

"He (the New England politician) did what his brothers have done in Ohio. He passed on to the manufacturing interests tax after tax, until today, so hard pressed are many of these concerns, that they find it 'cheaper to move than pay taxes.' In Fall River the textile mills pay 60 per cent. of all taxes; in Lawrence they pay 50; in Manchester, the great Amoskeag mill pays yearly taxes equal to \$11 for every man, woman and child in the community. In some of the smaller towns, mills pay \$27 for every man, woman and child. Machinery is taxed at full value, the average levy being about \$30 for each thousand. Other property is taxed at about 40 per cent. of its value. When the heavy load of after-war taxes was added, protest was made. To deaf ears at first; but not now—not since the Otis Manufacturing Co. announced its intention to move south. Hurriedly the authorities got together and promised a reduction of one-third in taxes and additional reductions later. There is an object lesson here for the taxing authorities of Ohio. In Ohio manufacturing concerns must pay not only the real and personal property taxes, but a variety of special taxes so numerous and complicated that lawyers must be employed to determine the assessments."

The editor of *Finance and Industry* expresses the hope that it will not require a policy of "cheaper to move than pay taxes" to induce the Ohio Legislature to institute reform. He, however, misses important points. The politician is not to be blamed so much. He listens to those who come to talk with him; and, unfortunately, the only class who do approach him on the subject are landowners and speculators, with, now and then, a modest, timid committee of Single Taxers. Among the merchants and manufacturers are many who have large speculative land investments, and they feel all of the prejudices in favor of a multiple revenue system that can be seen in any real estate board. If the editor will watch how tax laws are made at Columbus, he will see that the lobby of the Ohio Association of Real Estate Boards is always on hand to do the steering. Producers keep away.

Another thing that the editor of *Finance and Industry* misses is that small industry is hit as severely in proportion to means as are the large concerns. A writer in the *Ohio State Journal*, not long ago, told of the widow of a tenant farmer. She bought a village lot for \$200, built a cottage, furnished it, and installed a loom, with which she proceeded to earn her living by making carpets. The man from whom she purchased the lot had paid only \$25 for it, and only ten cents a year as taxes. Her first tax bill from the county treasurer was for \$8.50—85 times as much as the lot speculator had paid annually for the privilege of keeping the lot covered with tin cans and jimson weeds. As a consumer, this widow also paid, as all of us do, indirect taxes concealed in the price for food, clothing, amusements, etc. The big capitalists, in thinking of taxation, should consider others as well as themselves.

On May 23, George R. Chandler, secretary of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, in addressing 200 business men in Columbus, declared that "Ohio itself is driving the nails in its own industrial and commercial casket with the hammer of taxation." He said that "Ohio industry must make a scientific study of the state's taxation laws." This suggestion for another tax survey has caused amusement among Single Taxers. One remarked that he hoped George Chandler would not be given the job of reading all of Ohio's revenue laws; for they were numerous enough to drive any reader crazy who tried to peruse them. Ohio's revenue system has been surveyed repeatedly, and the reports are seldom looked at. Ohio's Legislature of 1925 appointed a large committee, with Senator C. C. Bolton, of Cleveland, as chairman, to study the tax situation. The senator is a multi-millionaire landowner. His committee used up \$15,000 of the State's money, and asked for more. The report recommended three new taxes and an increase of the rates of two old taxes—all putting heavier costs upon production. It also favored heavier taxation of money, notes, mortgages, stocks and bonds.

Mr. Chandler told the Ohio Chamber of Commerce that Ohio is the loser because of its exorbitant taxation of commerce and industry. The Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for expansion, but not in Ohio, he said. The American Rolling Mills, with a factory here, is spending great sums of money for expansion of its Ashland, Ky., plant but none in Ohio.

The United States Steel Corporation is spending millions of dollars for expansion of its Pittsburgh interests, but it spends none for development in Ohio, because its tax bill in Ohio would exceed the amount it pays in dividends, Mr. Chandler declared.

He mentioned another firm that was considering locating in an Ohio city, but was advised, he said, by a Cleveland law firm to stay out of Ohio. He offered to give the name of the firm and the city it was considering as its future home, if anyone cared to know it.

The Movement in France

THE "*Ligue pour la Reforme Fonciere*" (Land Reform League), has been organized in Paris, France, with offices at 29, boulevard Bourdon. The maximum membership is fixed at 70, and its purpose is to foster discussion of all phases of the land question. To this end the by-laws are broad enough to admit land nationalisationists as well as followers of Henry George. The president is M. Sam Meyer, who took part in the Copenhagen conference and is a firm believer in the Single Tax method of solving the land question, and the organ of the League is *La Terre*, now issued quarterly with offices in Brussels and at the Paris address above. This paper, now in its third year, has been doing excellent service in bringing the ideas of Henry George to the attention of French speaking peoples.

The very good French translation of Progress and Poverty by J. L. LeMonnier was recently re-issued, in a well printed edition, and our friends in France have been active in bringing this book to the attention of the press and political economists.

The honorary president of the new league is M. Charles Gide, professor at the College of France, and author of an article on Landed Property in the Zionist Colonies, which appeared in the *Revue d'Economie Politique* in December.

M. Gide describes the method by which lands are bought by the National Jewish Fund (a private enterprise) in large tracts, and then ceded to groups of colonists who can organize communistically, co-operatively or individually. But the individual holder must pay a rental readjusted every 10 years for urban land and every 25 for farm land; and if he or his descendants cease to use the land they cannot rent it out to someone else but must relinquish possession, being compensated for expenditures on improvements by the new occupier.

Our Australian Letter

EASTER PROBLEMS

EASTER has again come round, and with it the problems that always come to the front at this season of the year. On this occasion they were ventilated by two Prime Ministers—the reigning one, Mr. Bruce, and Mr. Hughes, who was at the helm a few short years ago. Both are men of outstanding ability and extremely eloquent, while the latter has also a very happy way of wielding the pen. Both are politicians of a very high order, but politicians, which means that they would not move a step in advance of popular prejudice and current thought. Mr. Bruce, who was by far the most prominent figure at the luncheon on the opening of the Sydney Agricultural Show, made a splendid speech in which he emphasized the importance of enlisting the aid of science if our primary and secondary industries are to make the progress which they ought, and he appealed to the different industries to cooperate with the Government in order to achieve this most desirable result. He pointed out that 10% of the crops of the world are destroyed by insects every year and another 10% by weeds, so that there is plenty of work for science to do in diminishing, if not altogether eliminating, such a tremendous loss. Mr. Bruce further emphasized the absolute necessity of rapidly populating Australia if we wished to retain it as a continent for desirable whites; but, in saying that the scientific development of our resources so as to most rapidly increase our power to absorb new citizens would solve the greatest problem facing the people of Australia to-day, he omitted one very important factor which would go far to solve the problem by itself without the aid of science, important as the help of science would undoubtedly be, but the omission of which will prevent the problem from being solved at all.

THE MAN ON THE LAND

Mr. Hughes made a similar omission when dealing with the same problem at the opening of the new lecture hall at the Agricultural Show. Millions have been and will be spent, he told his audience, in schemes of migration with unsatisfactory results, and he had been forced to the conclusion that we had been going the wrong way about it. He did not, however, tell us what the right policy was. He might have done so, however, for years ago, when he was Prime Minister, he made a memorable speech in which he pointed out that over £31,000,000 had been spent in repatriating our soldiers, the bulk of which had gone to enrich the land owners to the detriment of the settlers, and declared that he would not be a party to any such method of procedure again. Yet the very same policy is being pursued by his successors now as was pursued with such ruinous results then. Under the British agreement, £34,000,000 may be, and most of it is being, obtained by the States on loans for development work, almost every penny, certainly the bulk, of which will go to enrich the land owning class. It must also be remembered that £250,000,000 has been spent in Australia on railway construction, and that £35,000,000 is now being spent, or is about to be spent, by the different States on the construction of roads, all of which has the same effect of enhancing the value of land, and making it more and more difficult under the present system for settlers to obtain it on reasonable terms. The whole of this extra value given to land, not by the exertions of individuals but by the increase, or expected increase, of population through the expenditure of public money, forms a proper source of public revenue, and it should certainly be appropriated by the community to meet the expenses incurred by the community. If this economically sound policy were pursued it would have the immediately beneficial effect of making land more easily accessible to labor, and thus very materially help to solve the problem of the unemployed. At the same time, by increasing our revenue from a legitimate source, it would enable us to take off some of the heavy taxes on industry which are preventing its proper expansion, and forcing up the cost of living on every hand.

THE OLD MAN OF THE SEA

Mr. Hughes very rightly described the man on the land as the basis of the pyramid of society, and he very justly remarked that "to put people on the land and keep them there we must make agriculture profitable." But how can that be done when we do all in our power to enhance the value of land for the owner, and, by exempting all land under £5,000 in value from federal taxation, foster land monopoly and prevent would-be settlers from getting suitable land on reasonable terms? What is wanted is a complete reversal of our present policy of exemptions and graduations, and the imposition of a uniform rate, applicable to all alike. And the rate should be reasonably