

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 Arvans, 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 democracy.

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 18, 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.