

Even the man who, without knowing a thing about it, used always to say, "Yes, of course, I think the Single Tax a good thing, but——" has almost disappeared. Once the subject of prodigious discussion in all its intricacies and phases by men who did know all about it, the Single Tax now receives even mention only occasionally.

—*St. Louis Globe Democrat.*

## The Landlord Gets The Benefit

HENRY GEORGE would have chuckled to read a recent financial item of news from New York.

The Chrysler people are putting up a 68-story skyscraper in that city, on ground leased from the Cooper Union.

Seventy years ago, because of the educational and charitable work of that organization, the New York legislature exempted its property from taxation.

But though the city gets *no taxes* from the Chrysler company, that concern, according to the *New York Times*, *must pay a sum practically equivalent to the taxes to the owners of the ground*—the Cooper Union.

Henry George insisted that any reduction or exemption of land values from taxation profited the landlord alone, since he charged all the traffic would bear, anyway.

Here, a generation after the death of the great Single-Taxer, comes pretty strong evidence that he was right.

*Labor, Washington, D. C.*

## Mexico

WE have received a fortnightly Review "MAN," from Mexico City. Its director is Engineer M. C. Rolland. This Review advocates the doctrines of Henry George and is the organ of the "Georgist Union" in the Mexican Capital. Its headquarters are at 444 Chapultepec Avenue, Mexico City.

Our Mexican brothers are developing an important campaign for the diffusion of the Georgist doctrine. They began in 1921 and are today more ardent than ever in their campaign. Under the very special conditions which this country is now going through, with its grave and unsolved agrarian problem, and with the important and delicate questions related to the foreign control of its petroleum resources, the activities of our Mexican friends may have very beneficial results in effecting a just and rational solution.

—*Georgist Tribune, Buenos Aires (Translation).*

A PENSION for ex-presidents is being advocated on the ground that it is beneath ex-presidential dignity to look for a job and take chances on being turned down. But what else does an ex-president deserve who while in office made no effort toward removing the cause of unemployment and poverty? The economic system which he considered good enough for his fellow-citizens ought to be good enough for him. —*American Economic League.*

## Land Prices

THE management of a large group of foreclosed farms in the Middle West reports the sale this spring of more than a dozen farms at "profitable figures." Presumably this means at prices in excess of the equity in the farms plus the expense of carrying and maintaining them since their foreclosure. These prices were better than were offered a year ago.

The management of this particular group of farms believes that land prices are due to go higher. It believes also that they should.

"Land prices have been either declining or stationary for the past eight years," it states. "An upturn should not be far off. The supply of farm land cannot be increased without involving considerable time and cost. Meanwhile, farming conditions are growing better and the pressure of population is becoming greater in this country. Sometime in the future we shall probably look back and see that the land prices of the present represented a bargain."

In contrast with this opinion is another, perhaps best expressed by an Illinois landowner, who has three good farms.

"I believe it would be unfortunate for land prices to increase at present," he said. "That may sound strange, coming from a man who has most of his capital invested in land, but I am not looking at it exactly from a personal standpoint. Land prices are now at about the point where a good farmer can earn a fair rate of interest on the investment. If they advance, without an equivalent advance in the prices of farm products, it will only tend to provoke discouragement.

"In the case of rented farms the landowner would have to exact a higher rental to keep his returns in adjustment with the capital investment represented by his land. The young fellow now farming as a tenant, but who hopes some day to become a landowner, would see his hope moving farther away. Naturally he would become discouraged. Good tenants are not any too numerous now. We can hardly afford to reduce their number if we want our land farmed right.

"An increase in land values, too, would hinder the reorganization, now going on, of farms into units better adapted in size and situation to farming under the new conditions. Besides it would simply be an invitation to higher taxes, and we're paying about all we can stand now.

"I'm not sure, either, that the old process of advancing land values was so good for us as some think. It did not contribute to a permanent agriculture—rather it had an opposite effect. There was always the temptation to sell out and take the profit that had accumulated. It encouraged speculative buying of land by townspeople who had no intention of farming it themselves but bought it for