

**A Self-Evident Fact.**

From Puck of September 15, 1897, and of September 25, 1912. Reproduced by courteous permission of the Editor of Puck.



Uncle Sam (to the other Powers): "Say, I want you fellows to distinctly understand that I am not racing with you!"

---

## CONDENSED EDITORIALS

---

### HOW IT GROWS.

Daniel Kiefer in the Cincinnati Post.

In 1903 Tom L. Johnson was a candidate for Governor of Ohio.

The issue was Singletax. At least, that is what the Cincinnati Times-Star, Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, Cleveland Leader, Ohio State Journal and other veracious organs of plutocracy said. They shouted themselves hoarse over the matter, describing the Singletax as being about everything that it is not.

Johnson was defeated by 114,000 majority.

In 1912 a Constitutional amendment was voted on in Ohio, providing for the Initiative and Referendum.

The issue involved in its acceptance or rejection was the Singletax. At least, so said all the aforesaid organs of plutocracy, their heirs, assigns, associates, bosses and hired men. Perhaps they would like to admit now that they were only lying.

There was the same shouting, the same misrepresentation and the same appeal to ignorance and prejudice. But it carried by 80,000 majority. The voters had done some thinking during those nine years.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### TAX AMENDMENTS IN OREGON.

Portland, Ore.

There are five tax amendments "before the house" in Oregon this year.

Two are amendments submitted by the legislature of 1909 and rejected by the voters in 1910: (1) Providing for a uniform rule of taxation and for the levy and collection of taxes for State purposes and for county and municipal purposes on different

classes of property; (2) permitting taxes to be levied upon different classes of property at different rates, but providing that taxation must be uniform upon each separate class of property within the territorial limits of the authority levying the tax.

Each of those amendments was rejected by the people of Oregon in 1910, and at the same time the people approved our "County Home Rule" tax amendment.

Immediately after the election it became evident that Big Business did not approve the decision of the voters in regard to those three measures. The day before the 1910 election The Oregonian, which is the mouthpiece of Big Business, briefly described the County Home Rule amendment, said it was bad, and advised the voters to kill it. Previous to election day neither The Oregonian nor any citizen of Oregon found any "trick" in the County Home Rule Tax amendment; and there was no trick in it. But as soon as it was known that the Home Rule amendment had been approved, The Oregonian raised the alarm that the amendment had been carried by "trickery!" that the ballot title, prepared by the Attorney General, did not describe the meaning of the measure! that the voters had been deceived into the belief that it did nothing more than abolish poll taxes, and that this was a "trick" because the legislature of 1909 had "abolished poll taxes in Oregon!"

In its report to the legislature of 1911, the State Tax Commission reiterated substantially what The Oregonian said, and advised the legislature to re-submit the two amendments that had been rejected, on the ground that the people didn't know what they were doing when they rejected them. They also advised the legislature to submit a repeal of the County Home Rule Tax amendment, on the ground that the people did not know what they were doing when they approved that amendment. The inference is that in the opinion of the State Tax Commission, every measure submitted at one election should be re-submitted at the next election, on the ground that the people blunder in rejecting as well as in approving measures.

"The statement that the legislature of 1909 "abolished poll taxes in Oregon" is false. It did repeal the "State poll tax law," but did not repeal the county and road district poll tax law, the result being that in 1909 and 1910, county and road poll taxes were collected in almost every county in Oregon, according to the written statements of county clerks.

Anyway, without looking into the matter, the legislature of 1911 followed the advice of the State Tax Commission, which was the voice of the Esau of Big Business, re-submitted the two rejected tax amendments, and submitted a repeal of the County Home Rule Tax amendment, except that part prohibiting poll taxes. That is, it has asked the people to repeal the portion of the amendment giving the people absolute power over tax laws, but added to the repeal measure a nice little provision prohibiting the legislature from passing any tax or exemption law under the emergency clause.

That emergency clause toy is supposed to be full compensation to the people for giving up their absolute control over tax laws. But it isn't.