

production of iron ore than those who owned the land in fee. The sole capital invested was embraced in the steam shovels, tracks, and the necessary tools. Labor might complain of its wages, but Capital could say it was not its fault; it was dividing fairly what it got. But suppose a single company owned both land and machinery. It could then pay higher wages if it chose. But it would not. It would pay the prevailing rate in the open market, and its power to keep \$2.67½ cents plus its share of the 12½ cents, would be due to its power as a landowner, and not as a capitalist. And the value of its property, both land and capital could be determined as accurately as they were when separated in the Colby mine.

There are vast areas of mineral lands of known value, that are bought and sold on that value, yet are held undeveloped. The Singletax laid upon those known values would force them into use. Their use would necessitate the employment of capital and labor. The increased demand for labor would advance wages, not only of the newly employed, but also of those already employed. Hence, The Public feels warranted in saying that the Calumet mining company does not, because of its ownership of the opportunity, have to make terms with its laborers; but that if the Calumet mining company's opportunity—that is, its beds of ore—and all other mining opportunities, were taxed at their annual rental value, the Company would have to make terms with its men.

s. c.

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, February 10, 1914.

Congressional Doings.

The Burnett Immigration bill passed the House on February 4 by a vote of 241 to 126. The bill provides a literacy test to the effect that all immigrants hereafter admitted to the United States must be able to read English or some other language. Originally it contained a clause forbidding admission of all Asiatics, but this was eliminated to avoid diplomatic difficulties. Parties and factions were divided in the vote on the bill. Reactionaries and progressives split on the question, as also did the organized parties. The bill now goes to the Senate. [See vol. xvi, pp. 179, 203.]

The Smith-Lever Agricultural Extension bill was passed by the United States Senate on February 7 with an amendment against race discrimination in the carrying out of its provisions. The bill, which was passed by the House on January 19, now goes to conference. It provides for demonstrations on the farm of approved methods and scientific discoveries as to farming and home economics made in the State agricultural colleges, experimental stations and in the Federal Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture and land-grant agricultural colleges are to outline plans for carrying out the demonstrations. The bill appropriates unconditionally \$10,000 annually to each State. In addition a sum of \$600,000 for the coming year, with a yearly increase of \$600,000 for the next seven years, is to be provided for distribution among the States on a basis of rural population, conditioned on each State appropriating a sum equal to its portion of the Federal funds and after seven years a permanent appropriation of \$4,800,000 annually. [See vol. xvi, pp. 128, 638.]



The Senate on February 4 refused by a vote of 32 to 31 to accept the credentials of Frank P. Glass, appointed to fill a vacancy by Governor O'Neal of Alabama. The rejection was based on the ground that since the adoption of the direct Senatorial election Amendment no authority has been given the Governor to fill vacancies by the Alabama legislature. [See current volume, pages 134, 82.]



The House Committee on Mines and Mining favorably recommended on February 3 a bill for control of radium but not, as originally planned, for withdrawal of radium lands from entry. \$150,000 is to be appropriated to build government factories for its manufacture and \$300,000 to extract the radium. [See current volume, page 82.]



Wilson Opposed to Toll Exemption.

That President Wilson favors repeal of the exemption from toll for American vessels passing through the Panama canal was made clear by the publication of a letter on February 6 to William L. Marbury of Baltimore. In this letter, after paying a personal tribute to Secretary of State William J. Bryan, President Wilson says:

With regard to the question of canal tolls my opinion is very clear. The exemption constitutes a mistaken policy from every point of view. It is economically unjust; as a matter of fact, it benefits for the present, at any rate, only a monopoly; and it seems to me in clear violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.