

## Oregon

**J**. R. HERMANN has returned from his trip around the circle to find people in Oregon interested in taxation, and to some extent in the Single Tax. One daily paper in Portland is publishing a series of articles showing the causes of the enormous increase in local taxation of every government unit in the State. Its remedy is an income tax. Hermann has a way of forcing the issue, but press and pulpit and Grange are opposed to giving it publicity. However, he had not been back a week before he secured several hearings at different gatherings.

The president of the Oregon Single Tax League is Arthur Brock, a long time, thoroughgoing, fundamental Single Taxer, ex-president of the Typographical Union and for a number of years a member of the State Federation of Labor executive board. Dollar for dollar, more has been accomplished and more can be accomplished in Oregon for Single Tax educational work than in any other State in the Union. There never has been yet a thorough campaign made for the Single Tax. Even the proposals that were made a few years ago were always wrapped up with something else in hopes of making the principle acceptable to those who were opposed to it.

They actually received no greater percentage of votes (except one measure) than the real thing did in 1920. The one measure that carried by a small vote in 1910 was so worded that it was NOT in operation for two years, and it was then repealed BEFORE it could operate. Its repeal was overwhelming and the politicians who at first saw a new light in 1910 and flocked around to discover a possible way to office have since been flinging rocks at the Single Tax.

The small farmer was pop-eyed with fear that his taxes would be doubled under the awful Single Tax. Now the taxes have been doubled without the Single Tax, and then doubled again, not only on the farmer's land values, but on his labor values, and it is doubtful if the farmer could be so easily scared again. One daily publication recently showed where a well improved farm of 43 acres had been boosted in the past ten years 100 per cent.

The weakness of the Single Tax campaigns in the past has been the proffering of partial measures to the electorate that were easily attacked on side issues, and the failure when means were at hand to carry on a local campaign personally conducted in the different rural counties. When means were not at hand the misrepresentations permitted to go unchallenged that were made by the venal and craven press of the State could not be helped. The wonder is that so large a portion of the common people voted for the measures submitted. In 1920 the first Single Tax measure in its entirety was voted on, and wherever and whenever discussed—or cussed—it had to be on that issue and that alone.

Organized labor has repeatedly endorsed the straight and unequivocal Single Tax. It has not made it THE issue, nor has it been able to stop fighting the plunderbund-open shop, nor let up on its numerous boycotts, sufficiently to breathe into the campaigns the breath of life, but consider-

ing the cunning of the opposition to the Single Tax, the wonderful resources at the command of special privileged organizations, the bewildering array of secondary issues put before the workers, organized labor in Oregon has done well to stand pat and its official organ, the *Labor Press*, has published much Single Tax matter in the past two years, as well as affirmed the principle in its editorial columns repeatedly. In 1920 it published an advisory ticket with the Single Tax measure marked YES, although not another publication in the State did so. Organized labor in Oregon might do better, but it might have done much worse, and joined in the hue and cry against the Single Tax. Organized labor in Oregon is likely to take up as its leading issue in 1921 the industrial compensation issue which has been and is being bitterly attacked by the industrial insurance people. Could Hermann be properly equipped he would be more than likely to start such a wave of inquiry and opposition into and against the present universally unsatisfactory system of taxation that the Single Tax measure, already having over 2,000 signatures, would be overshadowing. A. D. CRIDGE.

## Pennsylvania

**T**HE Philadelphia County Committee held its annual meeting May 29th and the election of officers resulted as follows:

Robert C. Macauley, Chairman; Wm. R. Cline, Treasurer; Julian Hickok, Secretary; Earl Prevett, County Organizer. At a previous meeting a Committee of Fifteen was appointed to conduct a special campaign in selected divisions of selected wards with the object of testing out certain campaign methods. Earl Prevett, chairman of the committee, has outlined a plan to sell the Single Tax idea and the Party idea to the people by adopting well recognized principles of salesmanship.

The Pennsylvania State Committee held its annual meeting at headquarters, 1214 Spring Garden Street, Philadelphia, Pa., on June 30th. Election of officers resulted as follows:

Chairman, James H. Dix, Delaware Co.; Secretary, Julian Hickok, Philadelphia Co.; Treasurer, George A. Haug, Philadelphia Co. Additional members of Executive Committee, Earl Prevett and Charles Schoales, both of Philadelphia Co.

The following were elected to the National Committee from Pennsylvania: Robert C. Macauley, James H. Dix, James A. Robinson, George A. Haug, John W. Dix.

The State Committee recognized that the coming Fall campaign would more appropriately come under the direction of the various County Committees. They, therefore, decided to take advantage of the off-year for the State to extend the Party activities to Pennsylvania counties not yet organized. However, the committee is planning to take advantage of the proposed State Constitutional Convention movement and is working to get Single Tax representation at the convention.

JULIAN HICKOK.