

reverend gentlemen of the cathedral and twenty-three ushers. They took a straw vote, and there was 1 vote for Cotterill, 3 for Parish and 21 for Gill.

If we could have had our campaign apart from the mayoralty campaign, and have had time and resources, we could have won. But scores of our Singletax people had to go into the Cotterill campaign and work like nailers, for the Cotterill campaign was the important one and Cotterill is a Singletaxer and a good one. The cause of the Recall and Woman Suffrage would have received a terrible blow if Gill had been elected. Women who felt the stigma that would attach to woman suffrage, worked like beavers to defeat him. You can see how it took our best workers and how we had to keep the Singletax and the Cotterill campaigns separate. And to cap all, Oliver T. Erickson was in the hospital through most of the campaign.



The well-meaning churchmen of whom my Knights of Columbus friends told me, objected as strenuously to the Singletax as they favored Gill. Their objection was that it was Socialism. Alas the irony of fate! The official Socialists, on their advisory ballot recommending measures to be voted for and against, classified the Singletax amendments as "immaterial!"

Doctrinaire Socialists here bitterly opposed them. It frequently happened during the campaign that after we had talked at a street meeting, a Socialist would bound up as soon as we had left, and make the most reckless attack on the whole Singletax theory.

I received a letter from Mayor Stitt Wilson of Berkeley during the campaign, in which he said he was glad I was in this land-value tax campaign—that it was the next great step in the social revolution, and he shortly expected to take up the question of taxing land values in California. When I read that letter to a meeting of Socialists to which I had been invited to speak, some of them jeered at Mr. Wilson, and said he was not a Socialist at all; and Bruce Rogers, editor of the Socialist paper, said that the sooner Wilson was thrown out of the Socialist party and put where he belonged, with the capitalists, the better it would be for Socialism. At the Quiz Congress held before the primaries, the Socialist candidate for Mayor, Mr. Wells, when asked if he was in favor of the Erickson amendment, said he didn't know what it was, he hadn't read it at all.

However, there were Socialists who seemed better disposed, and we believe that a great many of them voted for the Erickson amendment. But on the whole the influence of socialistic officialdom was against it.



There were a great many meetings held by the women. It may be said that practically every Woman's Club in Seattle discussed this amendment. Besides the women who did not yet understand the question, there were women against us who did understand it. The wife of one of the most prominent of those 47 owners of Second avenue had her automobile out election day for Gill. And Mrs.

George A. Smith, who held meetings against the Singletax, was in charge of the women's campaign for Gill. It was she, by the way, who asked in the newspapers who was financing me, and got her answer through the same channels, that I was financing myself and receiving no compensation for my work from anyone.



All this is very ragged writing, but I haven't time to fix it up. Let me go on with what occurs to me about the value of the campaign regardless of immediate results. It was well worth while. Its educational value cannot be estimated. I have never seen people more aroused and interested. It caused Singletax to be discussed everywhere. The public library sent to Singletax headquarters for material; said they couldn't meet the demand for reading matter on the Singletax. The book stores all ran out of "Progress and Poverty" and other works of Henry George. Everywhere one went, on street cars, or in stores, or on street corners, Singletax was being discussed, and always earnestly. The campaign here has only begun.

We are all tired. I spoke six times some days, three times at noon and three at night, and sometimes at an afternoon meeting in between, and passed literature besides while others were speaking. Monday and Tuesday I passed out thousands of sample ballots besides making eight speeches in those two days. My feet were so swollen and sore and tired and my hands and arms and throat, that I went home and fell into bed Tuesday night at 8 o'clock when the polls closed, and I have not got rested yet.

But the Cotterill election is such a magnificent victory, we do not care for anything else.

MARGARET A. HALEY.



SEATTLE AND OVER THE BORDER.

Victoria, B. C., March 7.

The Singletax fight in Seattle was made on fundamental lines and with great earnestness. Many of the best workers, however, had their energies absorbed in the Cotterill fight, and the election of Cotterill is itself a victory. Not only is he a Singletaxer, but a militant one; and his election was in spite of the combined opposition of Big Vice and Big Business. Over and over again Big Business organs urged his defeat on the ground of his being a Singletaxer.

In this connection I wish to put in a word about Margaret Haley. This little woman's energy, ability, pertinacity and eloquence were remarkable, encouraging, delightful. Had the Singletaxers been able to secure half a dozen Margaret Haleys there would have been a victory that would have made the country sit up and take notice.

I believe that the women and small home owners were scared by the talk of confiscation. The women had not had time to look in economics much, and their fears were great because of a virtual confiscation perpetrated upon small property owners several years ago in a great re-grading and levying scheme.

I have been in Vancouver and am now in Victoria, taking advantage of the close of the Seattle campaign and the nearness of both cities to visit them before returning to Portland. The talk in Seattle of either city going back to the old way of taxing improvements is laughed at here. I have talked with men in no way related to the Singletax, nor in favor of it, and they all said that there is no possibility of going back, and no move to do so.

Newspaper men in Vancouver assured me that no such thing was contemplated. The same here in Victoria.



The development and growth of Victoria since adopting the exemption of improvements is amazing. The city seems to have awakened from a long sleep. From the window of the Times office I can see four modern buildings going up, with new ones completed at every turn of the eye. A new skyline has arisen in Victoria since improvements were exempt. This new Times building itself is a product of the exemption. Victoria has nothing here in the way of railroads or new industrial developments of magnitude not here before the change, but things are a-hum with industry and life. This town of 30,000 expects to put up buildings for 1912 of \$8,000,000 in value.

In Vancouver they confidently predict 24 millions as against 17½ millions last year, and some told me 30 millions. With the opening of the spring the rush for buildings is enormous. The trouble in Vancouver arose mainly because of an unprecedented rush of idle labor from the south. Many of the men came from the United States, driven out by the harsh command of the police. Vancouver was advertised as booming, and they came and were fed. The new Mayor was a reactionary, who thought to stop the tongues of the Socialists with a club, and applied it. The mistake was realized by him, and now the men meet and talk to their hearts' content. The result of the opening up of new camps in the timber, railroads and building has reduced the idle people to the normal.

The new labor temple in Vancouver was built, in my opinion, partly as a result of the exemption of improvements. A dilapidated old church stood on the ground. The labor men bitterly pointed out to me that they were made to pay as much taxes on that old church as a man with a good building near by. So they borrowed \$100,000 at 5½ per cent and built a magnificent structure. Some of them innocently assured me, however, that the Singletax had nothing to do with it!



I found that money at reasonable rates was easily obtained in Vancouver at the banks for *improvements of a stable nature*. They said in Seattle that the application of the Singletax had driven capital away from Vancouver.

One very striking thing in Vancouver is the compactly built city. No empty lots except where the old buildings have been torn away to make room for new ones to be built. I found one billboarded lot in the heart of the city, and asked a man why it stood there in that shape. "Oh, that belongs to

the Hudson Bay people, and they will run up a ten-story steel building on it right away. Materials ordered, contract let. Costs them just as much to hold it idle as to use it." "Can they rent it?" I asked. "They have already rented it," was the reply. "See that big building over there?" "Yes." "Well, that is the new Burns building, 18 stories; won't be finished for three months. Every room rented in it now. People will move in as soon as they are allowed to get in."



The passage by the last Parliament of British Columbia of a bill exempting improvements from taxation in unorganized districts is very significant, yet it seems to have been overlooked by Singletax news gatherers.

ALFRED D. CRIDGE.



TAX REFORM IN ONTARIO.

Toronto, March 4.

A few weeks ago the Labor party waited on Sir James Whitney, Provincial premier, to ask for certain amendments in the law. Among these was a request for local option in taxation so as to allow a lower rate on improvements and then to place a higher rate on land values.

When this request was made, Sir James informed the delegation that this demand is made by only a very insignificant number of citizens. His reply aroused the Labor men, and they determined to organize a deputation which in numbers and influence would prove the Premier to be mistaken.



Accordingly on the 2d inst. a deputation of upwards of 200 representatives from municipal councils, labor unions, tax reform associations and other bodies waited on the Government. The delegation was introduced by Mr. Stewart T. Lyon, editor of the Globe, our largest paper in Ontario. In the audience were not merely the leaders in the Labor party but also many of our leading citizens, among whom were Professor Farmer (of McMaster University), Mr. McKay (manager of the Globe), Mr. W. J. Southam (proprietor of the Ottawa Citizen), Mr. Allan Studholm (member of Parliament for the city of Hamilton) and Mr. Gregg (architect).

Mr. Hopewell of Ottawa, the first to address the Premier, urged that the municipalities be granted home rule in taxation, and pointed out with force and clearness that there are two distinct values, one caused by the individual, the other by the presence of the community. "A man," said he, "may own land here and live on the other side of the world, yet his land grows in value just as surely as if he were here. This is no new principle that we request, for the municipalities have had for many years the power of granting exemptions from taxation to manufacturers, subject to the approval of the people."

The representatives of the City Council of Toronto—Controller Church and Controller Hocken—followed. The former brought with him the report on the subject of the taxation of land values com-