

sion," as the session of Congress in December following the election has come to be known.



#### Government by the Minority.

La Follette's (Pro. Rep.) Feb. 3.—Here is one man's view of self-government. Addressing the New York lawyers, this man said with great earnestness: "We don't believe that all people are fitted for popular government. Some of us don't dare say so, but I do; and the question whether a people is fitted for popular self-government depends upon the restraint that the minority can place upon the majority to see that justice is done." That is explicit, is it not? The minority must restrain the majority; that is, the minority must rule the majority. We are all familiar with this. When this minority is made up of the nobles in purple and fine linen, we call it an aristocracy. When it is composed of the rich and powerful, we call it a plutocracy. And when judges, selected from the aristocratic and plutocratic minority, reflect in their decisions the economic views of the minority class from which they come, then we have what has come to be called a judicial oligarchy. In each case a minority restrains and rules the majority. Who is the man that thus champions a ruling minority? It is the President of the United States.



#### A Word to the—Well, to the Seattle "P.-I."

The Toronto (Ont.) Star (Ind.), Jan. 27.—The jokers of the press, says the Ottawa Citizen, are making no end of fun of Montreal's tax on bath tubs. Yet, funny as this bathtub tax is, it is not half so funny as are many of the people who laugh at it. For this tax, though it looks like a freak, is the legitimate outcome of the very system which many of these humorists support. Our whole system of taxation is on the bath tub basis. We tax not only the bath tub, but the floor, the walls, and the roof of the house in which the bath tub stands. There used to be a tax on windows. This enlightened generation smiles at the manifest lack of wisdom. What, discourage the means of admitting light and air? Encourage darkness, dirt and disease? The state should rather pay a premium to those who put in windows. Put in as many as you can, and keep them open. But we have no right to laugh at our ancestors. We tax not only the windows and the bath tubs, but every brick, board and nail in the house, every appliance for comfort, warmth, air, and cleanliness. We discourage the building of houses. We encourage the man who leaves a lot vacant, an eyesore to the neighborhood, growing thistles and burdocks. Let him build a house and surround it with a nice lawn, and down comes the assessor with a demand for more taxes. . . . We cannot afford to laugh at the tax on bath tubs.



#### The Singletax in California.

Los Angeles Tribune, Dec. 17.—When a large, representative organization like the City Club listens for the second time in a year, and with deep respect and interest, to the expounding of the Singletax theory, it may be said that the once despised political

economy of Henry George is making headway on this side of the line, as it has in Canada. Time was when a Singletaxer was merely looked on as a harmless crank. He could generally floor other disputants in debate, but the final answer to him was that George's plan might be unanswerable but was "utopian." Of such dreamers are some of the world's great movements born. The presence of Charles Frederick Adams of New York before the City Club on Saturday shows that the utopian now appeals as practical to some hard-headed men. Of itself this meeting would not have been very significant. But it was a part of a series of events whose meaning will not be overlooked by any student of affairs. At the recent meeting of the assessors of California counties in San Francisco, the Singletax was discussed with deep interest, and Assessor Dodge of the Bay city was openly in favor of "taxing land values only, exempting improvements." At the recent convention of the League of California Municipalities at Santa Barbara, Mayor J. Stitt Wilson of Berkeley advocated "an assessment regulated by the unearned increment of site values." His address was followed by a unanimous resolution favoring home rule in taxation, so that any community could adopt the Singletax or whatever else seemed best. . . . Seven Canadian cities are now under the modified single tax, and there can be no doubt that the seed is germinating all down the Pacific coast.



#### The Singletax in Canada.

The (Ottawa, Ont.) Citizen (Conservative daily), Jan. 20.—Not satisfied with a system under which the concentration of municipal taxes upon land values is left to the option of the municipalities themselves, the legislature of Alberta proposes to make this reform mandatory throughout the Province, the new system to come into effect seven years from this time. This is mainly the result of the trial of the Singletax in Edmonton, the capital and chief city of Alberta. . . . When Alberta, after successful local experiment decides to take the further step of establishing the Singletax for the whole Province, it is not easy to understand why Ontario should be condemned to a continuance of the present outworn system. It is well enough, perhaps, to let these go-ahead people of the west lead us in the race for improved municipal government, but surely it is not reasonable to allow them to distance us altogether.



The Christian Science Monitor (religious), Jan. 24.—Edmonton has been experimenting along Singletax lines for some time past, and apparently to its entire satisfaction. Like Victoria, Vancouver and other western Canadian cities, however, the system has been somewhat handicapped by the Provincial laws. The Singletaxers have had to make some sacrifices in many instances in order to prove the worth of the principle they advocate. But in Alberta now there is a strong movement toward bringing the legislature around to the point of making the Singletax system general rather than local. The success achieved by the municipality of Edmonton has had much to do with this. The fixing of taxes, the concentration of taxation on land alone has worked out