

ville, and attended the public schools there. Ambitious, he surmounted difficulties to continue his studies at Louisiana Polytechnic Institute in Ruston, and later at the University of Chicago. He went to Idaho to carve out his career and by outstanding ability won success.

From that ardent and able young Single Taxer of Seattle, Washington, C. Arlin Nave, we learn of election victories in his State that bid well for the success of the Single Tax movement. Among the elected is Mr. Louis Nash, a thoroughly versed Single Taxer, as County Commissioner. The other elected County Commissioner, John C. Stevenson, is a fighter, too, and judging from his talks and paper, the *Weekly Broadcast*, which he publishes, he is the next thing to being a Single Taxer. The same is true of Senator-elect Homer T. Bone, of Tacoma, who quoted Henry George in his address at the Democratic Banquet, November 12. Hon. Marion Zioncheck, Congressman-elect from the first district, campaigned along with Nash and Stevenson. All these men received a large majority in spite of the fact that Mayor Dore classed them as radicals and hired a radio each day to speak against them. Mr. Morrow of the forty-fifth district, a Single Taxer, was elected State Senator. He is a live wire and has a son in the twenties who is active also.

Hon. Robert Crosser, Single Taxer, was reelected to Congress from Cleveland as a Democrat. Ed. F. Alexander, Cincinnati attorney and Single Taxer, appears to have been defeated in his attempt to be elected to Congress on the Democratic ticket.

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE.

An Important Move Defeated

PORTLAND, Ore. has over 9,000 lots that it has had to take over due to delinquent taxes and assessments. The city of Portland has been unable to sell these lots, but in order to get them back on the tax roll, the city council submitted a charter amendment, November 8, 1932, to the voters of Portland, which would have given the city council authority to lease for any number of years not exceeding 99 years, such parcels of land as were not needed for public use.

The proposed amendment was lost by a majority of 4,353, the vote being 44,773 for, and 49,126 against.

This amendment left the details of the leasing of this land to the city council, but there were a few conditions required in the amendment. Here are the principal ones:

The lessee was to pay all taxes and assessments levied against the property, the same as any other property owner. In case of releasing, the lessee was to have preference. This provision would protect the lessee who had improved the land. This procedure, as a general rule, is followed in private leases.

This amendment provided for three appraisers; one appointed by the city council, another appointed by the lessee, and the third by the first two appraisers.

All expense incurred in connection with carrying out the provisions of the amendment was to be paid out of the assessment collection fund or such fund as might be designated by the city council. Thus any real estate man who leased land for the city would have been paid a commission for his services.

This amendment also gave the city council authority to

enact such ordinances as might be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the amendment.

This amendment gave the city council the authority to make leases for any number of years not exceeding 99 years. There were specifications for the valuation on which land rent would be based for 7 year, 35 year, and 99 year leases. A 35 year lease to be revalued every 7 years, a 99 year lease to be revalued at the end of each 10 year period; the rent of a 7 year lease to be based on the initial valuation. Land bought for future use was to have paid 6 per cent rent of its valuation.

There was opposition from three principal sources; real estate men, the *Oregon Voter*, and the Portland City Club. *The Oregon Voter*, a weekly magazine, published by C. C. Chapman, who keeps the business people in the Pacific Northwest posted on economics, finances, taxation, and all public matters, whether local, state, or federal. Mr. Chapman may not admit it, but he represents special privilege. The study of this leasing amendment by the Portland City Club was made by two real estate men, one lawyer, and the editor of a banking publication. The recommendation by the above committee against this amendment was made at the regular luncheon at the end of the speaker's talk and was rushed through without any discussion so that the city club might adjourn on time. The Portland City Club, as a general rule, is very progressive, tolerant, and thoughtful. It is a powerful influence in the community. Other recommendation by this club this year were against the oleomargarine tax (10c per pound), the increase on the State income tax, and the chain store tax. It seems to me if the Portland City Club had had the time to discuss this leasing amendment, or had had a different kind of a study committee, its decision might have been different.

The day before election real estate men demanded that the Portland City Council withdraw this charter amendment, but the council stood firmly on its own ground.

The amendment, if passed, would have approximately collected the gross ground rent from the 9,000 vacant lots. That is the ground rent collected from taxes on land values plus the ground rent collected by the City of Portland on its leases would have been a sum equal to the gross ground rent.

I haven't the inside dope on the framing of this amendment; so I do not know if there were those that really knew what they were about, or if the city council unwittingly planned this leasing amendment to get the vacant land back on the tax duplicate.—EDNA LASKEY.

ENDING June 30, 1932, 1,200 overseas vessels entered Sydney Harbor, compared with 1,367 during the previous twelve months; a diminution of nearly half a million net tons. Extinction is our fate unless we unshackle our trade.—*Progress*, Melbourne, Aus.