

to vote on specially taxing the value of land—not improvements, but the bare land—of taxing extra every land-holding worth more than \$10,000, and taxing it on a rising scale so as to discourage big holdings, except for use.

If the Oregon proposals carry, working farmers will have their taxes reduced \$8 a year apiece on the average. With most working farmers the reduction will be greater. Pretty much the same effect will doubtless be produced in Missouri.

But whether the proposals carry or not, isn't as important as the fact that the questions are being discussed by the people themselves all over those States. Oregon and Missouri have become great debating societies for deciding whether industry or land monopoly shall be favored by taxation.

All of us have something to learn from those debates, for it is impossible anywhere to tax industry without favoring land monopoly or land monopoly without favoring industry.



THE RIGHT KEYNOTE.

Samuel Danziger in No. 288 of the Press Bureau
Publication of the American Economic
League, Cincinnati.

It is a rare good fortune to have this year at least one Presidential candidate who bases his arguments on sound economic principles.

That candidate is Woodrow Wilson.

It is not always popular to stick to logic and common sense in discussing current problems. There are more people who will applaud a suggestion to send trust magnates to jail than will appreciate the suggestion to deprive trusts of the privileges which give them power. More will demand an arbitrary minimum wage-law than understand the fact that more freedom instead of less is what workers need to get what they produce.

So when a candidate discusses such questions as trusts and minimum wage, and appeals to reason and logic rather than to ignorance and prejudice, there is good ground for hope that his election will result in establishing a policy that will deal with evils in such a way that their cause will be removed and make no spectacular but useless efforts to strike at symptoms.

In speaking on the trust problem Wilson leaves to his opponents the advocacy of such quack remedies as regulation, prosecution and litigation. He points to the privileges which have given them power, the privileges which his opponents would leave undisturbed, and says that these must be removed.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SINGLETAX IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Vancouver, B. C.

In the Oregon and Missouri campaigns for Singletax the statement is being made by opponents of the reform, that the Singletaxers of British Columbia are tired of their "experiment" and are anxious to have

the Singletax system repealed. Let me say that such statements are wholly and absolutely false.

The Singletax is not an experiment in British Columbia. Since 1894 we have been exempting 50 per cent of the value of improvements from Municipal Taxation. This partial application of the principle worked so well that now nearly every municipality in British Columbia voluntarily exempts the total value of improvements from taxation and finds that that works very much better.

Twenty years ago candidates for municipal offices who sought office for the sake of office boldly announced that they were opposed to Singletax. Today they advertise that they will see to it that improvements be not taxed.

And the principle is now being accepted for Provincial taxation. There is not a Singletaxer in the present Provincial cabinet, and nearly all their appointees to office are opposed to it; yet the Premier has announced that at the next session at Victoria, amendments to the Provincial revenue laws will have a prominent place on the legislative menu. The proposed new law will involve the cancellation of the old three dollar poll tax, as well as important changes in the way of reduction in personal and realty taxation. The Government holds the view that all the revenue necessary for carrying on the machinery of government should be derived from natural resources.

A few days ago an honest Tory who consistently opposes Singletax said to me: "I am afraid that this Singletax is going to be very hard to repeal, now that people have got a taste of it." That expresses concisely the feeling of the opponents of Singletax in B. C. today. More than likely the opposition in Oregon and Missouri have a premonition of this. I asked my Tory friend: "Why should it be repealed?" He replied: "It is very hard on any one who wants to hold vacant property."

Exactly. No self-respecting Drone likes to be forced out of the Hive.

Now what has Singletax done for British Columbia?

First. I have noticed in American municipalities where I lived that a small army of men are employed to chase up owners of personal property for assessment and collection of taxes. To say nothing of the unpleasantness of this inquisitorial proceeding, I noticed that the boldest liar had the lowest valuations and the man who moved oftenest and farthest paid the least taxes in proportion to the value of his personal property. In B. C. we no longer pay this army of gum shoers, and the falsifier of personal property valuations is without a vocation. A man may tell the truth about his personal property and he won't be fined for doing so.

Second. The C. P. R. Co. are, I think, the most powerful landed monopoly on the American continent. They owned 6,000 acres in and alongside the city of Vancouver. For eighteen years, under the old system of taxation, they held the greater part of this land idle, selling timber from it and waiting for a rise. Under the Singletax they got a tremendous hustle on. In three years, by employing constantly several hundred men and half a dozen logging engines, they have cleared the greater part of that land, and it sold like hot cakes and at good prices, too. Two years ago the ground on which a splendid apart-