

the call for the west was heard and obeyed. He came to Saskatoon, and soon after entered into a legal partnership with his present partner, the town solicitor, the two together, constituting the firm whose name is not now heard for the first time, but is known far and wide, the firm of Smith and Brown."—*Whig*.

G. Cecil Bateman, B.Sc., '05, who has held a mining position at Copper Cliff, has been paying a short visit to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Bateman, Sydenham Street, before leaving for Mexico, where he has received a more important appointment with a large mining company.

Dr. E. G. Cooper, Calabogie, died in Renfrew hospital on Monday, Feb. 19th, of typhoid fever. He was a graduate of Queen's of the class of '99.

#### MR. WHITE'S ADDRESS.

On Saturday, Feb. 17th, after the meeting of the Alma Mater Society, an address was given by Mr. John White of Chicago. Mr. White is an entertaining speaker and has quite a fund of funny stories with which to carry conviction to the minds of his hearers. Moreover, he seems to believe what he says and so is all the more apt to convince his audience.

Mr. White's specialty is the single tax theory as enunciated by Henry George. He spoke on various phases of the question, and hence, all that can be done here is to give a very brief outline of the address. There were two main ideas—the first that the existing legal order with regard to things economic is fundamentally wrong—the second that a panacea for most, if not all, the evils resulting from such a sys-

tem, is to be found in the single tax theory of Henry George.

The fundamental evil or contradiction of English law is that it tries to defend the right of the individual at the same time that it defends the claims of certain privileged classes, notably the owners of land. This, the lecturer said, is very simple and apparent. A man must have food, clothing and shelter if he is to live. These things are produced only by labor. Labor is therefore the only basis of private property. But labor is only effective when it has access to land, that is to the raw material of nature. Now if a man has a right to live he has a right to labor, and if he has a right to labor he has a right of access to nature. And if he has a right of access to nature no one has a right to forbid him that access. From which it might be inferred that private property in land was wrong. Not so, however. Private property in land is necessary. But the unfair division of land is wrong. And this injustice could be remedied by a system of taxation, which would recover the unearned increment of land. Yet English law makes such recovery impossible, and hence our modern economic evils. How different things would be if this fundamental contradiction were removed. Buyer would seek seller, the monstrous doctrines of Malthus would be eternally discredited, the laborer would get the full product of his labor, vacant lots would disappear from our cities, land speculation would cease to exist, privileged classes would vanish, and all men would have equal rights.

A discussion of the points taken up would take too much space. It may be noted that the assumption as to a man's right to live is not so simple as it seems. Again it is true that a man cannot la-