

recently entered into our League; Don Jose Capitan Fernandez, advocate, and Don Federico Sanroman, of Ecija; Don Jose Manaut Nogues, advocate of Valencia; Don Enrique Gomez Asencio, advocate, of Lerida; Don Jose Rubio Gali, advocate, and Don Antonio Ariza, doctor, of Seville; Don Juan Bautista Perello of Reus, and of the many new subscribers to our journal for whom we have no space and whom we are sure very soon to find many as associates of the Spanish Single Tax League.

To all a hearty welcome, now at the right hour.

GEORGE WHITE.

(See Portrait.)

George White, who has recently set everybody in Bergen County, N. J., talking by a suit brought against the State Board of Equalization, the result of which has been to upset many tax levies in several municipalities and the refunding of \$16,000 to the town of Hackensack, of which Mr. White is a resident, was born in London, England, in 1855. In 1873 he came to New York, and was manager of the New England Newspaper Union from 1880 to 1886. At that time he lived in Boston. In the latter year he came to Brooklyn, and was president of the Brooklyn Single Tax Club.

Mr. White was a delegate to the Single Tax conference at Cooper Union in 1890, and was a member of the Committee on Resolutions with Tom L. Johnson and John Z. White. Since that time Mr. White has maintained an unbroken record of Single Tax activity, always contributing his share in the great work, writing and speaking, and contributing from his moderate income to such activities as approved themselves to his judgment. Last month he debated with Prof. Kirkpatrick, the well known Socialist, on the merits of the Single Tax versus Socialism, before a select audience at Hackensack.

JOHN J. HOPPER has been appointed by Governor Sulzer to the Good Roads Commission of this State.

THE QUESTION BOX.

(Under this heading we shall answer every inquiry that it is possible to answer respecting the Single Tax, its incidence, and the philosophy of social regeneration it includes. Our readers are asked to give this department such aid as they can.)

C. F. Hunt, of Chicago, writes:

You take direct issue with Henry George when you deny that rent is "a deduction from wages and interest." (July-August, p. 47). Mr. George says (p. 440, Prog. and Pov. Doubleday, Page edition):

"Labor and capital would thus not merely gain what is now taken from them in taxation, but would gain by the positive decline in rent caused by the decrease in speculative land values."

ANSWER: We consider it misleading to teach that economic rent is a deduction from wages and interest, for what we propose is the taking of rent in taxation, and we justify such taking by the argument that it does not trench upon wages or interest. Nevertheless, the amount paid today in periodic rent or lump sums as purchase money probably does not truly indicate the fair rent which would be fixed under free conditions, because labor is today forced to the less productive land before the more productive has been fully utilized, and this we say results in the lowering of the "margin of cultivation."

Mr. Hunt asks us why we consider the "Pie" illustration faulty. Several writers on the Single Tax have used this illustration, dividing Rent, Interest and Wages into three parts, cut as we cut a pie, and that if the rent piece is cut larger than any one of the others it must be at the expense of the piece called Wages or Interest.

Now it is obvious that the Pie once divided the several parts cannot change their size; they cannot grow larger or smaller, any more than the several parts of a yard stick when divided. What those who use this illustration have in mind is probably this: that if landowners should extract more than economic Rent, the plus,