

inquiries in Canada that Mr. Martin's attitude in British politics is not strange. Mr. Martin owns a big chunk of land in Vancouver. Until the Singletax got in its work at Vancouver, he held this land for a rise in price without the bother of having to improve it. But the Singletax, which has abolished taxation of improvements in Vancouver and shifted the burden over to land monopoly, has compelled Mr. Martin to "get a move on him." He has had to clear his land, to make streets through it, to put down sewers, to lay water mains, and otherwise to make that land a serviceable part of the planet. If he didn't make these improvements, the value of his land would eat itself up in land value taxes. Mr. Martin's prejudice against the Singletax is therefore easily accounted for.



### Flying Red Flags.

A New Jersey judge—Francis J. Swayze of the Supreme Court of that State—has probably put a quietus, in New Jersey at least, on the police nonsense about Socialist red flags. He decides that the Socialist Party is a party in American politics, that its official emblem under the law is a red flag, and that its members have the same right to make public displays of this emblem that the Democratic or the Republican or the Progressive or the Prohibition parties have to make public displays of their official emblems. None but fools and fire-eaters have thought otherwise.



### HIGH WAGES AND THE TARIFF.

That people believe what they wish to believe was never better illustrated than in the case of the protective tariff. The very word "protection" insinuates itself into one's consciousness without challenge from the understanding. Life at best is a struggle; and to maintain one's self in the commercial world requires vigilance, self-denial, and arduous toil. To be protected from the forces that bear down so hard upon humanity means an easier lot. And so ardent is the wish for this immunity that many do not stop to inquire whether the schemes devised for the purpose really do afford protection. Analysis is waived, the facts accepted, and the conclusion swallowed. The name itself is sufficient to disarm criticism.

But it sometimes happens that the interval between the promise and the fulfillment is so long drawn out, or the result is so meager, that it attracts attention. Skeptically minded persons may ask, Wherefore? They may go so far as to in-

quire into the theory. And now and then one has actually been known to question the results.



When it was proposed to reduce the high tariff enacted to finance the Civil War, action was stayed by the plea that a high tariff was necessary in order to protect the infant industries that had sprung up while foreign goods were so heavily taxed. When this excuse had served until the "infant industries" had reached such colossal proportions that even hardened Protectionists no longer dared use it, the plea was changed to a tariff to maintain high wages and the American standard of living.

Here again is a plausible charge designed to pass unchallenged. Who that is dependent upon the labor of his hands, or of his brain, wishes wages reduced? Who would have the standard of living lowered? No, no, no, let no unhallowed hand touch the Ark of Prosperity!



But are the higher wages of this country really due to the protective tariff? Is the standard of living dependent upon keeping out foreign goods?

If the protective tariff is the cause of high wages in this country, one might well ask why a high tariff does not cause high wages in Spain, in Italy, in France, or in any other European country that enjoys a high tariff. But lest Europe be too far away for a Protectionist's imagination, let the question be asked, What made American wages high before the tariff?

Not only did this country begin without a protective tariff, but it began in spite of tariffs levied against it. In the Colonial times the mother country passed onerous shipping laws, and laid burdensome taxes upon the struggling Colonists. And these oppressive measures of King and Parliament were enacted with the expressed and avowed purpose of preventing the Colonists from competing with like industries in England. Those were the days of real infant industries, and of an unnatural mother that tried to strangle them in their cradle.

Yet what was the condition as to wages and the standard of living in this country as compared with England?

For answer, it is not necessary to lean upon illusive statistics, nor to depend upon "royal commissions of inquiry into the condition of labor." We have a certain and infallible answer in the movement of population. Labor never knowingly goes from a place of high wages to a place of low wages. The fact that men of all races, creeds, and sects continued to emigrate from Europe to this country shows where wages were highest.

where opportunities were greatest, and where the standard of living was best. And in spite of oppressive laws imposed by mother country the condition of labor was so much better in this country that immigration continued in increasing volume.

Nor did this relative advantage of labor cease with the setting up of an independent government. The early tariffs levied by the young government for purposes of revenue were low, yet wages and the standard of living were high, as shown by the steady movement of population. Henry Clay, the great high priest of Protection, said, when pleading for a protective tariff, we must have protection to American factories because wages are high in this country. That is the way he put it, "because wages are high in this country." Men who would engage in manufacturing said they could not do so because the labor of the country was already employed at wages higher than they could afford to pay without Protection. Labor in the fisheries, on the shipping, in the forests and on the farms was earning more than in European countries, and would not voluntarily enter manufacturing until the population was of sufficient density to permit of economical production. But the Protectionists, impatient of delay, disregarding economic laws, and ignoring the advantages of natural conditions, sought to drive Labor into factories by taxing it in other industries.

Now, if American wages and the standard of living were higher than abroad during the struggling Colonial days, and during the early days of the Republic, so that it was necessary to have a high tariff to drive men into manufacturing, at just what time did the metamorphosis take place that changed cause into effect, and effect into cause? Who will name the day, month or year in which the tariff raised wages or elevated the standard of living?



There is a reason why certain persons in this country wish the voters to believe their standard of living depends upon a protective tariff.

In the early days, when population was flowing into the Colonies in spite of the repressive laws of the mother country, Labor fared well, and employers enjoyed reasonable profits; but there were very few rich men. The American millionaire was as yet undreamed of.

But with the advent of a Protective tariff a change came. Labor found conditions hard, and growing harder.

In spite of the utmost that unions can do, the margin of income over outgo is lessening. Men marry later, or not at all. Families are limited to

two or three children, instead of the ten or twelve of former times. Employers find themselves facing a choice between failure and joining a trust. The millionaire is unnoticed, the multi-millionaire is a commonplace, and the black flag of the billionaire is already discernible on the horizon.

Is it really a mark of wisdom on our part to accept without question the claims of these interested persons?

STOUGHTON COOLEY.



## THE TAX AMENDMENTS IN MISSOURI.\*

Generally speaking, under the Amendment relating to the subject matter of taxation, the following Missouri taxpayers will pay increased taxes:

(a.) Public service corporations, certainly, as long as their franchise values remain capitalized.

(b.) The owners of vacant and inadequately improved city and town lots, considering their availability, especially such as are located at the very centers of population.

(c.) The owners of lands speculatively withheld with a view to subdivision for future municipal needs.

(d.) The owners of idle available lands throughout the State.

The owners of adequately improved and utilized lands, considering their availability, will pay substantially the same taxes as now, the tax on the improvements being shifted to the land value, and the owners of specially well and appropriately improved lands will probably pay less.



But an exaggerated idea of the change involved is apt to creep into the public mind. Let us, then, examine the situation.

The last manual issued by the Secretary of State of Missouri gives us the following figures touching the taxable wealth of the State (using round numbers for mental comfort):

Total real estate values.....	\$1,135,000,000
Total personal property.....	359,000,000
Total public service corporation property .....	181,000,000

Or a grand total of.....\$1,676,000,000

Thus we see that real estate values now furnish about two-thirds of the taxable wealth of the State.

\*This article, somewhat more extended, was originally written for and published in The Republic of St. Louis. It was in reply to a fair editorial in opposition to the land-value-tax amendment proposed by the Equitable Taxation League of Missouri, and financed largely by the Joseph Fels Fund of America, of which Daniel Kiefer, Blymyer Building, Cincinnati, Ohio, is the chairman. As the question now before the voters of Missouri for their action at the next election is pre-