

The benefits of English free trade have been absorbed by English land owners; but when the principle involved in the Lloyd-George Budget shall have been carried to its logical conclusion, the benefits that heretofore have been intercepted by the landowners will be distributed among the workers.

So Germany, when she had completed the circle of special privilege exploitation, and was on the point of inevitable decline, turned to the taxation of ground rent. Thus there are two forces at work in the German Empire: (1) Commercial restriction, which must lead ultimately to business stagnation; and (2) the taxing of the unearned increment of land, which with equal certainty will lead, if perceptively pursued, to permanent prosperity.

It is peculiarly providential that Germany should have turned to the taxation of rent at the very moment when she had reached the limit of expansion by the exploitation of special privileges. But for that, her decline would have been as dramatic as her rise. Her remarkable progress has been in spite of commercial restrictions; its continuance will depend upon the taking of ground rent for public use, and the freeing of industry from the burden of double taxation.

Were it necessary to choose between a protective tariff and the taxation of ground rent, on the one hand, and free trade and the taxation of industry but without taxation of ground rent, on the other, the former were far preferable.

German conditions, so far from disproving the doctrine of laissez-faire, may be destined to establish its validity.

STOUGHTON COOLEY.

## CONDENSED EDITORIALS

### THE NEW PARTY.

Louis F. Post, in the Chicago Daily Press of Aug. 10.

The first new party of staying qualities and national size in fifty years, seems to have come. No other was national in size; and although all came to stay, none stayed.

There was the Greenback Party. It won elections in a few States, and then petered out—"Benbutlered" out, as folks said.

Then the Populists. They also won in spots; and though they still have a committee for their party, there is no party for their committee.

Labor parties also there were in those historic fifty years, but they were short-lived and their successes few and local.

There is still a Socialist Party—two of them. But the Socialist vote, 5 per cent, gives poor promise of size, however long the stay. This party doesn't set up to be a new party, either; it sets up to be a new nation.

Since the days, then, of Fremont, when the Republican party was born, no new party with staying qualities has come into American politics until now—if it has now.

Ex-President Roosevelt says, "Let there be a new party of staying qualities and national size!" and, lo! there seems to be one.

This party has more "higher-ups" in its leadership than any other since 1856. Even ex-President Van Buren, who led a new party before that, hadn't the support of such leaders from old parties as ex-President Roosevelt has.

But is Roosevelt's Party here to stay?

Only political prophets can answer that question, now. And political prophecy usually springs from wishes more than knowledges.

Nevertheless, this new party has a tremendous meaning with reference to democracy.

Not party democracy, but fundamental democracy. The democracy of principle. The democracy of the Declaration of Independence, where it says that "all men are created equal." And not that this new party stands up straight for democratic principle. It does not—not straight.

Yet it has tremendous meaning with reference to democracy. It is a product of democracy. As bread (poor, good, better or best) is a product of yeast working in flour, so this party is a product of democracy working in American politics.

It may prove to be the product for our country and generation.

Or it may not. It may be dog-day politics and wither with the frost.

Whether it does or no, here is a bit of advice about it. The advice of a clear-headed American democrat of principle, it is as good now as when he uttered it: "How you vote doesn't make much difference, but how you think does; for if you think right, you will vote right."



### WHY WOMEN SHOULD VOTE.

Newton D. Baker, Mayor of Cleveland, in The Woman Voter for August.

Ohio women should vote because Ohio is now recognized as one of the most progressive States in the American Union. Its legislation is beginning to represent the real vital interests of its people. This can never be fully realized until all of its people participate in making and approving its laws. This is not a man's government, but a people's government; and as nature has made emotional and intellectual differences among people, that aggregate of the public conscience and intelligence which is the basis of all sound law ought to include the varying opinions and feelings of all the people.

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

### REACTIONARY NEW HAMPSHIRE.\*

East Jaffrey, N. H.

The sixth New Hampshire Constitutional Convention passed into history when it finally adjourned at 11 o'clock on Saturday, June 22. Although the

\*See Public of June 23, page 609.

State has been classed as Progressive for the past few years owing to the efforts of Winston Churchill, Gov. Bass and others, yet sufficient attention was not given to the nomination of delegates, and the Convention was largely composed of reactionaries.

Edwin F. Jones, of Manchester, law partner of U. S. Sen. Burnham and of counsel for the great Amoskeag Company, was chosen President, and the leaders of those who thought the Constitution needed little "tinkering" were former Attorney-General E. G. Eastman of Exeter, Judge Mitchell of the Superior Court, Hon. James O. Lyford, naval officer of the Port of Boston, and Judge J. M. Barton of Newport, chairman of the Republican State committee. The Convention was composed of 409 members, there being at least one from each town, consequently there were a large number who had not studied contemporary politics sufficiently to realize the necessity for radical improvement in the organic law. Couple to this the fact that delegates were nominated under the old caucus system and not under the direct primary, and it will be understood why the Convention was chiefly composed of "best" citizens who were perfectly satisfied with things as they are.

The first pitched battle occurred over a resolution of my own, which provided for the Referendum on measures passed and rejected by the legislature, the legislative Referendum, and the submission of Constitutional amendments by the legislature and by the Initiative, and which was championed by Allen Hollis of Concord, R. B. Stevens of Landaff (respectively counsel and assistant counsel of the new Public Service Commission), R. B. Wolf, a Progressive Republican from Berlin, H. G. Dean, of Danbury, F. P. Hobbs of Wolfeboro, and myself.

From the opening of the Convention meetings were held every morning and afternoon by the supporters of the measure, which were attended by many delegates seeking information, and the evening previous to the discussion in Convention, Prof. Lewis J. Johnson of Harvard addressed the delegates on the subject at a public meeting. The matter was warmly debated all one day, and when late in the afternoon it came to vote, after the method of making Constitutional amendments had been sacrificed, the result was 177 against, to 157 in favor. In the meantime another I. & R. measure had been introduced to fall back upon, if necessary, embodying the straight Oregon plan; and the margin of defeat being so narrow, it was decided to make another fight.

Meanwhile, the matter of taxation had begun to forge to the front. New Hampshire still labors under the Constitutional provision of "proportionality" in the matter, but the Tax Commission in its last report had recommended that this word be stricken out, leaving the matter entirely with the legislature.

Before the opening of the Convention, however, they evidently had a change of heart; for the secretary of the commission, a delegate, introduced proposed amendments opening the door to classification of growing wood and timber, and intangibles, and nothing else. Mr. Stevens also introduced a resolution providing that the whole question of taxa-

tion be left with the legislature, the only restriction being that it should be "reasonable." This proposition was discussed at some length and found considerable favor, the second week closing with a growing sentiment in favor of the I. & R. and the Stevens amendment.

Over Sunday the forces of Privilege "got busy," and worked as only they know how to do; and when the delegates returned for the third week, they were greeted with a front-page "ad." in the principal State daily, calling their attention to the fact that both the I. & R. and the Stevens amendment were inimical to the great property interests of the State, and that certain large financial enterprises under contemplation must be held in abeyance if these revolutionary projects were submitted by the Convention. In addition, several leading attorneys of these interests were in evidence about the Convention.

On being put to vote the Stevens proposition was defeated 231 to 95, while the next day the second I. & R. resolution met its Waterloo by 227 to 133.

The Equal Suffrage advocates had previous to the Convention done an enormous amount of work in promoting public opinion, and before the assembling of the delegates had pledges of support from over 150; but the great Amoskeag Company, which employs nearly 16,000 operatives, and of course many children among them, evidently feared that "votes for women" might interfere with dividends from their mills. They threw the weight of their influence against the amendment, with the result that it was lost, 208 to 149.

Prof. Updyke of the Civics department of Dartmouth College, and a delegate, prepared and introduced several propositions looking toward the Short Ballot. All met the same fate: a unanimously unfavorable report from the committee to which they were referred, a fight being made in behalf of only one, and this so hopeless that only a voice vote was taken upon it.

An effort was made to submit an amendment for a different method of submitting Constitutional amendments, New Hampshire being restricted to a convention for that purpose; but the vote against the change was decisive, 189 to 65.

The Recall and Home Rule for cities were killed without even a requiem being sung over their remains.

The net result of the Convention was the submission of twelve amendments, all of them good, but, as Roosevelt says of Taft, they are "good feebly." They include an increase in the Senate from 24 to 36, with the districts divided on a basis of population instead of property; a decrease of the House of Representatives from 495 to 340; allowing the legislature to impose a graded inheritance tax, a tax on the incomes of public service corporations in lieu of a direct tax, and to classify wood and timber and money at interest for taxation and to impose

an income tax on foreign corporations (thus making such a conglomeration of Constitutional provisions as will cause legislators and courts many sleepless nights in years to come); to eliminate the word "Protestant" from the Constitution; to allow the disfranchisement of voters for violation of election laws; providing for the choice of State officers by pluralities instead of majorities; allowing pensions to be granted for more than one year at a time; extending the jurisdiction of police courts; and allowing the Governor to veto separate items in appropriation bills.

These are to be voted upon at the November election, and each must receive two-thirds of the votes cast upon it to be adopted.

During the Convention one of the Boston papers alluded to the Convention as a "joke." To the writer it seemed more as though the reactionaries were sitting on the safety-valve of a boiler which is liable to explode at any time, as has been the case at Lawrence, San Diego and elsewhere. The direct results, viewed from the Progressive stand-point, are the education which all the delegates, and through them the citizens, have received regarding these matters, the closer association of Progressives, and the prospective formation of a Voters' League which is to undertake the enlightenment of the voters on the records of candidates and matters of public policy.

GEORGE H. DUNCAN.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### FARMERS AND TAXATION.

Cleveland, Ohio.

One of the chief stumbling blocks to a scientific method of levying taxes lies in the antagonism of the farmer. At least I have found this to be so here in Ohio. In my work in the recent Ohio constitutional convention, many of the farmer members, intelligent on general topics, showed not only their antagonism to the Singletax but showed me what I think the trouble is, not so much trouble with the farmer as with those of us who are trying to make some headway toward proper methods of levying taxes.

In assessing city property the law in Ohio, and the law or custom in most States, provides that the value of the site and the value of the improvements, that is, the structures, shall be assessed separately. The same law holds good in the country, with the result that all land is assessed at so much an acre, and the buildings are assessed separately. Don't you see that when you appraise land in the country at so much an acre, just as land in the city is appraised at so much a foot, there unconsciously arises the notion that the factors that contribute to the value of the acre are the same as contribute to the value of the foot?

Therefore, the farmer, when he considers "putting all the taxes on the land," just naturally kicks. And when Singletaxers say they don't intend to levy all the taxes on land but on "land values," he just as naturally doesn't know what they are talking about.

An explanation of just what is meant by land values can be understood, but "How are you going to get at the land values?" is the question he next asks; and because it is not done anywhere, except in the cities, where there is pure site value upon the land area, he shrugs his shoulders, and the inertia continues.

The remedy that I propose is, not a change in taxation laws—not yet. Change the assessment laws so that all site value shall be assessed by itself, as is now done in the cities; assess separately all labor value, where it seems to be a part of the land value as in the case of farms; and assess improvements separately as we do now. Not until we begin at this lowest rung of assessment shall we make easy headway toward a solution of the tax problem now agitating the people. Not until some program of this sort is carried out, will it be possible for the farmer to analyze his farm values. When he can do that easily it will not be any more difficult for the farmer to understand the injustice of taxing him upon what he does than in the case of the city man.

This program does not require amendment of Constitutions nor any change in tax laws. It simply requires a change in the law providing for the assessment. And such a change is no more a Singletax move than is the rule for the separation of the assessment of land from improvements.

The Singletax can not come in Ohio until the majority of the farmers know what it is and what it will do for them; and they can not know under present methods of assessing farm property. When their values are analyzed for them upon their tax bills, the movement toward the Singletax will take on force of itself.

E. W. DOTY.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

---

Week ending Tuesday, August 20, 1912.

---

### Graduated Land Value Taxation in Oregon.

Under the auspices of the Graduated Specific Tax and Exemption League of Oregon (225 Worcester Building, Portland) an Initiated amendment for the Constitution of that State will be voted on by the people at the election next November. This amendment provides for—

(1) Graduated taxes, in addition to regular and special levies, on owners of railroad or other franchise and right-of-way values amounting to more than \$10,000 in any county.

(2) Graduated taxes, in addition to regular and special levies, on owners of water-power-values and raw land or community-made-land-values amounting to more than \$10,000 in any county.

(3) Exempting all personal property and improvements from taxes, except when the people of a county vote to tax personal property and improvements.