ated by the superintendent of the bridge at a moment's notice. If a street railway is careful it lives because it is so. If it is good it will live; if it is bad it ought to die. Only a few years ago every railway in Massachusetts was living on franchises terminable at 90 days' notice. It is not true that capital will feel insecure under such conditions. Capital feels insecure when trying to hang on to antiquated schemes of horse cars when the public demands electricity, of five-cent fares when the public demands lower ones. The best franchise is that with the shortest life because it will live if the people want it to live, and if not, not.

"Under the present law it is almost impossible to build competing lines. With a friendly administration in Cleveland an attempt to introduce a three-cent fare line was knocked out in the courts. We went back and did it over again. It is tied up again. Now all the municipalities in Ohio and all of their governments are equally unconstitutional. There is but one, and that, Cleveland, that could not grant a franchise for three-cent fare, for two-cent fare, for one-cent fare to any company to enjoy ten minutes. There are pages of restrictions in the present law for new grants. It is almost impossible to get a new grant. It is easy to extend existing lines, but renewals —that provision can be found in a line. No competition is provided for, no property owners' consents are required. When the interests of these powerful corporations are at stake, a way has been found to protect them. In Cincinnati a renewal was even granted for 50 years, and the law says 25. To secure a renewal they have merely to win one council and they have won their fight. They don't have to wait for their grant to expire. They can get the renewal at any time. They can pick the time to make their fight. You would not allow a little city to be placed in debt by its council without making the people say whether or not they approved of this burden.

"The expiring franchises in Cleveland and Cincinnati could be sold for 25 years for more than the combined debts of those cities, in addition to paying the present owners the full value of their property.

"Make no grant valid until it has been ratified by popular vote. The council can't sell out the people then. This is safe and wise. With that one provision you can leave the rest to the city. If citizens vote to grant franchises on a five-cent fare basis that will be their concern. You require a two-thirds vote to make valid the bonding of a community, but you will give away 50 to 75 millions of the people's money without their consent if you leave the law as it is now. Don't let men ask for perpetual franchises and then come in and say: 'Leave the law as it is.' Don't let men come in and ask to perpetuate a 50-year franchise in Cincinnati that men tell me was granted through fraud. I believe it was. You need not waste sympathy on the men who hold that franchise. They took it as men buy a stolen horse, on their own risk.

"This curative act that has been proposed goes further than the present law. It gives the right of renewal before the expiration of the franchise. With a 20-year franchise a corporation under this proposed law could ask and receive an extension from the date of the expiration of its franchise for 25 years more. Or, in other words, it would be possible to obtain a 45-year franchise at any time. You have the brightest minds among the politicians to deal with. They are trying to get 45-year franchises if not franchises in perpetuity.

"Provide that in addition to the franchise becoming valid only when approved by the vote of the people that also when a grant is renewed the company shall secure the renewal that will carry passengers for the lowest rate of fare. I would treat the old companies much more fairly than their heads would treat tenants of theirs. If you should lease land of one of them for 25 years and build a house upon it, he would take the house when your lease expired. But I don't think that is right. I would do better by them than that. I would provide that the old companies should be paid a fair price on the valuation of its tracks and cars and power houses, plus some. If you provide in your code for the facilitating of the giving away of property of people you will leave behind you a code that will still be a monument to you, but anything but an enviable one."

Henry Thomas Buckle's thoughts and conversation were always on a high level. Once he remarked: "Men and women range themselves into three classes or orders of intelligence; you can tell the lowest class by their habit of always talking about persons; the next by the fact that their habit is always to converse about things; the highest by their preference for the discussion of ideas."—Chicago Chronicle.

SENATOR BUCKLIN'S REPLY TO AUSTRALASIAN TAX CRITICS.

Hon. J .W. Bucklin, in the Denver Daily News, of August 24.

At the special session of the legislature held this year the privileged classes of Colorado made a most strenuous effort to induce the legislature to repeal the Australian tax amendment. Those who were leading in that campaign denounced the amendment and its author in the most violent manner. They charged that the amendment was a fraud and freak, that it had passed the legislature and been submitted by dishonest methods and arguments, and was unworthy of respect or even decent consideration. Through the newspapers I was told the State was getting too hot for me, and I would have to skip out. It was said that the bill was an anarchist bill, and that "we do not agree with anarchists, we kill them."

This style of campaign, however, proved unsuccessful. The legislature did not pass the repeal bill, the courts would not take the question away from the voters, and for the first time the privileged classes began to realize that there was some vitality in the measure which would require respectful treatment and intelligent opposition. They, therefore, began to call out their reserved forces. Corporation lawyers and professors of political economy are now appearing in the fray, anxious to defend the owners of social values from their just burden of taxation.

OUR OPPONENTS.

The two ablest gentlemen who have yet appeared against the amendment are Hon. L. F. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol. As a rule their arguments are similar, and I shall treat them jointly.

Mr. Twitchell says that the amendment "has none of the fiscal economical or philosophical features of the Henry George theory," while Prof. Rossignol says that "it is about half single tax." Mr. Twitchell says it is "the peculiar product of its author," and bears "no resemblance to the Australasian land tax law," while the professor says that it is "similar to the system in operation in New Zealand, and to some extent an imitation of it."

Both gentlemen studiously ignore the fact that a similar law is in force in South Australia, another in New Wales, and still another in Queensland. The existence and character of the laws in these other colonies is a complete answer to the argument that the Colorado amendment is not similar to the Australasian tax laws. Messrs. Twitchell and Rossignol assert correctly that the New Zealand state tax

has exemptions of small landholders, and a graduated tax on large holders. The Australasian tax laws of South Australia and Queensland, however, do not exempt any landholders whatever, nor do the laws of New South Wales or Queensland have any graduations of any kind. Yet these laws have worked just as successfully as have the laws of New Zealand—in fact, the graduations and exemptions are generally admitted to be a blemish. If the laws in other states were the only ones which had no exemptions or graduations, however, I might have thought that a careless examination was a sufficient explanation of their incorrect position. But when we consider the fact that any examination at all of the New Zealand home rule or local option laws discloses the fact that such laws have no land exemptions or graduations there seems to be no excuse for the misrepresentations which have been made. The local option or home rule part of the Colorado law is the chief portion of it, more important by far than the other section. What the motives are of those who claim that the Colorado law differs in principle from the Australasian laws I leave it to the public to imagine. Certain it is that such allegations have no foundation in fact. These gentlemen concede that the Australasian tax has worked well in the colonies, and there is no logical reason for thinking that it will work otherwise in Colorado.

These gentlemen utterly misconceive and misunderstand the chief object and purpose in the adoption of the Australasian tax. They assume, without argument, that the main object and purpose of the amendment is to reform our land laws. Mr. Twitchell particularly does not seem to understand that we propose a tax reform, but thinks our whole object is a reform in land tenure. For this reason he does not discuss the tax question, and neither gentleman seems to understand that this amendment opens the only way in which any tax reform at all is possible. The principal tax reforms which the professor advocates could be adopted under this amendment, otherwise they would be unconstitutional.

In New Zealand the Australasian tax was adopted at two different times, for state purposes in 1891, and for local purposes in 1896. The former tax was adopted to take the place of the general property tax, and to supply the revenue needed because of the repeal of that tax. The general-property tax exempted small property holders, so the new tax made a like exemption. The land question at this time did not enter into the discussions, although the chief discussions centered around the fiscal question. The graduated portion of the law was passed with the idea of breaking up the large landed estates, but being unjust, it has not produced the desired effect so much as has the ordinary tax which contains no graduations. In 1896, however, New Zealand adopted the local option tax, similar to the Colorado amendment, purely as a fiscal measure, with almost no discussion of land tenures.

In Queensland the Australasian tax was adopted in 1890 by the conservative party purely as a fiscal reform, and without any discussion of the question of land tenures.

South Australia in 1884 adopted the Australasian tax without any exemptions or graduations, for the purpose of supplying a deficiency in revenues. There was at this time but little discussion of the land question.

New South Wales in 1895 adopted the Australasian tax without any graduations as a tax reform, to supply the deficiency caused by a reduction of tariff duties. The land question was only incidentally considered.

Nowhere in any of the colonies was the Australasian local tax adopted as a land reform, but always as a fiscal reform. Nor do such local tax laws anywhere contain graduations or exemptions. The Australasian tax is at the present time being rapidly adopted throughout New Zealand by the local governments, always as a fiscal reform. All these facts concerning the Australasian tax in the colonies both Mr. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol ignore. Their misconception of the reasons for adopting the laws in Australasia, as well as the purpose of this amendment, colors their whole consideration of the question. It makes them call the measure revolutionary, when, in fact, it is very conservative. To change land tenures might be called revolutionary, but not so a reform in taxation which merely makes it possible for the people to more equitably tax the few who own the earth. Reform in taxation is the main object we are striving for, all other objects being beneficial but secondary. Let our opponents, therefore, drop their hysterics, get down to business and discuss this question in a rational manner.

LAND MONOPOLY IN COLORADO.

Mr. Twitchell says that there is no land monopoly in Colorado. There is a large number of Spanish land grants in Colorado, some of which are as large as the largest estates in New Zealand.

There are no estates in New Zealand as large as the land ownership of the Colorado Fuel and Iron company, which owns more soft coal land, according to the statements of its officers, than exists in the entire state of Pennsylvania. In some of the counties of the state the Colorado Fuel and Iron company is in absolute control, and it owns land in a large portion of the counties.

The land grants to the Union Pacific railroad surpass any made in New Zealand.

Nor has New Zealand any landed estates or corporations which begin to compare in value with the value of rights of way and franchises of the railroads of Colorado.

In truth, Colorado is worse cursed with the monopoly of social values than is New Zealand. It is therefore time to let up on such statements as that there is no land monopoly in Colorado. It is the monopoly of land that makes the Denver Republican fight us so bitterly, and that causes it to refuse us a hearing in reply. If the privileged classes of Colorado are wise they will not force us to expose the extent to which land monopoly has already gone, especially in Denver.

But suppose there was no land monopoly in Colorado, what of it? Should we wait until the horse is stolen before we lock the stable door? Would it not be wiser to prevent land monopoly in its beginnings rather than to promise a cure for the disease after it has a firm hold on our system? Such relief would then surely be denounced as dangerous and revolutionary. If there is no land monopoly now, let us adopt this amendment so that there never will be any.

NOT SO RADICAL.

Both Mr. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol mistake the extent to which the amendment goes in local taxation. They say that it is the single tax in local taxation, and collects all local revenue by this system. This is not correct. It is not a tax system, nor does it authorize the adoption of a tax system, but only authorizes the people to make certain exemptions from direct taxation. It does not, therefore, authorize the people to abolish saloon or other licenses, which are a large part of town and city revenues. Nor does it authorize the people to abolish fees which are a large part of the receipts of coun-

ty offices. Many other local revenues are also left untouched by this measure.

These gentlemen are also inaccurate in saying that the amendment provides for a two-mill increase of state tax, on social values. It provides for not to exceeding two mills tax, but of course, no such tax would be adopted without a corresponding reduction of tax on general property.

There are so many inaccurate statements made by these gentlemen that it is not possible within moderate space to mention them all.

THE MAIN POINT.

The most noticeable thing about their arguments, however, is not their inaccuracies or misstatements, gross as these are, but the points they fail to consider. I have already mentioned their failure to consider the question as a tax reform. More noticeable still is their failure to consider or hardly mention the chief feature of the amendment.

There is one thing about the Australasian tax amendment that is so prominent that no fair consideration of the matter can ignore it, and that is the fact that it does not establish any change of any kind whatever, but merely places power in the hands of the people to make changes in the future should they so desire. This is in reality the whole question. Not whether the Australasian tax is just or unjust, but whether the people should have control of the subject; whether they are capable of local self-government. Even if all the arguments of Mr. Twitchell and Prof. Rossignol are correct in every particular, yet they have not touched the real question at issue, which is whether the people can be safely trusted with power. If they can be, then there is no good reason for opposing the amendment. Underneath all opposition to this amendment will be found a complete distrust of the American idea of self-government. Disguise it as they will, our opponents oppose this measure because they fear the people. They think or profess to think that if the people are given power they will drive capital out of the state; that they will destroy uniformity in taxation; that they will place the just burdens of the many on the few; that they will entirely exempt the cattle companies and other property on the public domain; that they will place all taxes on farmers in agricultural counties, where farmers are in the majority; that, in short, if the people of any county are given power over local taxation, they will do everything that is bad, and nothing that is good. This is their fundamental reason for opposing this amendment, not that the amendment is bad, but the people are bad. Our opponents do not discuss this feature of the question, and dare not discuss it. They know that if this feature of the measure is once understood the amendment will carry by a vote of ten to one, as was the case recently on a similar proposition in Oregon. For this reason our opponents do not discuss the initiative and referendum in taxation, which is all that is involved in the main proposition.

Already signs of rational consideration of the amendment are appearing among the privileged classes themselves. Let the amendment once be fully understood and all disinterested opposition to it will disappear like mist before the morning sun. There was a time when I thought it possible that the measure might not be fully understood, and might, therefore, be defeated. I do not fear any longer. The light that is beginning to appear absolutely insures its success. By election day few intelligent persons will be found in the ranks of its opponents. I move that the vote in its favor be made unanimous.

Now, if Plain Duty were only stylish or chic, or if she had tact or aplomb or something like that, we might brace up and pay attentions to her; but if she is merely plain, she must not be surprised if a good many of us give her the cold shake.—Puck.

When the Aryans declared in set terms that their purpose was benevolent assimilation, the savages were much struck.

"Assimilation!" exclaimed these simple people. "And does this mean that we shall be fair-skinned, too?"

"Well, skinned, at any rate!" said the Aryans, being very careful not to promise too much.—Puck.

BOOK NOTICES.

"THE NEW BOOK OF KINGS."

The announcement comes from London of a new edition of Mr. J. Morrison Davidson's little book with the above title. This new edition was doubtless called forth by the tempestuous noises of the coronation. Its subtitle is "A Republican Counterblast." The present reviewer counts among a few choice book treasures a copy of the first edition, given him by the author's brother, Thomas Davidson, the great scholar, who died about a year ago in this country. The book has been out of print for several years, and this new edition will be gladly welcomed by lovers of the principles of republican democrary.

The "New Book of Kings" takes up the lines of English sovereigns and tells simply what manner of men they really were. A black list it makes. The author tells fact upon fact—such facts as polite historians feel called upon to omit—and so

---

The Colorado Home Rule Fight.

The following letter from the Hon. John Sherwin Crosby, of New York, speaks for itself. Mr. Crosby has been "stumping" the State of Colorado in behalf of the Bucklin home rule amendment to the State Constitution, under which every county would be at liberty to exempt personal property and improvements in the discretion of its own voters. He writes:

I am on my way home from a brief sojourn in Colorado. Perhaps nothing could have added to the strength of my already fixed and firm belief in the vital importance to the whole country of carrying what is known as the Bucklin, or Australasian Tax Amendment to the Constitution of that State, providing as it does for local option and the initiative and referendum in taxation.

Participation in the active campaign there going on in that behalf has, however, convinced me that a larger fund than has yet been raised, or can be raised in the State, is absolutely necessary to the work in hand. So immediate and urgent is the need that I write on train, and would if possible impress upon all who read my letter the importance of making their contributions at once.

Senator Bucklin is making a most laborious tour of the 57 great counties of the State, speaking once or more than once every day until November 4, and paying, and preferring to pay, his own expenses, which are exceptionally heavy owing to the long distances he has to travel. He is ably and faithfully supported by as earnest and energetic a band of workers as ever championed the right. What they lack is money, comparatively little of which has as yet been received from outside the State.

There is a vast territory to be covered, but it is inhabited by a people of superior intelligence, keenly alive to questions of public welfare. If they could be provided with literature in time to be read before election day, I should feel comparatively little anxiety as to the result.

As I have already stated, money is what is needed. It is needed now—at once. It will soon be too late, and I respectfully but earnestly urge everyone interested to send whatever amount he can by next mail to Hon. James W. Bucklin, in care of the Australasian Tax League, 610 Charles Block, Denver, Col. If everyone will immediately send at least one dollar, the necessary fund will be secured in time for effective use, and success will be reasonably assured.

I write without the consent or knowledge of Senator Bucklin, whose self-reliance and modesty are equalled only by his economic wisdom, his rare political sagacity and his sincere and untiring devotion to the cause he espouses. He should receive the moral and material support of us all in this crowning effort of his long and arduous struggle to open the way to equitable taxation, and to righteous revenues, public and private.

JOHN SHERWIN CROSBY.

September 13, 1902.

This letter is published and its suggestion approved by the National Committee for the Promotion of the Australasian Tax System.

LAWSON PURDY, Secretary.
111 Broadway, New York.