villager—I'm quite well, thank yer, miss; but I ain't seed you afore. Y're fresh at it, ain't yer, miss?

District Visitor—Certainly I haven't visited you before, Mrs. Johnson.

Villager (after dusting chair)—Well, yer sits down 'ere, an' yer reads me a short psalm, yer gives me a shillin', an' then yer goes.—London Fun.

The Czar—I will build two big battle-ships.

John Bull—I will build four.

The Czar—I will build eight.

John Bull—I will build sixteen.

The Czar—Let us have peace.—Hamilton (Canada) Spectator.

"I suppose that this season," said the Elastic Skin Man, "you'll go as a Cuban reconcentrado?"

"Bah!" said the Living Skeleton, "you're outdated. I'm just a plain, ordinary United States volunteer, returned from camp."—Life.

Mrs. Dearborn (of Chicago).—Where did you say your friend lived?

Mrs. Wabash (also of Illinois).—At 2,119,226,415 Prairie avenue.—Yonkers Statesman.

"Do you really think the czar wants to disarm Europe?"

"Well, perhaps he only wants to disarm suspicion."—Puck.

THE PUBLIC

is a weekly paper which prints in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the really valuable news of the world. It is also an editorial paper. Though it abstains from mingling editorial opinions with its news accounts, it has opinions of a pronounced character, which, in the columns reserved for editorial comment, it expresses fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without hope of discreditable reward. Yet it makes no pretensions to infallibility, either in opinions or in statements of fact; it simply aspires to a deserved reputation for intelligence and honesty in both. Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department of original and selected miscellany, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest. Familiarity with THE PUBLIC will commend it as a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Free of postage in United States, Canada and Mexico, elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week. Payment of subscription is acknowledged up to the date in the address label on the wrapper.

Single copies, five cents each.

Published weekly by

THE PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, Room 522,
Schiller Building, Chicago, Ill.

Post-office address:

THE PUBLIC, Box 657, Chicago, Ill.

SUBSCRIPTION AGENTS:

Western Reserve, Ohio, OTTO PFISTER, 314
American Trust Building (Telephone, Main 1069),
Cleveland, Ohio.

Toronto, Ont., E. M. BLOOMER, 579 King St
West.