

legislators is obvious, for the groups would inevitably select the most able among themselves, and individuals of large affairs would sacrifice other things to promote a cause in which they had a heart interest.

- (3) The ballots to be canvassed by propositions, and the representatives of the successful one declared elected. This will do away with all the refinements that have been foisted upon the ballot system such as primaries, proportional voting, gerrymandering, etc.
- (4) Frequent elections are required to relieve those who have been elected to represent a definite ambition, as soon as it is accomplished, and to enable the majority to correct enactments that prove in practice to be mistaken ones.

Through such a method of voting the people would govern themselves according to the experience and self-interest of the majority, securing that which was for the best good of the largest number. Selfish interests and narrow minded moralists would be powerless to impose their WILL upon the public, except to the extent that they could influence public opinion. Interest in public questions would be enormously increased through the propaganda of the several groups and organizations formed to carry into effect their opinions; these strivings would become NEWS for the papers; magazines would teem with articles, pro and con, and the number of signatures obtained upon all of the petitions would be a barometer of the state of the public mind. No one could truthfully say that it made no difference as to how he voted; on the other hand he would be stirred into activity to promote that which he conceived to be for his own best interest.

Take the case of the Single Taxer. Is it not true that there is a substratum of agreement that landlordism is an evil in economic conditions, and might we not be very much surprised, if a consensus of opinion upon the fundamental principle underlying this proposition of elimination of the ground hogs, met with a large volume of votes in its favor?

This article is already too long, but I realize that much more needs to be said to explain and illustrate the points barely touched upon, but I hope there is sufficient to banish from your mind the two fallacies referred to at the beginning.

F. LINCOLN HUTCHINS.

"THE common sense of taxation," says Irving T. Bush, "is to put taxes upon what people spend and not upon what they save." When, Mr. Bush, did you ever hear of a man not being taxed every time he spends a cent. And when did you ever hear of anybody returning for taxation anything he had saved?—*Cleveland Press*.

IN three years, 829,000 acres of English land have gone out of cultivation, and in one year government paid for transportation to send 81,520 persons out of the country. Do you see the connection?—H. M. H.

NEWS—DOMESTIC

California

THE Great Adventure League of California will continue the fight for the Single Tax. It is announced in the *Henry George Standard* that the League will make an effort to organize the voters who cast their ballots for Amendment 29 last November. The League believes that with a little money and some preliminary work it may be able to effect an organization among the 125,000 in the State who voted for the Single Tax and thus be able to finance the campaign in 1924 with funds provided by Californians.

It is stated in a newspaper received from Sacramento that \$40,000 were expended by the opponents of the Single Tax. A club woman of Los Angeles, Mrs. Bernice Johnson, testified that she personally contributed \$7,523 to defeat both the Single Tax measure and the proposal to increase the number of signatures necessary to an initiative petition, which was also defeated along with the Single Tax measure.

Colorado

MR. BARNEY HAUGHEY, of Denver, has completed his measure which will be voted upon as an amendment to the Charter on May 16. The optional feature included in the first proposal is omitted.

Mr. Haughey has had a number of "dodgers" printed and is doing what he can to educate the people pending the vote in May. The essential part of the proposed measure for which petitions are being circulated, is as follows:

Land and all interests in land including franchises in public roads, streets and alleys shall be listed, valued and assessed each year separate and apart from personal property and improvements on land; said assessments shall be made by the manager of the Department of Revenue.

Each year the Council shall fix and determine the tax rate to be levied for municipal purposes upon the assessed value of land and franchises in public ways, and shall also fix and determine the tax rate to be levied for said purposes on personal property and improvements on land. Provided, that no tax for municipal purposes shall be levied on the value of any building erected after the adoption of this amendment, if said building is used exclusively for dwelling purposes. Provided further, that for the year beginning January 1, 1924, the tax rate for municipal purposes on personal property and improvements on land shall not exceed 90 per centum of the rate levied for municipal purposes on land and franchises in public ways; and the tax rate then levied for municipal purposes on personal property and improvements on land shall be reduced 10 per centum each year until such taxes are completely abolished.

This measure is called "The Lower Rent Bill." The newspapers of Denver have as yet made no comment on the bill, but it is rumored that the Real Estate Exchange is raising money to defeat it.