

The electors are developing higher ideals of political morals and citizens' duties. Prohibition was adopted by about 36,000 majority, and 95 per cent of all who went to the polls voted on the question. This was the seventh vote on Prohibition measures in this State, and the first time the women voted on the question. It was rejected in 1910 by 22,000 majority.

The death penalty was abolished by less than 500 majority. Two years ago such a measure was rejected by about 20,000 majority.

A measure limiting the voting rights to naturalized citizens who have received their final papers, and to native born citizens, was adopted by a majority of four to one.

On a measure declaring the duty of the State to employ any citizen on demand, and levy a high inheritance tax to provide funds, 57,652 voted "YES" and 125,332 voted "NO." This indicates a very strong radical sentiment on the unemployment question.



Some of the Singletaxers, including A. D. Cridge, G. M. Orton, H. D. Wagnon, Will Daly and myself, initiated the amendment to exempt every person on \$1,500 of the total assessed value of his or her dwelling house and other labor values of property used to make a living.

H. D. Wagnon, G. M. Orton and other Singletaxers initiated a measure levying a graduated sur-tax on the values of land and other natural resources.

Both of these measures were opposed wholly on the ground that they were the beginning of the Single Tax. On the \$1,500 Exemption 64,825 voted "YES" and 134,291 voted "NO." On the sur-tax measure 59,390 voted "YES" and 123,697 voted "NO." Both were defeated by practically a two to one majority of those voting on the questions.



The Anti-Singletaxers offered four measures, two submitted by the Legislature for the State Tax Commission, and two by initiative petition. The first two were rejected by majorities of two to one, and this was the third time they had been rejected by the people. The third measure was proposed by initiative petition to create a special tax commission to draft a new tax code for the Legislature; this was rejected by a vote of four to one. The fourth was a constitutional amendment intended to make Single Tax impossible, and was rejected by a majority of three to one. The majority vote against Anti-Singletax measures grows with each succeeding election.

The vote in favor of the measures offered by Singletaxers grows from one election to another. This year they were defeated by two to one majorities. Two years ago they were beaten by eight to three majorities.

This year the whole amount spent for the \$1,500 exemption measure, including the cost of the petition, was about \$800. Anti-Singletaxers probably spent at least \$20,000. One of their leagues reported expenses of nearly \$9,000. The Anti-Singletaxers also opposed the measure to abolish the State Senate and provide Proportional Representation for election of representatives in the Legislature.

The people of Oregon are not ready for any forward political step. The measures to abolish the State Senate and provide a method of Proportional Representation for electing representatives in the Legislature were rejected by majorities of two to one and three to one respectively.

In my opinion this election in Oregon should greatly encourage the progressives and radicals to continue their work. It is true that we won only Prohibition and abolition of the death penalty, but we did not lose anything. The other fellows gained nothing at all, except the election of officers. That is something for them, but their candidates all professed so much faith in the Oregon System, and promised so faithfully to protect it, that there is probably no danger of our losing much under the incoming administration. If the reactionaries had elected the Governor four years ago with the Legislature they did elect, Oregon would have gone back a long, long way by this time. The Fels Fund saved us from that fate, and thus made possible the victories in California and Ohio. In our campaign four years ago the Oregon System was an issue, and the Republican candidates were opposed to it. In the recent campaign everyone seeking an office, from the Governor down, professed very great admiration for the Peoples Power System.

Remembering that there were from seventy-five to ninety thousand women voting this year, most of whom had given little or no attention to politics or economics until this campaign, there is surely every reason for progressives to take heart of grace, and this is especially true of the Singletaxers.

In closing, I wish to express my opinion that the best work that can be done for the Single Tax movement hereafter, in Oregon at least, is to submit at every election a straight Single Tax measure.

W. S. U'REN.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE MIDDLEMAN

Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, Dec. 5.

Apropos of middlemen, and the possibility of economic loss from having too many of them, it may be said that we should probably have fewer were the artificial scarcity of employment removed by the freeing of natural opportunities. The job of the middleman looks like "easy money" to many who shrink from the hardships of daily manual toil as wage earners in a society where the seizure of natural opportunities has created artificial scarcity of employment. Each man who attempts to keep a little shop hopes that he is destined to succeed where many have failed, and here and there the able man with the instinct of the monopolist and a minimum of conscience sees the opportunity to drive out his competitors and profit by the privilege of controlling a considerable market. Open natural opportunities and men will be less tempted by the gambling chance of the small shopkeeper, so that communities will have as many middlemen as they need and no more. The Singletax is no cure-all, but freedom and economic justice will give men the chance to show what is in them, to develop up to

their best. It may thus remedy the plethora of middlemen.

E. N. VALLANDIGHAM.

SINGLETAX AND THE RICH.

Waban, Mass., December 3.

In view of the claim sometimes made that the Singletax is a scheme for enabling the very wealthy to escape taxation, the following figures may be of interest. The names of the largest taxpayers in Boston (excepting corporations) for the year 1913 were published in all the Boston newspapers. Mr. Jonas M. Miles, a member of the Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Singletax League, computed what the tax of each of these individuals would have been if Boston had raised the same amount of total revenue by a tax on land values only, exempting buildings, personal property and polls. The actual tax rate was \$17.20 a thousand. The equivalent rate on land values only would be \$37.10.

Name.	Actual tax.	Single tax.
George R. White.....	\$ 79,687.60	\$133,856.80
Eugene N. Foss.....	41,997.24	44,976.33
Isabel Anderson.....	38,720.64	60,766.09
Abraham Shuman.....	30,904.96	51,810.15
Fannie E. Morrison.....	29,771.48	49,621.25
Eben D. Jordan.....	28,450.52	26,830.72
Lotta M. Crabtree.....	25,782.80	44,282.56
Frederick Ayer.....	24,645.88	44,627.59
George A. Gardner.....	23,895.96	13,645.38
George N. Black.....	21,343.48	37,830.87
Martha C. Codman.....	18,746.28	37,367.12

Total\$363,946.84 \$545,614.86

The increase is \$181,668.02, or nearly 50 per cent. It will be noted that only two, Mr. Jordan and Mr. Gardner, would have had their taxes reduced. Of these, Mr. Jordan had to pay taxes of over \$6,000.00 on the Boston Opera House Building, which, like any other improvement, would be exempt under the Singletax. Incidentally, the opera in Boston has not been and was not expected to be financially profitable.

The real point in the above table is, of course, not the fact that these particular individuals would have paid more taxes, but—

1. That the increased taxes shown would have forced into efficient use much valuable vacant and under-improved land.

2. That the corresponding reduction in taxes on houses, stores, factories, machinery and merchandise would have tended to keep down the cost of living for the average citizen of Boston, whether home owner, apartment renter or slum dweller.

3. That the push of increased taxes on vacant land and the pull of lower taxes on trade and industry would have combined to increase the number of jobs for workers and to make business better.

CHARLES H. PORTER.

I have made it my chief care neither to ridicule nor to deplore, nor to execrate, but to understand the actions of mankind.—Spinoza.

In the long run men hit only what they aim at. Therefore, though they should fall immediately, they had better aim at something high.—Thoreau.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, December 8, 1914.

The President's Message.

The final session of the 63d Congress began on December 7. The President's message was not delivered until the following day. After referring to the European situation the President called attention to the fact that one result of the war was the cutting off from Central and South American people of the source from which they had obtained most of their imported supplies. The United States is ready to supply these wants but lacks a merchant marine. The President then said:

To speak plainly, we have grossly erred in the way in which we have stunted and hindered the development of our merchant marine. And now, when we need ships, we have not got them. We have year after year debated, without end or conclusion, the best policy to pursue with regard to the use of the ores and forests and water powers of our national domain in the rich states of the west, when we should have acted; and they are still locked up. The key is still turned upon them, the door shut fast at which thousands of vigorous men, full of initiative, knock clamorously for admittance. The water power of our navigable streams outside the national domain also, even in the eastern states, where we have worked and planned for generations, is still not used as it might be, because we will and we won't; because the laws we have made do not intelligently balance encouragement against restraint. We withhold by regulation.

I have come to ask you to remedy and correct these mistakes and omissions.

After urging that the Senate pass promptly the two conservation bills that have already passed the House and also the Philippine bill the President said in regard to the merchant marine:

How are we to carry our goods to the empty markets of which I have spoken if we have not the ships? . . . And how are we to get the ships if we wait for the trade to develop without them? To correct the many mistakes by which we have discouraged and all but destroyed the merchant marine of the country, to retrace the steps by which we have, it seems almost deliberately, withdrawn our flag from the seas, except where, here and there, a ship of war is bidden carry it or some wandering yacht displays it, would take a long time and involve many detailed items of legislation, and the trade which we ought immediately to handle would disappear or find other channels while we debated the items. . . . Therefore, I propose another way of providing the means of transportation, which must precede, not tardily follow, the development of our trade with our neigh-