

ographers, elevator boys and scrub women, resolve to buy this building, valued at say one million dollars, and that each of them of whatever degree, contributes just one thousand dollars to the purchase fund. A million dollar company is formed with 10,000 shares of \$100 each, and each occupant takes ten shares. The building is bought and its one thousand occupants are exactly equal owners. They have precisely equal rights to the use of the building.

Now the situation is parallel throughout. The office building represents the earth; the thousand occupants stand for all mankind—with "equal rights to the use of the earth," as is so convincingly shown in Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics,"—and their natural birthright free, instead of property by purchase, as in the illustration.

How is that situation to be met? How is the "ideal of public ownership" to be practically realized?



Would any real estate agent consider the situation difficult or perplexing? Surely not.

Rents are collected as in the illustration. Each tenant pays in rent the value of the space he occupies or monopolizes, as tenants everywhere expect to do. Those who are not tenants, who monopolize no space, these pay no rent.

Out of the rentals are paid the expenses of operation, maintenance and repairs.

Each occupant, being an equal owner, has an equal vote at the stockholders' meetings. Each has an equal say in the management and upkeep. Here is equal suffrage and majority rule, with representative government through the board of directors.

After paying from the rentals all necessary and agreed expenses, the balance is paid in dividends to the stockholders. Each stockholder is an occupant of the building, so each has shared in its use and has benefited from its care. Each occupant is an equal stockholder, so each receives an equal share in the dividend.

Here we have the Singletax in perfect operation. It is a practical and exact realization of *common ownership of common property*.



With the Singletax in operation in the larger world, with its larger commercial needs, its unlimited social wants and ever increasing civic and national desires, there is no definable limit to the *common expense* of operation and upkeep except the *common income*. The equal stockholders of

our corporate earth may do what they will with their own.

If each holder of a plot, whether it be at a corner of Broadway and Wall street, or but a few acres of farm land in Dakota, would, through the Singletax, pay into the common treasury the rental value of his holding,—whether it be much or little, or nothing—and if each inhabitant of the country has, by the ballot, an equal say in the disposition of this fund, do we not secure exact justice,—equal rights?



If in applying this plan we only approximate that ideal, is not the mere approximation due to imperfect human performance and not at all to imperfect plan?

MARSHALL E. SMITH.



## VOTES OF WOMEN.

What influence will the votes of women have upon the fall elections?

This is a subject which as yet has never been seriously considered by slate-makers and campaign managers, but the signs of the times present indubitable evidence that hereafter it will have to be.



This year the women will vote in six States, possibly in seven. Five of these States: California, Idaho, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, are Republican, and they cast 31 electoral votes.

Colorado is insurgent, and her six electoral votes are in doubt.

In Ohio the Constitutional Convention has provided for submission of the question of enfranchisement of women to the voters on the 3rd of September. It carried two to one in the Convention; if it carries in the State there will be 24 more electoral votes that may be controlled by women.

There are 531 votes in the Electoral College. It takes 266 to elect, and 61 of them may be dominated by women voters. If there is a candidate in the field who is an out-and-out supporter of "Votes for Women," there isn't much doubt among those who know the temper of the women voters, that it would be possible to turn a practically solid woman vote over to him.



When the Biennial convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs meets in San Francisco this month, there will be a conference among

the delegates present who are voters. It will not be on any program, nor connected with the sessions of the convention. The time and place may even be kept a secret, but for a long time women voters have felt that there should be some plan for unified action among them, and they intend to make one now.

It is well known that Sarah Platt Decker, ex-president of the Federation, is heartily in favor of such action, and the faithful will probably look to her as their natural leader.

Women divide on national policies, but it is believed that they can be prevailed on to unite in a demand for "The Ballot First," and to give their united strength to the candidate who is pledged to bring about the general enfranchisement of their sex. It is easy to see that the united vote of women would control in any State, for the vote of the men is sure to be divided.



For months past, women voters and would-be voters have been writing to prospective candidates asking their views on this question, and the answers have been wholly unsatisfactory, save and except in the case of Senator La Follette.

As Governor of New York, Roosevelt favored it; as President of the United States he afforded it neither aid nor comfort. They find him on both sides in his recent Outlook utterances. They have not forgiven President Taft for his "Hot-tentots" speech to the suffrage convention in April, 1910, and they have expressed themselves with considerable vigor concerning Governor Woodrow Wilson's letter in which he declares his mind at sea. Mrs. Champ Clark is a suffragist, and it is possible, so some of the suffragists say, that Mr. Clark would join them in the strains of what bids fair to become a campaign classic, "You Gotta Stop Kickin' My Dawg Aroun'."

Without a candidate pledged to their cause the women may fail to effect any concerted scheme of action, but they will lay the way for 1916.

ELLIS MEREDITH.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### WOMEN'S SINGLETAX LEAGUE.

Washington, D. C.

The eleventh annual convention of the Women's National Single Tax League was held in Washington during Memorial week. The first session was opened at 10:30 a. m., on Monday, May 27, at the New Ebbitt House, with prayer by the Rev. Chas. Everest Granger of Gunton Presbyterian Church. The only formal address at the opening session was

made by Colonel H. Martin Williams, reading clerk of the House of Representatives. The colonel called attention to the great number of men in enforced idleness who were anxious to work at almost any wage, and pointed out clearly and convincingly that land monopoly is the underlying cause.

At the afternoon session addresses were made by Mr. Herbert J. Browne, Miss Ada Rhodes and Jackson H. Ralston, Esq., of Washington.

Mr. Browne gave an interesting account of the inhabitants of a small island, 200 miles south of Cuba, where there exists no labor problem, no question of unearned increment; where locks, bolts, and bars are unknown; where the entire population live a simple life of brotherly kindness toward one another.

Miss Rhodes gave a vivid description of an English mining town after an appalling accident, such as happens quite frequently in mining regions, quoting a statement from the London Telegraph, one of the most conservative papers of Great Britain, in which it advocated the nationalization of the coal mines as the only remedy for coal strikes.

Mr. Ralston called attention to the progress being made in Oregon and Missouri and showed how the Initiative and Referendum made it possible to force the Singletax into practical politics, incidentally paying a high compliment to W. S. U'Ren of Oregon.

The evening session was held at the Public Library, at which an address of welcome and of commendation was delivered by Prof. Thomas E. Will, who is now a resident of the Capital City. Mrs. John Sherwin Crosby, president of the League, responded in a felicitous manner, and then introduced Miss M. Elma Dame of New York City, who is a nurse in the tenement district and also a Settlement worker. Miss Dame pointed out the utter inadequacy of charity, settlement work and other forms of organized philanthropy to cope with conditions under our present system of oppression and injustice which penalizes industry, thereby pauperizing labor.

Miss Grace I. Colbron of New York City followed Miss Dame, speaking on a subject closely allied to the Settlement workers—Child Welfare and Economic Justice. Miss Colbron dwelt upon the futility of legislative action to meet the demands of the situation, which ignored a radical change in our system of taxation. Referring to Miss Dame's address, she said charitable workers soon discovered that this evil was not due to parental greed, nor entirely to the greed of the mill-owners, who were themselves the victims of the system, and crushed out the lives of other men's children in many cases, only to keep their own above the possibility of being similarly crushed if the wheel of fortune turned. "It would be much better to understand the evil of land monopoly which lies at the bottom," she said, "and give the workers justice, than to offer charity while continuing to reduce them to a stage where they have nothing further to lose and, in a fit of desperation, will seize what they can get in any way they can get it."

Henry George, Jr., the final speaker of the evening, spoke on "Taxation in the District." Mr. George is chairman of a sub-committee of the Congressional Committee on the District, which has been making a thorough investigation of the methods of taxation in vogue in the Capital City. Whilst he pointed out