

their best. It may thus remedy the plethora of middlemen.

E. N. VALLANDIGHAM.

SINGLETAX AND THE RICH.

Waban, Mass., December 3.

In view of the claim sometimes made that the Singletax is a scheme for enabling the very wealthy to escape taxation, the following figures may be of interest. The names of the largest taxpayers in Boston (excepting corporations) for the year 1913 were published in all the Boston newspapers. Mr. Jonas M. Miles, a member of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Singletax League, computed what the tax of each of these individuals would have been if Boston had raised the same amount of total revenue by a tax on land values only, exempting buildings, personal property and polls. The actual tax rate was \$17.20 a thousand. The equivalent rate on land values only would be \$37.10.

Name.	Actual tax.	Single tax.
George R. White.....	\$ 79,687.60	\$133,856.80
Eugene N. Foss.....	41,997.24	44,976.33
Isabel Anderson.....	38,720.64	60,766.09
Abraham Shuman.....	30,904.96	51,810.15
Fannie E. Morrison.....	29,771.48	49,621.25
Eben D. Jordan.....	28,450.52	26,830.72
Lotta M. Crabtree.....	25,782.80	44,282.56
Frederick Ayer.....	24,645.88	44,627.59
George A. Gardner.....	23,895.96	13,645.38
George N. Black.....	21,343.48	37,830.87
Martha C. Codman.....	18,746.28	37,367.12

Total\$363,946.84 \$545,614.86

The increase is \$181,668.02, or nearly 50 per cent. It will be noted that only two, Mr. Jordan and Mr. Gardner, would have had their taxes reduced. Of these, Mr. Jordan had to pay taxes of over \$6,000.00 on the Boston Opera House Building, which, like any other improvement, would be exempt under the Singletax. Incidentally, the opera in Boston has not been and was not expected to be financially profitable.

The real point in the above table is, of course, not the fact that these particular individuals would have paid more taxes, but—

1. That the increased taxes shown would have forced into efficient use much valuable vacant and under-improved land.

2. That the corresponding reduction in taxes on houses, stores, factories, machinery and merchandise would have tended to keep down the cost of living for the average citizen of Boston, whether home owner, apartment renter or slum dweller.

3. That the push of increased taxes on vacant land and the pull of lower taxes on trade and industry would have combined to increase the number of jobs for workers and to make business better.

CHARLES H. PORTER.

I have made it my chief care neither to ridicule nor to deplore, nor to execrate, but to understand the actions of mankind.—Spinoza.

In the long run men hit only what they aim at. Therefore, though they should fall immediately, they had better aim at something high.—Thoreau.

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, December 8, 1914.

The President's Message.

The final session of the 63d Congress began on December 7. The President's message was not delivered until the following day. After referring to the European situation the President called attention to the fact that one result of the war was the cutting off from Central and South American people of the source from which they had obtained most of their imported supplies. The United States is ready to supply these wants but lacks a merchant marine. The President then said:

To speak plainly, we have grossly erred in the way in which we have stunted and hindered the development of our merchant marine. And now, when we need ships, we have not got them. We have year after year debated, without end or conclusion, the best policy to pursue with regard to the use of the ores and forests and water powers of our national domain in the rich states of the west, when we should have acted; and they are still locked up. The key is still turned upon them, the door shut fast at which thousands of vigorous men, full of initiative, knock clamorously for admittance. The water power of our navigable streams outside the national domain also, even in the eastern states, where we have worked and planned for generations, is still not used as it might be, because we will and we won't; because the laws we have made do not intelligently balance encouragement against restraint. We withhold by regulation.

I have come to ask you to remedy and correct these mistakes and omissions.

After urging that the Senate pass promptly the two conservation bills that have already passed the House and also the Philippine bill the President said in regard to the merchant marine:

How are we to carry our goods to the empty markets of which I have spoken if we have not the ships? . . . And how are we to get the ships if we wait for the trade to develop without them? To correct the many mistakes by which we have discouraged and all but destroyed the merchant marine of the country, to retrace the steps by which we have, it seems almost deliberately, withdrawn our flag from the seas, except where, here and there, a ship of war is bidden carry it or some wandering yacht displays it, would take a long time and involve many detailed items of legislation, and the trade which we ought immediately to handle would disappear or find other channels while we debated the items. . . . Therefore, I propose another way of providing the means of transportation, which must precede, not tardily follow, the development of our trade with our neigh-

bor states of America. It may seem a reversal of the natural order of things, but it is true, that the routes of trade must be actually opened—by many ships and regular sailings and moderate charges—before streams of merchandise will flow freely and profitably through them. Hence the pending shipping bill, discussed at the last session, but as yet passed by neither house. In my judgment such legislation is imperatively needed and cannot wisely be postponed. The government must open these gates of trade and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the government's monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable; and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance, the government ought to withdraw.

The difficulty of framing proper rural credit legislation was next mentioned but no suggestion was offered. Congress was urged to take up the recommendations of the safety-at-sea conference and to appropriate money for the survey and charting of the coasts, especially the Alaska route. After urging a policy of economy the President took up the question of national defense, saying:

It is said in some quarters that we are not prepared for war. What is meant by being prepared? Is it meant that we are not ready upon brief notice to put a nation in the field, a nation of men trained to arms? Of course we are not ready to do that, and we shall never be in time of peace so long as we retain our present political principles and institutions. And what is it that is suggested we should be prepared to do? To defend ourselves against attack? We have always found means to do that, and shall find them whenever it is necessary without calling our people away from their necessary tasks to render compulsory military service in times of peace. . . . We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel based on fact or drawn from a just and candid interpretation of realities can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or the integrity of our territory is threatened. Dread of the power of any other nation we are incapable of. We are not jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce or of any other peaceful achievement. We mean to live our own lives as we will; but we mean also to let live. We are, indeed, a true friend to all the nations of the world, because we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none. Our friendship can be accepted and is accepted without reservation, because it is offered in a spirit and for a purpose which no one need ever question or suspect. Therein lies our greatness. We are the champions of peace and of concord. And we should be very jealous of this distinction which we have sought to earn. Just now we should be particularly jealous of it, because it is our dearest present hope that the character and reputation may presently, in God's providence, bring us an opportunity such as has

seldom been vouchsafed any nation—the opportunity to counsel and obtain peace in the world; reconciliation and a healing settlement of many a matter that has cooled and interrupted the friendship of nations. This is the time above all others when we should wish and resolve to keep our strength by self-possession, our influence by preserving our ancient principles of action. . . . We never have had, and while we retain our present principles and ideals we never shall have, a large standing army. If asked: Are you ready to defend yourselves? We reply: Most assuredly, to the utmost; and yet we shall not turn America into a military camp. We will not ask our young men to spend the best years of their lives making soldiers of themselves. There is another sort of energy in us. It will know how to declare itself and make itself effective should occasion arise. . . . We must depend in every time of national peril, in the future as in the past, not upon a standing army, nor yet upon a reserve army, but upon a citizenry trained and accustomed to arms. It will be right enough, right American policy, based upon our accustomed principles and practices, to provide a system by which every citizen who will volunteer for the training may be made familiar with the use of modern arms, the rudiments of drill and maneuver, and the maintenance and sanitation of camps. We should encourage such training and make it a means of discipline which our young men will learn to value. . . . It is right, too, that the national guard of the states should be developed and strengthened by every means which is not inconsistent with our obligations to our own people or with the established policy of our government. . . . More than this carries with it a reversal of the whole history and character of our policy. More than this, proposed at this time, permit me to say, would mean merely that we had lost our self-possession, that we had been thrown off our balance by a war with which we have nothing to do, whose causes cannot touch us, whose very existence affords us opportunities of friendship and disinterested service which should make us ashamed of any thought of hostility or fearful preparation for trouble. . . . A powerful navy we have always regarded as our proper and natural means of defense and it has always been of defense that we have thought—never of aggression or of conquest. But who shall tell us now what sort of navy to build? We shall take leave to be strong upon the seas, in the future as in the past, and there will be no thought of offense or of provocation in that. Our ships are our natural bulwarks. When will the experts tell us just what kind we should construct, and when will they be right for ten years together, if the relative efficiency of craft of different kinds and uses continue to change as we have seen it change under our very eyes in these last few months?

But I turn away from the subject. It is not new. There is no new need to discuss it. We shall not alter our attitude toward it because some among us are nervous and excited. We shall easily and sensibly agree upon a policy of defense. . . . The country has been misinformed. We have not been negligent of national defense. We are not unmindful of the great responsibility resting upon us. We shall learn and profit by the lesson of every experience

and every new circumstance, and what is needed will be adequately done.

I close, as I began, by reminding you of the great tasks and duties of peace which challenge our best powers and invite us to build what will last, the tasks to which we can address ourselves now and at all times with free hearted zest and with all the finest gifts of constructive wisdom we possess. To develop our life and our resources; to supply our own people, and the people of the world as their need arises, from the abundant plenty of our fields and our marts of trade; to enrich the commerce of our own states and of the world with the products of our mines, our farms and our factories, with the creations of our thought and the fruits of our character—this is what will hold our attention and our enthusiasm steadily, now and in the years to come, as we strive to show in our life as a nation what liberty and the inspirations of an emancipated spirit may do for men and for societies, for individuals, for states and for mankind.

[See current volume, page 1045.]



Progressive Party Meeting.

The Progressive Party National Committee in Chicago on December 3 decided to maintain the party organization. In its public statement it declares that at the recent election it received 1,750,000 votes and had made encouraging progress in southern States, especially Louisiana and Georgia. It states farther:

The industrial depression and the consequent reaction against the Democratic tariff was undoubtedly the issue which primarily determined the reactionary results of the recent elections.

Both the Republican and the Democratic parties have passed tariffs by the old method of log-rolling and the people have now successively repudiated them both.

As long as the tariff is made in politics and log-rolling there can be no stability of industrial conditions and business can have no peace. The way to provide stable industrial conditions and business peace is to accept the principle of protection as a fixed national policy and take the tariff out of politics.

The Progressive party specifically declared this doctrine in its platform of 1912 and pointed out that the only way to take the tariff out of politics was by the creation of a permanent expert non-partisan tariff commission.

We call attention to the necessity of prompt action on the Murdock tariff commission bill introduced in May, 1913.

Progressive principles are permanent, and now more than ever it is evident that the Progressive party is the necessary organ for their realization.

It was also decided that the committee be called to meet again in January, 1916, to prepare for the presidential campaign. [See current volume, page 1096.]

Militarists Become Active.

The National Security League was formed at New York on December 1. It is designed to carry on an active propaganda for increasing the army and navy and strengthening of the coast defenses. To that end it passed resolutions urging prompt action on a resolution to be introduced in Congress by Representative Gardner of Massachusetts for an investigation of the condition of the armament of the United States.



Commission on Industrial Relations.

In a statement to the Commission on Industrial Relations at Denver on December 2, Governor Ammons of Colorado gave his views on happenings during the strike. He said that since the last of the million dollar bond issue had been sold to pay expenses of the militia, the President has been asked to withdraw the federal troops. He thought that there would have been no trouble had the miners not insisted on recognition of the union. He declared himself in favor of a mediation act. J. C. Osgood, president of the Victor American Coal Company, told of the hiring of mine guards and purchase of machine guns by the company. He said that no miner employed by his company had made any complaint about wages or conditions before the strike. The majority of the men, he said, object to an eight-hour day that curtails their earning capacity. Governor-elect George A. Carlson declared his intention to recommend to the legislature an act to create an industrial commission to handle all strike troubles in the future, and also to draft labor legislation that would seem to be needed. John McLennan, president of the local miners' union, testified on December 4 and retold the whole history of the strike. Former United States Senator Thomas M. Patterson declared that the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company had intentionally employed foreign miners of different nationalities to prevent co-operation among the men. He said that in elections the coal camps returned almost unanimous majorities for whatever the companies wanted. Jesse F. Welborn, president of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, took the stand on December 5. He was questioned by Chairman Frank J. Walsh, who asked him concerning instructions said to have been sent regarding conduct of the strike by directors of the Rockefeller Foundation. Walsh also asked him concerning the identity of the press agent who has prepared the matter justifying the company's attitude which has been sent in pamphlet form to legislators, congressmen, editors, teachers and others supposed to have influence. He admitted that this press agent is private secretary of a railroad president in Pennsylvania, but declined to say anything more. He told of having ordered \$25,000 worth of arms and ammunition to be used against