

IN MEMORIAM.

JAMES WATSON STUART.

On the 21st of June, after a brief illness, James Watson Stuart, of this city, passed into spiritual life. Of this life just ended in outward form in its splendid career of usefulness, filled as it was with noble and kindly deeds, it may with truth be said:

"His deeds inimitable, like the sea
That shuts still as it opes, and leaves no tracts
Nor prints of precedent for poor men's facts."

And such is the power of influence that noble lives have upon their fellow men, those that knew Mr. Stewart were unconsciously swayed by his strong yet gentle character and the peculiar charm of his genial nature. Because of this, more significant and filled with beauty are the poet's lines—

"So our lives
In acts exemplary, not only win
Ourselves good names, but doth to others give
Matter for virtuous deeds, by which we live."

Some twelve years ago a dozen men composing what was termed the Economic Club met alternately at their different homes for the purpose of discussing economic questions. Prominent among this little coterie was Mr. Stuart and Judge Potter, now a member of the Supreme Court of this State. It was at this time that Mr. Stuart had begun the reading of "Progress and Poverty." The wide divergence between Mr. George's teachings and those which had for generations been accepted *nemine contradicente* was to Mr. Stuart's strongly conservative nature almost startling. Mr. Stuart's fine perception of justice and his full recognition of the mandates of the moral law, however, gave perfect freedom to his splendid reasoning powers, and he accepted Mr. George's doctrines with a finely poised enthusiasm, which was of itself a promise of his zeal in after years in bringing the truth to his business associates and all others with whom he came in contact in social life.

Engrossed as he was with all the details of his business interests, he nevertheless read every work of Henry George, and purchased many sets for those of his friends he was particularly desirous of seeing accept the new political economy. Having a large acquaintance in this city among the clergy, Mr. Stuart labored almost unceasingly in an endeavor to win from many of the leading members public expression to the truths which they in private life recognized and had been brought to see through his indefatigable labors. In the dissemination of Mr. George's teachings Mr. Stuart did not confine his efforts to his home city or state.

Of his means he gave liberally in response to every call, for in teaching what he usually referred to as the "natural order" came the fixed belief that this was the world's truest religion; he deemed that he was in the service of God and was obeying the divine will by appealing to men's rationality and awakening conscience from its deadly inertia.

Of Mr. Stuart's devotion to the cause he so earnestly espoused while in life no stronger evidence is necessary than mention of the fact that by his last wishes, expressed in his will, a generous sum of money was left for the propagation of the truths for which Henry George lived and died.

It was in the home life that a full survey of Mr. Stuart's character could be had. Having never married, Mr. Stuart made his home with his sisters and brothers. Upon these kindred all the generosity of his large-heartedness was lavished with a tenderness and dignity rarely seen. How perfect seemed his ideals; he was happy only when he was bringing happiness to others. How near to the eternal light seemed such a soul. The human side struggles for supremacy over the spiritual as realization comes with chastening hand to stir the sacred memories of a friendship so loyal and of a presence that brought sunshine and gladness wherever it moved. With the words of the minstrel who sang so sweetly to the memory of his well-beloved Hallam, we, too, may say:

"* * * The man that with me trod
This planet, was a noble type
Appearing ere the times were ripe,
That friend of mine who lives in God."

JAMES A. WARREN.

Pittsburg, Aug. 12, 1905.

HOW MUCH LAND VALUE IS TAKEN
IN TAXATION?

MR. LAWSON PURDY REPLIES TO MR. C. J. BUELL—NOT POPULATION, BUT THE KIND OF POPULATION THAT MAKES LAND VALUES.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

An article appeared in the Spring number of THE REVIEW, by C. J. Buell, entitled "Equitable Taxation." Certain statements in this article I believe to be misleading, and should like to give my view of the facts.

Mr. Buell says that in the State of Minnesota about two-thirds, and in all other States where statistics were accessible from one-half to three-quarters of all State and local revenue is derived from land values. The census of 1890 gives the total State and local revenues as \$584,000,000. Of this amount 64 per cent. is stated to be derived from a tax on real estate. Part of the remainder is undoubtedly derived from a tax

on land values, but not a large proportion. Of this 64 per cent. it is safe to say that not more than half is drawn from land values, so that it would be nearer the truth to put the amount of the revenue derived from land values by State and local taxation at not to exceed one-third of the total revenue.

It is true that in cities sometimes more than half the revenue is derived from land values; this is true in the City of New York. But the amount in New York is only about two-thirds, whereas in the rural districts of New York the amount derived from land values is very much less in proportion.

In 1897 the United States Department of Agriculture published Circular No. 5, "Local Taxation as Affecting Farms." Most of the statistics were gathered by George B. Rounsevell and Edgar L. Ryder, both exceptionally intelligent men and Single Taxers. The conclusion arrived at in that report was that the unimproved value of farms is less than 40 per cent. of the improved value. In several counties of the State of New York, upon which reports were made, land values were less than 82 per cent. of the real and personal property assessed. In view of the fact that vacant land is notoriously under-assessed it is evident that Mr. Buell's statement of the proportion of tax paid on land values in the United States is fully twice the amount actually paid.

Mr. Buell says that in many States no constitutional change is needed to put the Single Tax in operation. There are only eight States which have constitutions that will permit all taxes to be levied upon land values, and in some of those States there are constitutional provisions limiting the rate of taxation which would prove serious obstacles. There are about twenty-five States in which the constitution requires the equal taxation of all property.

Mr. Buell says "When the States shall have made the changes necessary Congress may avail itself of that provision of the national constitution which provides for the apportioning of direct taxes among the States according to population." He argues that this would be fair because land values are proportionate to population. This is an old fallacy that has been put forth by distinguished Single Taxers, but has frequently been exposed. Land values are not in proportion to population: they are in proportion to the productive power of population. This includes three factors: The number of people, the intelligence and energy of the people, and the situation, fertility or mineral richness of the land. If federal taxes were apportioned according to population some poor States would have to pay to the support of the United States an amount equal to their entire land values and they would have nothing left for local expenses.

I will make a few comparisons between poor states and rich States based on the

census of 1890 which I think will show the gross injustice of apportioning federal taxes in proportion to population.

The wealth per capita in Rhode Island was \$1,459; in Montana \$3,429; in North Carolina \$361 and in South Carolina \$348. The cost per capita for State and local government was in Rhode Island \$16.50, in Montana \$20.61, in North Carolina \$1.99 and in South Carolina \$2.69.

If federal revenue were raised by a tax on land values South Carolina would have paid \$1,725,000. If it had been apportioned per capita it would have paid \$5,250,000, while the total cost of supporting the State and local governments in South Carolina was only a trifle over \$3,000,000. Now reverse the proposition. If Nevada had paid its proportion of federal revenue based on land values it would have paid \$778,391; if it had paid per capita the amount would have been \$208,670.

These comparisons can be made to the same effect between all the Southern States and the Central and Northwestern States. The cause is evident. The population of Rhode Island is compact, intelligent and industrious. Rhode Island is favorably situated to supply the markets of the world. The productive power of the people is naturally very high. In North and South Carolina a large proportion of the population is colored, ignorant, shiftless. The productive power of the people is low. In Montana and Nevada the mineral wealth is enormous. The productive power of the people is very great, and land values very high.

LAWSON PURDY.

REPLY BY MR. BUELL.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I. As to the percentage of state and local revenue actually raised from the value of land, I can speak positively only for Minnesota. In this State land is assessed separately from all other values, and always has been, and the reports of our State auditor each year will furnish the data from which the exact percentage can be obtained. For many years about two-thirds of all State and local revenue has been raised from the assessed value of land. In some rural counties, over three-fourths of the local revenue is collected from land values. This is no accident, but is the result of a deliberate policy on the part of local auditors and assessors.

II. The only other point that I care to discuss is the question of the fairness of apportioning federal taxes among the States on the basis of population. Of course my supposition is that the State would raise its share of the federal revenue as well as its local revenue by assessing land values alone. Permit me to call attention again to the fact that it does not follow that the people who live in a State would actually