

then of moderate reformers. He will be remembered by men who were interested in organized labor and anti-monopoly movements in New York in the late '70's and early '80's. A few years later he appeared at an economic conference to oppose municipal ownership; but in the interest, mind you, of municipalities! At this time he was a protege of Samuel Insull, now one of the great leaders in the electric power monopoly, and even at that time financially interested in private monopolies of public utilities. A few years later still Mr. Foote settled in Chicago as the publisher of "Public Policy," a reform paper with a monopoly purpose which was backed financially by the same Samuel Insull. Incidentally he established himself at the capital of Illinois during legislative sessions, where he secured the adoption of two reform measures of genuine merit (including the advisory Initiative), and thereupon tried but without success to secure the enactment of a cunningly drafted public utilities law that would have been of enormous advantage to the Interests. His connection with the Illinois electric combine having then been discovered, his career in Illinois ended.



At about this time, Tom L. Johnson was becoming troublesome to the Interests in Ohio, and Mr. Foote migrated to Columbus where he devoted himself industriously to putting obstacles in Johnson's way—always for the purpose, let it be understood, of helping Johnson! He would come forward with "something better," "something just a little different," as Johnson used to say—when ever Johnson's plans were in the way of winning out. Circumstances indicated that Mr. Foote in Ohio was still a protege of Samuel Insull of Illinois, although his operations are conducted in the name of the Ohio State Board of Commerce, an organization of his own begetting. Meanwhile, he had got into close relations with the Tax Reform Association of New York—a body originated principally to secure home rule in taxation for cities and counties, but which has drifted into opposition to that policy. Out of this New York connection Mr. Foote was able to add to Mayor Johnson's difficulties and to bother Mr. Bigelow in connection with his Initiative and Referendum work. Also to organize an international tax reform body, of a quasi official character, of which he has had the presidency, a prestige that has added to his usefulness as a perennial worker for the Interests. Its sixth meeting was held in Des Moines last week. Through the same connections Mr. Foote was able two years ago to assist the electric power interests of Oregon in

their almost successful fight against Wm. S. U'Ren's measure for county option in taxation. He has been similarly able to assist the same interests in the pending campaign in Oregon for tax-exemptions of all property but land values in three of the counties and for a graduated land-value tax on the owners of exceptionally valuable land. In Ohio, the crux of Mr. Foote's opposition to the Initiative and Referendum was that under it the people of Ohio would be permitted to vote on the Singletax.



Singletax and the Ohio Amendments.

Some very good Singletaxers have expressed concern over what they have understood to be the fact that the Initiative and Referendum Amendment to the Ohio Constitution forbids its use for securing the Singletax in that State. They are misinformed as to the fact. Ten percent of the voters of Ohio may now Initiate a Constitutional amendment adopting the Singletax; and if a majority of the votes of the people cast on the subject are in the affirmative, that amendment becomes part of the fundamental law of the State. No approach to such an opportunity is possible anywhere in the whole Union outside of Initiative and Referendum States. Yet some Singletaxers, from impatience and from ignorance of the facts—a few for less excusable reasons, it may be feared—have used their influence against this reform in Ohio, on the ground that it is hostile to the Singletax! Enemies of the Singletax knew the contrary well enough. Under Allen Ripley Foote's direction, they centered their opposition upon the fact that the door to the Singletax would be opened; and with this cry, plus misrepresentation, they sought to prejudice farming communities. But they were overwhelmed by the popular vote. The clause forbidding the use of the *legislative* Initiative for the Singletax was proposed at the suggestion of Allen Ripley Foote, who expected Mr. Bigelow and the other Singletaxers in the Constitutional Convention to oppose it and thereby make campaign material against the Initiative and Referendum. To Mr. Foote's discomfiture Mr. Bigelow accepted the harmless clause without debate. But he defeated the attempt to exclude the Singletax from the *Constitutional* Initiative. Consequently the Singletax prohibition prohibits nothing not already prohibited by the general tax clause. But it does constantly advertise the fact that the Interests must be afraid of the Singletax or they wouldn't have tried in this way to head it off. And the way is open now for easily overriding that clause whenever the people wish to do it.