TAX LIMITATION IS DESIRED

"Tax limitation," a subject which will be presented to the voters for support or rejection on November 7th, is a problem in economics not generally understood, and few articles written on the subject leave the reader fully conversant with the topic. An article that does, however, explain the measure in full, was read at the Public library in Portland by Elton Warkins recently. The article said:

In discussing the proposed statewide tax and indebtedness limitation amendment, it is deemed advisable to briefly explain and define that measure. As I understand it, the measure proposes to limit the taxing bodies and the taxing power of this state so that the tax of each year will not exceed that of the preceding year more than 6 per cent; that is, if the tax of the state is $100 for the year 1916, the tax for 1917 cannot exceed the sum of $106.

In discussing this proposed measure I shall take the affirmative, for I believe that it is for the welfare of this state that this measure pass. I shall deal with it under four heads: First, Its Constitutionality. Second, The Necessity. Third, Its Feasibility. Fourth, Its Benefits.

Constitutionality

I shall dispense with the constitutionality by saying that the Supreme Court of the state has held that one legislature cannot limit the taxing power of another legislature. Consequently, an amendment of the kind proposed can only become a law of this state by the method herein proposed. In fact, it is the only constitutional way a measure of this scope can be enacted.

Necessity

As to the necessity of the proposed measure, many reasons can be affirmed. In the first place, everyone will admit that taxes are too high. Oregon pays more taxes per capita than any state in the Union, and within the last decade taxes have increased nearly 400 per cent. In other words, taxes have increased nine times faster than the population of this state, and the per capita tax of this state went from $11.42 in 1902, to $30.50 in 1913, and the bonded indebtedness per capita has gone from $7.90 in 1890, to $71 in 1913. In round numbers, taxes went up from six million to twenty-three million dollars within and during the last ten years.

Compares Income of State

Now, figures to some are bewildering, so let us view it from another angle. Let us compare it with some of the resources of this state. **In the first place, the state's entire crop of grain and vegetables would not pay the taxes levied in this state.** In the second place, the taxes exceed the total value of all our hogs and cattle, and twice the value of our sheep, and save and except the timber of this state, there is no resource within and under its control large enough to yield income to pay the taxes. You ask the cause of this monumental extravagance. My answer to that inquiry is that we have more than 50 boards and commissions in this state trying to tell us what to do and how to do it; and furthermore, each locality and each Representative desires to have some particular hobby taken care of, and in order to get an appropriation for the desired project that sponsor agrees to support and vote and urge the other fellow's appropriation, and so it goes until every proposed expenditure is carried and levied upon the people. A recent investigation of a committee of the State Taxpayers' League ascertained and devedoped the fact that different commissions and boards were performing similar duties and maintaining separate statistical bureaus and separate corps of deputies.

An alleged result of this profligacy and criminal waste is that seven families are moving out of the state to one coming in. Another result is that new industries have been prevented from coming to this state and some of those already established have been driven out. So much therefore, for the argument under the second head.

Practicability

Now, as to the practicability and feasibility, I maintain the answer therein is found in the established fact that more than half of the states of the Union now have similar amendments; that is, these states have refused to let the sky be the limit but have maintained a point beyond which those who levy the tax cannot go. The proposed law has been demonstrated practicable by the state of Colorado, where it has been in operation sufficiently long to prove its advantages and its feasibility. In fact, the practicability and feasibility of a measure of this kind should need no proof. Just think of the idea that a body of citizens will delegate to a few the power to tax the whole to an unlimited extent. No business house on earth would say to its board of directors, or its manager, or its president: "Go the limit. Spend all you please and your action will be approved." But if further proof of the feasibility thereof is necessary, the people of Oregon do not have to go to Colorado, or other sister states. The practicability of the proposed measure has already been demonstrated in Oregon. I refer to the Bingham law, Chapter 159 of the 1915 session laws, which has been in vogue in this state for two years. That law is practically the same as the one proposed, the difference being that the Bingham law relates only to counties and takes either of the two preceding years as the basis of the current levy; whereas the proposed amendment covers every taxing power and takes only the preceding year for the current year levy. But whether it is feasible or not, it is necessary for the self preservation of the citizens of this state and for the perpetuity of the state itself and for its growth, and in view of the fact that no better proposition has been offered, and as this proposed law might open the way for improvements and better proposals, it is deemed not only necessary but expedient that the proposed amendment pass, thereby starting the wedge that will ultimately bring about much needed and much desired reform.

Benefits

Now we come to the fourth head, namely, the benefits to be secured by the passage of this proposed amendment. In the first place, many of the 50 odd commissions and boards of the state will be combined and consolidated, thereby eliminating useless office holders and eliminating worthless commissions and boards. Another benefit the people of this state will derive thereby is that it will curtail expenditures that are unnecessary. It will tend to harness the officials of this state together in order that the necessary expenditures may be allowed and the useless appropriations eliminated. It will prevent extravagance, waste and profligacy and tend toward an economical administration of the state institutions. Another very advantageous benefit will be secured, and that is those who now levy the tax and vote for the appropriations will be arrayed against each other, so to speak; that is, each one will be continually on the lookout for arguments and reasons why the other fellow's appropriation should not be allowed, and why his appropriation is necessary; whereas, at the present time the situation is one where you tickle me and I will tickle you—you vote for my appropriation and I will vote for yours, and instead of the appropriations being adjusted and dovetailed into each other, they are simply piled up on top of each other regardless of the virtue of any of them.

Another beneficial result that will necessarily follow the passage of this measure would be the establishment of a budget system, which is the only practicable and businesslike method a state or government of public affairs can be administered.

Objections Answered

The principal objections we find to this proposed measure comes from those who might be termed the tax eaters; that is, office holders, and their arguments against the propsed amendment may be classified under three heads: First, that it should not be in the form of a constitutional amendment, but should be passed by the legislature as other laws are passed. This is answered conclusively in my argument under the first head, the constitutionality of this proposed amendment. The second argument against it is that we cannot properly administer the affairs of the state if the amendment is passed. The answer to that is that these officials have been getting along so far and the proposed amendment does not reduce the taxes but allows a 6 per cent increase, and if they have been conducting the state properly heretofore why cannot they do it in the future, and if they have not been doing it in the past, by what right have they been informing the people that they are entitled to re-election; and furthermore, why have they been clamoring for a reduction in expenditures and promising these reforms, if they knew all the time that it would be detrimental to efficient and good government. The truth of the matter is that the expenses of our state and other institutions have been too high and too exorbitant, and nothing but a state or National government could stay out of bankruptcy at the rate the people of Oregon have been going for the last decade, and if it continues bankruptcy will be the result of our state.

The third argument against is that if the proposed amendment is adopted it will prevent Oregon from participating in the Federal appropriation for roads, which requires the state to advance and appropriate an equal amount. Now Oregon's share of the Federal appropriation at the present time is and will be $78,000, so all we will have to do is to take $78,000 from our present appropriation for roads in order to secure the aid of the National Government, and as Oregon now has a continuing appropriation for roads of one mill, and as this tax raises an annual amount of $235,000, there is no need to be alarmed at this fallacious argument.

No Limit On Taxing Power of People

It will be borne in mind that extraordinary expenditures and emergencies will and can be submitted to the people, and the proposed amendment, even if it does pass, will not limit the people or forbid them voting an appropriation for any particular purpose they so desire; and therefore the specious argument along this line is thus answered.

Gets Unanimous Support

In conclusion, it is strange to say and to notice that this proposed amendment has an almost unanimous support from the newspapers of this state; it is endorsed by all the leading papers of the city of Portland; it is also endorsed by the Bureau of Legislation and Taxation of the Chamber of Commerce and other responsible organizations of this state, and it will be left to the people on the 7th of next November to say whether they endorse a measure along this line, or whether they shall acquiesce in the wasteful and profligate methods now and heretofore practiced. The measure should be passed, for it is not only constitutional: it is necessary; it is practicable and it will be beneficial, and until some other proposition is offered which will surpass it in these particulars, the proposed amendment should receive the commendation and approval of the voters of this state, thereby condemning the present monumental waste and extravagance so long practiced by the representatives of the people.

POLITICAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

For Sheriff.

Vote for 61 X, Lee Warnick, Democratic candidate for sheriff, Union county. For the people.—Pd. Adv.

Joint Senator Union and Wallowa Counties.

To the voters of Union and Wallowa counties: I am the Republican nominee for joint senator for Union and Wallowa counties and respectfully solicit your votes on Nov. 7. If elected I will perform the duties of the office to the best of my ability, and point to my record in two sessions of the state legislature as a pledge for my future conduct.

—Paid Adv. tf. ED E. KIDDLE.

Vote X62, Thomas H. Williamson for Sheriff.

I am the Republican nominee for sheriff of Union county. Past experience as deputy sheriff will enable me to perform the duties of sheriff and if elected will do so without fear or favor.

I will appreciate the support of the voters of Union county in the coming election.

THOMAS H. WILLIAMSON.

—Paid Adv.

VOTE

57 X Rodney J. Kitchen, Republican-Progressive Candidate for District Attorney for Union County

I was born in Porter County, Indiana. Graduated from the high school at Valparaiso in said county and in the university from the scientific, classic and law departments. Admitted to practice in the Circuit, United States and Supreme courts of Indiana in 1899 and have practiced continuously since, two years of which I was prosecuting attorney in Indiana. I was admitted to the Supreme court of Oregon in 1906. I am married and have three children. Am a tax payer of Union county. Have resided in Eastern Oregon over ten years and in Union county the past six years.

I stand for a strict enforcement of all criminal laws and an economical administration of all county business.

To those who do not know me personally, I court a thorough investigation of my ability as a lawyer as well as my past and present record as a public or private citizen. I am not sending out literature written by myself telling of my superior qualifications but am willing to let the people pass upon my fitness for this office.

My home paper commenting on my nomination says: "Kitchen was born and raised in Porter county, Indiana. He graduated from the Valparaiso high school and also from the scientific, classic and law departments of the university. He was chosen class orator on the two latter occasions. He practiced law here for a few years and at one time was prosecuting attorney. His ability is known and respected throughout Porter county."—Messenger.

If elected to this office, I will assume my duties without having made any promise to any person, firm or corporation, except to do my full duty.

As it is impossible to see each voter personally, I take this means of soliciting your support at the November election, which will be greatly appreciated.

RODNEY J. KITCHEN.

—Pd. Adv. 10-28-30. 11-1-3-4-6.

J. A. EGGLESON FOR JOINT REPRESENTATIVE

I am a farmer and stockraiser and have been a resident of Wallowa county for 17 years.

I favor strict economy, without impairing efficiency in public service. I am opposed to the creation of any needless new jobs or offices, and am especially opposed to more than one Circuit Judge for this district.

If these planks meet your approval, I shall be pleased to receive your vote.

J. A. EGGLESON.

Paid Adv. 10—27-30 11—1-3-6.

For County Assessor.

I am now serving my first term as County Assessor. During that time I have endeavored to conduct the affairs of the office, as economically as consistent with good service, with the especial view of assessing all property on an absolutely fair basis, and believe the records of the office will show good results along the line of equalizing assessments, as well as the placing of these assessments, and extending the different levies of the several taxing districts in the tax rolls, in a neat and businesslike manner.

I respectfully invite the voters to get first hand information, regarding the efficiency of the work accomplished in this office. On this record, I ask for re-election at your hands on Nov. 7th and if elected pledge continuation along these lines.

—Paid Adv. tf. U. G. COUCH.

VOTE

56 X JNO. S. HODGIN, OF LA GRANDE, FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY.

I have been a resident of Oregon over twenty years, 16 years engaged in the successful practice of law in Eastern Oregon, and over nine years in Union county; and I am well acquainted with the needs of this county, as well as the duties of this office. Will appreciate your support on November 7th, next.

JNO. S. HODGIN,
La Grande, Oregon.

—Pd. Adv. 10-28-30-31. 11-1-2 3 4 6

For Assessor.

I have been regularly nominated on the Democratic ticket for County Assessor. If I am elected I pledge myself to a fair assessment. I believe the burdens should be fairly divided. I will devote my entire time to the affairs of the office, believing that the salary is sufficient to pay for it. I respectfully solicit the support of the voters at the polls.

Pd. Adv. W. A. MAXWELL.

United States Senator
Geo. E. Chamberlain

Will speak at the Methodist Church Tuesday Evening October 31, at 7:30 on the political issues of the day.

Paid Advertisement by Woodrow Wilson Club

Professional Directory

FRATERNAL ORDERS

A. F. & A.M.—La Grande Lodge No. 41, A. F. & A. M. holds regular meetings first and third Saturday at 7:30 p. m. Cordial welcome to all Masons.
ROBERT S. EAKIN, W. M.
A. C. WILLIAMS, Sec.

B. P. O. E. ELKS, La Grande Lodge No. 433. Lodge meets each Thursday evening at eight o' clock. Home and club privileges cheerfully extended to all Brother Elks.
FRANK C. BRAMWELL, Exalted Ruler.
ADNA B. ROGERS, Secretary.

KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS—Red Cross Lodge No. 27 meet every Monday night in Castle Hall (K. of P. Hall.) A Pythian welcome to all visiting Knights.
A. W. NELSON, C. C.
DELILE GREEN K. of R. & S.

MODERN WOODMEN OF AMERICA—La Grande Camp No. 7703 meets on the first and third Thursday evenings of each month in the K. of P. Hall. Visiting neighbors welcome.
H. E. DIXON, V. C.
CHAS. JESTER, CLERK.

WOODMEN OF THE WORLD—La Grande Camp No. 169 meets every first and third Friday at K. of P. Hall. All visiting neighbors welcomed.
O. L. M'DOWELL, C. C.
E. W. EASTMAN, CLERK.

L. O. O. M.—La Grande Lodge No. 850 Loyal Order Of Moose holds regular meeting every Wednesday night and 8 p. m. in Eagle Hall, fifth floor Foley building on Adams Ave. Visitors always welcome. Dues payable at Young's Sweets.
GEO. YOUNG, Dic.
HARRY SWART, Sec.

O. E. S.—Hope Chapter No. 13, O. E. S. holds stated communications the second and fourth Wednesday of each month. Visiting members cordially welcomed.
EMMA L. KIDDLE, W. M.
MARY A. WARNICK, Sec.

ROYAL NEIGHBORS—Iris Camp meets every second Friday afternoon and every fourth Friday evening, every month in K. of P. Hall. All visiting members cordially welcomed.
MINNIE BUNTING, Oracle.
LILY C. KIMMEL, Recorder.

REBEKAHS—Crystal Lodge No. 50. Meets every Tuesday evening in the I. O. O. F. Hall. All visiting members are invited to attend.
ADLA CHILDERS, N. G.
ROSA GLASS, Sec.

K. & L. OF SECURITY.—Mt. Emily Council No. 2646. Meets second and fourth Thursday evening at 8 o'clock at Eagle Hall. Visiting members are welcomed.
C. E. STITT, Pres.
C. W. COOK, Fin. Sec.
VIOLA L. HOGUE, Rec. Sec.

DENTIST

E. P. MOSSMAN—Dentist: rooms 6 and 7 new West Building Phone Black 1521; Office hours 8 to 12 p. m. and 1 to 5 p. m.

OSTEOPATHIC PHYSICIANS.

DR. J. L. INGLE—Osteopathic physician.

DR. MARGARET INGLE—Diseases of women; care and feeding of children. Office New Foley Bldg. Hours 10-12 a. m.; 2-5 and 7-8 p. m., and by appointment. Office phone Red 1761; residence Red 881.

VETERINARY

DR. H. W. RILEY—Graduate Veterinarian Hospital. 1409 Madison Ave. State Stallion Inspector and Inspector of stock for shipment. Home Independent Phone, Black 41. Farmers Co-operative Phone, Main 112.

ATTORNEYS

CRAWFORD & EAKIN—T. H. Crawford and Robert S. Eakin, Attorneys at law. Practice in all the courts of the state and the United States, Office, West Jacobson building, rooms 9-10-17. La Grande Oregon.

COCHRAN & EBERHARD.—Geo. T. Cochran and Colon R. Eberhard Attorneys. La Grande National Bank Building.

E. W. EASTMAN—Lawyer—Office Rooms 1 and 3, La Grande National Bank Building.

R. J. GREEN—Attorney at Law. Rooms 14-15, Palmer-Roesch Bldg., La Grande Ore Practice in all state and Federal courts.

ALBERT SMALL—Attorney at Law. Rooms 26-27, La Grande National Bank Building. Practices in all state and Federal courts. Phone Main 11.

CONTRACTOR AND BUILDER

H. E. ROSKAMP, Contractor and builder. La Grande Ore., Phone Red 1981.

ARCHITECT

MILTON S. BLOCK—Architect Sketches and estimates cheerfully furnished. Office, Room 21 New Foley building.

C. B. MILLER—Architect, Room 28, New Foley Building.

W. L. STRINGHAM—Instructor of piano. Studio over Young's Confectionery.

For a Muddy Complexion.

Take Chamberlain's Tablets and adopt a diet of vegetables and cereals. Take outdoor exercise daily and your complexion will be greatly improved within a few months. Try it. Obtainable everywhere.