

**MR. MACKENDRICK INTERESTING
BUT IMPRACTICAL**

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I have just finished reading Alexander Mackendrick's long article on "The Line of Least Resistance" for Single Taxers.

If I did not know him to be a very honest and conscientious Single Taxer, I should think he was trying to queer the movement.

I can't speak for the East but here in the middle of the continent we have already started on the road and we shall probably keep on.

We have begun taxing products of labor at a lower valuation than land value, and it is only a question of keeping on.

I want to enter an emphatic protest to his declaration on page 214, "that the services for which taxes are paid are rendered exclusively to already utilized land or its occupiers."

Of course he doesn't believe any such thing. It is utterly absurd. Of course "a vacant lot can't be burned," "it can't be burgled," "it has no children to be schooled," etc.

But it is just these services and the demand for lots to be used that makes the price of vacant lots.

No street—no sewer—no water—no police protection—no fire protection—no school near by—no street cars or other rapid transit—what is the result? No price for vacant lots or a very low price at best.

Mr. Mackendrick has woven something of a theory but we are confronted with a conclusion—we are partially exempting labor products and evidences of ownership from taxation and we are going to keep on till they are all exempt.

Indeed I believe no State has ever taxed ordinary title deeds, though most States still tax stocks which are just the same thing. In Minnesota we have almost ceased to tax people on what they owe, that is on the evidence of the debt—the mortgage.

Mr. Mackendrick's article is theoretically interesting but very impractical.—C.J. BUELL.
St. Paul, Minn.

FROM PROFESSOR DAVENPORT

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

May I express my complete concurrence in Mr. Mackendrick's views as expressed in the last number of the REVIEW; as also my pleasure in his accurate and comprehending report of my own positions.

Not at all in the manner of protest or complaint, but solely to keep the record clear, I take the liberty to suggest that Mr. Hutchins seems to me to have fallen somewhat short of a similar understanding and accuracy. Out of the argument which Mr. Mackendrick rightly interprets as bearing merely on the time at which society shall proceed against rental incomes, Mr. Hutchins somehow deduces a preference for income taxation as against land-rent appropriation. The fault, of course, may easily lie with the exposition; but nothing could be further from my thought than the rendering which Mr. Hutchins has found possible.

—H. J. DAVENPORT

TAXING PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATIONS

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

It can't be done.

Public service corporations have just one source from which they get money—it all comes from the people whom they serve.

If you require such corporations to pay either gross earnings taxes or general property taxes, their charges must be enough higher to cover such taxes.

It therefore follows that all such taxes are really paid either by the patrons of the utility taxed or by the ultimate consumers of the goods shipped or services furnished by such corporations.

This is true of all usual and ordinary taxes whether they be levied on the gross earnings or upon the general property of such corporations.

Perhaps this truth is more easily seen in the case of gross earnings taxes.

A CASE IN POINT

The St. Paul Gaslight Company pays 5%