

"where there is room to spare." The land market would be glutted. But this which would manifestly occur under those extreme circumstances would occur also where the tax was lighter, provided the tax were not so light as to fall considerably short of the increase in values.



Recurring to Victoria and Vancouver, if the Singletax works to the advantage of home owners in the residence sections there, "where there is room to spare," but to the advantage of big investors in the business sections, "where the area is limited," the reason is not far to seek. It will be found not in any variation of principle, but in the fact that the same rate of land-value tax is heavy in the former section and light in the latter, *as compared with the intensity of the land monopoly in each*. "Where there is room to spare" a light land-value tax will discourage land monopoly, because values are likely to advance too slowly to make an investment in tax bills "look good"; but "where the area is limited," payment of the same pro rata tax may amount to a reasonably good bet that the land values will rise so much faster than the tax as to leave "a wide margin of profit."



If the facts about Victoria and Vancouver are as the California Outlook reports them—and its report certainly accords with what Henry George taught and Singletaxers believe, the California Outlook's hint to the contrary notwithstanding—then the harvest which business-section land monopolists may be reaping in Vancouver and Victoria is not because those cities have got the Singletax. It is because they haven't yet got enough.



### The Singletax in Ohio.

As a rule, the editorials of the Saturday Evening Post of Philadelphia are as accurate as they are compact, and no higher tribute could be paid to their customary accuracy than that. But one of them in the issue of October 19, 1912—the one on recent amendments to the Ohio Constitution\*—is an exception. We refer to this part of it:

Singletaxers in Ohio, however, had been agitating for Initiative and Referendum. It was feared they might initiate by popular petition and pass an act embodying Singletax principles. So the new Constitution provides that Initiative shall not be used to classify property for the purpose of taxation or for laying any single tax on land values. This new Constitution is, indeed, a radical and democratic

document. It permits the people of Ohio to govern themselves, within certain limitations, pretty much as they may see fit—thus marking a great advance over most State Constitutions; but it carefully specifies that they cannot govern themselves to the extent of taking back, for the uses of the community that created it, the unearned increment in land values, or of appropriating for the public benefit further unearned increments.

This is a mistake insofar as it implies that the Initiative cannot be used in Ohio in behalf of the Singletax.



Precisely those powers of self-government which the quoted editorial says the people of Ohio are denied by the Initiative for which Singletaxers agitated, are in fact conferred upon the people of that State by the Initiative that has been adopted there. What is denied them—and this probably accounts for the error in the Post's editorial—is the power of adopting the Singletax by legislative Initiative. There are two kinds of Initiative in the new Constitution—one for legislative laws and the other for Constitutional amendments. Under the former, nothing can be initiated which the Constitution forbids the legislature to adopt; under the latter, anything can be initiated which the prescribed percentage of petitioners demand. The only difference between the two, so far as Singletax measures are concerned, is a difference of 4 per cent in the number of petitioners prescribed. The legislative Initiative requires 6 per cent, the other 10 per cent. Once initiated, the popular vote required for either is the same—a majority of the votes cast on the question itself. The Saturday Evening Post has so large a circulation, and is so seldom in error, that it may be reasonably asked to examine into this matter anew.



### Political Hysterics.

If Mr. Taft or Mr. Wilson or Mr. Debs or Mr. Chafin or Mr. Roosevelt had been bitten by a mad dog while on his way to make a campaign speech he would have been an object of friendly sympathy with everybody, and properly so. No matter how one might regard him or his party, or what one might believe and have said of his previous conduct and future purposes, every person of decent mind would have been sincerely sorry for his misfortune, sincerely hopeful for a speedy recovery, and sincerely sympathetic with his followers in their loss of leadership. But what would any self-respecting person have to think, of the Republican or Democratic or Socialist or Prohibition or Progressive candidate if

\*See Public of September 13, page 867.