

methods are needless. There is a simple and scientific way of getting a majority by one balloting. Use the "elimination" feature of the Hare system, as follows:

Suppose that Smith, Brown, Jones and Robinson are running for a city mayoralty. Each voter marks his ballot for all the candidates in the order in which he prefers them. For instance, take the voter who wants Smith to be elected and who thinks Robinson the most objectionable of the candidates, and who prefers Brown to Jones. The voter will mark his ballot thus:

Brown	2
Jones	3
Robinson	4
Smith	1

At the close of the poll the votes are sorted out according to the "number one" votes for each candidate. Then the candidate who has the smallest number of these first-choice votes is declared "out of the count," and his ballots are distributed amongst the other three candidates in accordance with the second-choice thereon—that is, the names marked "2."

Then the lowest of these three remaining candidates is eliminated, as was the fourth, and his ballots are similarly transferred. Then whichever of the remaining two is found to have the greatest number of votes, transferred or original, is declared elected.

An illustration will show how fully the voter's choice is given effect to: Suppose that when the ballots are sorted, Smith is at the bottom of the poll with the smallest number of first-choice votes. The voter whose ballot is shown above cannot have his vote count for Smith, because Smith is "out of it;" but the ballot is still effective to give a lift to Brown, the man whom the voter liked better than Jones and Robinson, and for whom he would have voted if Smith had not been running. Then suppose Brown be eliminated, our voter's ballot is "not dead yet;" it still takes a hand in, by counting one for Jones and against Robinson, the man most objected to by our voter. Finally the contest is narrowed down to the two best men in the opinion of the majority of the voters; and the better of these two men gets it by a clear majority.

In the British colony of Queensland, the law provides that the above system is to be used in parliamentary elections when there are more than two candidates for the seat in a single-member district.

You will notice how the foregoing

plan favors the full and free choice of the electors, by encouraging the nomination of more than two candidates. In the illustration above given, Smith's friends are not afraid to give him their first-choice votes, because they know that this will not injure the chances of any other candidate if Smith cannot be elected. They know that in that event their votes will go to a stronger candidate whom they have marked as next or next choice on their ballots.

To insure a clear majority in every case, it is desirable to have a rule that any voter who does not mark every candidate on his ballot with the numbers signifying his preference, will spoil his ballot—or rather, every candidate except one, because it would be understood that the one omitted candidate was intended to be the last of the lot. It will perhaps be objected that this might lead to a good many spoiled ballots. The obvious answer is that the spoiled ballots would be those of the least intelligent and least desirable class of voters—those who were too indifferent or too dull to understand the system under which they were exercising their franchise. Such a voter does a service to the public by spoiling his ballot.

"WHERE ROLLS THE OREGON."

At the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Pacific university at Forest Grove in Oregon, in July last, Mr. Harvey Scott, editor of the Portland "Oregonian," with far more seriousness than his remarks were received by his auditors, insisted that the residents of the east—the dwellers in New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Chicago—are provincial, and that those who live on the northwest Pacific coast are cosmopolitan. The insistence was earnest, and, literally interpreted, absurd; but it is probable that Mr. Scott did not desire to be literally interpreted. He wished properly to characterize that narrowness of vision which overlooks the fact that there is a manhood quite as noble and a culture quite as fine in the extreme west as in the older east. And Mr. Scott so far was right. Of course, there is also another side to the same mistake. Quite as often persons are found in the newer parts of our country who imagine that a "practical man" needs no training, and that the east, and especially the university towns, are, of all places, the most narrow, the most impractical, and, adapting words used by Mr. Frederick Harrison, "the least to be trusted." No man can be truly practical who is not broadly educated—

especially so far as to know what has been done in other times and other lands. Provincialism is the monopoly of no section and of no nation. Dr. Alexander Mackennal said, at the anniversary mentioned above, that he had often felt that London was the most provincial city in the world.

He who visits the northwest Pacific coast, and by that I mean the states of Oregon and Washington, will find himself as vitally in contact with all the world-currents of thought and life as if he were to remain in New York or go to England. Indeed, there is little room to doubt that the common people of those states are more alert, intellectually, more eager to learn, and better informed concerning the affairs of the world than the same class in any other country. This statement is made after careful investigation in many lands.

The characteristics of the northwest, of course, are best studied in the three cities of Portland, Ore., and Seattle and Tacoma in Washington. In all that constitutes the physical environment, those cities are more beautiful than any other in the United States. New York and San Francisco have larger harbors, but neither can compare with those western towns in natural beauty of location. From the streets of Portland may be seen Mount Hood and Mount St. Helens, on whose sides is perpetual snow, and the spectacle is grander and more splendid than that of Mount Blanc from Geneva. Mount Adams is also a noble snowpeak clearly visible, while still farther away, to be seen from other parts of the town, are Mounts Tacoma (or Ranier), Jefferson, and the Three Sisters. Large ocean-liners may also be found at the piers on the Willamette, which enters the Columbia about 100 miles from its mouth. Tacoma will long be the admiration of all who are fortunate enough to visit her when the skies are clear. At her feet is the picturesque Puget sound, and rising, apparently, directly from the water is Mount Tacoma, 15,000 feet high. Two statements in the last sentence require qualification. I call the noblest mountain in the United States, outside of Alaska, Tacoma instead of Ranier, because the former is the Indian name, and the more beautiful and appropriate. It would be a graceful and proper thing for the people of Seattle, the rival city, to unite with the people of Tacoma in asking that the Indian name be henceforward and forever the official name. (I hope my friends in Seattle will forgive me for this suggestion, which would be approved by

nearly all eastern people.) The other statement needing qualification concerns the height of the mountain. It is down in the books as about 14,444 feet, but I am assured that the latest surveys make the height 15,003 feet.

The location of Seattle is only less beautiful than that of Tacoma, while as a commercial center it is already apparently in the lead. Portland has about 100,000 population, and the other cities about 50,000 each, Seattle being a little the larger. No cities of equal size that I know in any part of the world are more beautifully located, and none except Geneva and Zurich can be compared with them. The Swiss cities, however, have no outlet to the sea, while those in our northwest have already a large and growing trade both with Europe and Asia. If, in the future, the Pacific becomes the great waterway of the world, these cities must grow in influence and importance. Their location compels them to be cosmopolitan in character; and the beauty of their environment makes itself manifest even in the thought and speech of their citizens. Turning from what nature has done for this region, we find that the people have already accomplished much for themselves. Their business houses would be a credit to any eastern city. Their homes are attractive, and show the same evidences of culture and refinement as are found in New York and Boston. Even the spirit of bravado and boastfulness which was common 20 years ago has almost entirely disappeared. The faces of the men do not have that eager and worn look so frequently seen on the streets of cities like Chicago and St. Paul. In one respect, however, there is a decided difference. The northwest Pacific coast shows traces of oriental and aboriginal life not found elsewhere. The Chinese and Japanese jostle the American Indian, and the comparison, in some respects, is not unfavorable to the latter. The Indians are given to practical joking and indulge their propensity in ways that the more demure Chinese greatly dread. On a steamship on which I was a passenger were many Indians and Chinese, and the former gave their oriental brethren little peace. There was no malice, but there was exquisite ingenuity in the mischief. In what may be called "the higher life" of the northwest coast, great progress has been made; as will be seen from the following illustrations: The newspapers of these cities are unsurpassed and rarely equaled in the interior or the east. The Portland

Oregonian is the oldest, and the peer of any paper in New York, and better than most that I know in Boston or Chicago. The late Charles A. Dana, of the New York Sun, is reported to have said that Mr. Harvey Scott, of the Oregonian, was one of the three greatest of American editors. This estimate is frequently repeated to strangers by Oregonians. A former associate of Mr. Scott is now editor of the Leeds Mercury, one of the greatest of the newspapers of Great Britain. The Post-Intelligencer, of Seattle, is a worthy rival of the Oregonian.—Dr. Amory H. Bradford, in The Outlook.

HOW THE SINGLE TAX WOULD AFFECT THE FARMERS.

An extract from Judge James G. Maguire's opening campaign address, made in San Francisco, September 14, as reported in the Call. Judge Maguire is running for governor on the nomination of the democrats, the populists and the silver republicans.

Although the single tax is not and cannot be an issue in this campaign, for the republican party by declaring negatively against a principle cannot commit the other party to the principle—it can only act for itself; yet I am not willing that my personal opinions on the question of taxation should be misrepresented in this campaign for the purpose of creating prejudice. They say that the single tax is intended to shift the burden of taxation from the wealthy people to the farmers. Their sympathy for the farmers may be questioned, but I shall not stop to question it now. I shall attribute the statement to ignorance. Let us see about that. The farmers of this state now pay more than 50 per cent. of the taxes for the support of the state in their direct taxes upon their homes and personal property, and indirectly upon the commodities on which the taxes paid by merchants and others are passed to them. If the farmers could have their share of the state taxes reduced to 25 per cent. on the whole they would be doing well. Let us see how they would fare under the single tax system. Land values are now assessed separately from improvements in this state, and the total amount of the land values assessment for 1897 was, I believe, \$654,000,000—the figures will be found in the reports of the state controller. Of that amount of land values assessed the city of San Francisco alone contains nearly one-third. Seven cities of the state contain more than 55 per cent. of all the land values in the state. The other cities and towns certainly contain another 20 per cent., making 75 per cent.

Of the remaining 25 per cent. not half, nor nearly half, is owned by occupying farmers; more than half is owned by speculators, by others, domestic and alien, who farm the farmers. (Applause.) Under the single tax system the farmer would pay not exceeding 12½ per cent. of the state taxes, as against 50 per cent. that he now bears. His proportion of the tax would not be more than ten per cent., because his exemptions would amount to vastly more than the increased tax upon the land value, and to the farmer the single tax would be a beneficence (applause), and it can be demonstrated from the official records, and tax rolls, I am not now advocating the expediency of adopting the single tax, because I will not be drawn aside from the issues of the present campaign to discuss questions that are not in issue. But I do say that the statement which I have just controverted is glaringly untrue.

Leading republican organs are declaring and have repeatedly declared that the single tax would drive capital from the state. Let us see about that. What is capital? Capital is movable property applied to the production of new wealth. Now all such property would be exempt from taxation under the single tax system. Would exemption from taxation drive capital out of the state? Is there any man who thinks so outside the editorial room of a railroad paper, or outside of the platform committee of a republican railroad convention? It would not drive capital out of the state. It would bring capital into the state; whether it is good or bad it would bring capital into the state instead of driving it out. Would it drive other forms of movable wealth out? No, they would be exempt, and they would flow into the state upon the same principle.

Exemption from taxation never drives wealth out of a state. But they say—they don't say it, but they intimate it—oh, it would drive the land out, there is nothing else that is useful to be driven out. So the utter fallacy of that statement becomes perfectly apparent. The trouble with all these people is that they are ignorant of the subject they are discussing, utterly ignorant of it; so ignorant that men who understand it dislike the simple task of answering them.

But they say it is a measure for the confiscation of land. Not at all. It is not a proposition to confiscate land. The confiscation of land would put an end to the single tax. Can the single tax apply to land belonging to the state? Certainly not. If it is to be taxed it must be in private occupation, and it must be