

THE SINGLE TAX.

Devoted to the Cause of Taxing Land Values.

Eighth Year—No. 85.

GLASGOW, JUNE, 1901.

Price, 1d.; by Post, 1½d.

Notes and News.

With this issue the *Single Tax* enters upon its eighth year. We make no apology for the change in the form of the paper. This has come about like previous similar changes, by discussion and advice from several subscribers. The paper, in our view, is now better adapted for preservation and use, and we trust it will continue to meet with even increased support from all who stand for the cause it seeks to advance.

* * *

There will be no change whatever in the policy carried out during the past seven years. In that time the paper has found friends by the hundred and by the thousand in all parts of the English-speaking world, while it has given courage and hope to friends battling for the faith in other countries.

* * *

We are constantly being advised from far and near of the usefulness of the *Single Tax* as an agitator and gospel messenger in the *Single Tax* movement.

* * *

These favourable verdicts from competent *Single Taxers* are sure signs to us that we are steering in the right direction, and we take this opportunity of sincerely thanking those friends who, by action—by voice, and pen, and purse, have enabled the *Single Tax* to serve the movement to advantage.

* * *

Mr. H. C. Fairlie has just given a special donation of £7 10s. for the *Single Tax* to be posted to 100 subscribers for twelve months. We have always maintained a considerable free list, and accept this addition to it with pleasure. We will be glad to send specimen copies of the paper for a time to any sympathiser; and will have pleasure in discovering fresh names for the free list for anyone who cares to follow Mr. Fairlie's lead.

* * *

The New Age, referring to the Budget debates, "regrets that little or nothing was said about the tax on land values, in view of the fact that so many Liberal leaders have professed themselves in favour of such a tax."

* * *

Mr. W. P. Byles, Bradford, writes:—"I wish we could get it rubbed in in these Budget debates that the land is the true and should be the only source of revenue. M.P.'s object to the sugar tax and the coal tax, and they are required to propose some adequate alternative. Why don't our friends say 'land'? Where are they?"

* * *

"Is Socialism reconcilable with Liberalism" formed the subject of a debate at Edinburgh last month between the Young Scots Society and the Independent Labour Party. A long discussion followed, and the vote was not taken till close on 11 o'clock. By 81 votes to 54, or by a majority of 27, the negative motion, that the two parties were irreconcilable, was carried.

In his recent lecture to the Glasgow Philosophical Society, Mr. James Henry, Glasgow City Assessor, said the increase of rental in Glasgow during the past fifty years has been on an average £78,000 per annum, or 386 per cent. in fifty years.

* * *

Ex-Bailie Burt, in the course of the discussion, remarked that "Mr. Henry had once stated that 50 per cent., or half the gross rental of the city, could be taken as land value, and that if that statement was correct, the land values of the city had increased 386 per cent. in fifty years."

* * *

Mr. Henry looked as if he did not quite expect that chicken to come home to roost, especially at the Philosophical, while ex-Bailie Gray provoked the meeting to much laughter with the remark that "there were only two men in Glasgow who understood the question—Mr. Burt and Mr. Henry wasn't the other."

* * *

Mr. H. M. Hyndman, of the Social Democratic Federation, had a letter in a recent number of *Reynolds' Newspaper*, in which he modestly affirmed—"I have already demonstrated on several occasions that the 'single tax on land values' advocated by Henry George for the purpose of lessening or removing all other taxation will neither—

1. Give back the land into the possession of the people in any effective sense, nor
2. Tend to replace the people on the land, nor
3. Help to organise production on the land, nor
4. Raise the wages either of the city workers or of the agricultural labourers, nor
5. Mitigate competition and foster Co-operation in any conceivable way."

In the light of the letters of Messrs. Seddon and Holder, published in other columns, Mr. Hyndman would appear to be a bit of a blether.

* * *

Mr. Peter Fyfe, Chief Sanitary Inspector, Glasgow, addressed a meeting recently of the House Factors and Agents on the subject of "Back Lands and their Inhabitants." His concluding remarks were:—"In Glasgow not hundreds but thousands of good, substantial, cheap dwellings were required, and until they were built by a powerful body, or by the Corporation, all efforts for the betterment of the city would lag."

* * *

Mr. Fyfe is along with the House Factors, and not a few other perplexed philosophers, up the wrong street on the housing question. He should take a look in at the Assessor's department and get Mr. Henry to read his proposal or "suggestion" on the taxation of land values—given recently to the G.P.S., and reported in our May issue.

* * *

In an interview with a representative of the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, Mayor Johnson is reported to have said that—"A majority of the people of this country are *Single Taxers*, but they don't know it. But they are coming to a knowledge of the fact, and it is for us who have studied the matter, and are a little in advance of them, to point out the way."

Housing Question and Land
 Sub Memorandum, 187.
 and Workshops," 40; "The
 Democracy versus Socialism,"
 Work," 119; "Newest Eng-
 75.
 I.P.—Glasgow Bazaar Speech,
 2, 138.
 53, 186, 189, 192.
 al Taxation, 26, 161, 186;
 t, 20—23; Minority Report
 30; "Westminster Gazette"
 George, 131.
 and Glasgow Bill, 99.
 —Taxation of Land Values,
 —Bazaar, 171; Henry George
 Mr. Macdonald's Letter, 84.
 claim, 143.
 New Zealand and Land Tax, 8.
 Taxation Commission (Minority)
 ng Bill in Parliament, 157, 161.
 26, 141.
 turn, 83.
 Tax as Remedy, 102.
 and Socialism.
 58, 198.
 er and Land Tax, 8; Single
 1, 150.
 Bradford), 129, 156.
 ax Reformers, 198
 Oxenham's Story, 92.
 . E.—On Political Economists,
 ublished Letter to Henry George,
 ongress and Land Values, 82;
 Alkirk, 190.
 Urban Site Value Rating Bill,
 Tax, 159.
 e Land Values, 139; H. George,
 ituation, 127.
 lues.
 C. and Housing Question, 85;
 173, 174.
 ax League, 102.
 ax League, 101.
 n Local Taxation Commission's
 Articles: Labour Questions and
 e Codben Club and Free Trade,
 n Henry George, 78.
 Appeal to Englishmen, 15.
 sioners—Investment in Ground

THE SINGLE TAX

Devoted to the Cause

Eighth Year—No. 85.

GLASGOW,

Notes and News.

With this issue the *Single Tax* enters upon its eighth year. We make no apology for the change in the form of the paper. This has come about like previous similar changes, by discussion and advice from several subscribers. The paper, in our view, is now better adapted for preservation and use, and we trust it will continue to meet with even increased support from all who stand for the cause it seeks to advance.

* * *

There will be no change whatever in the policy carried out during the past seven years. In that time the paper has found friends by the hundred and by the thousand in all parts of the English-speaking world, while it has given courage and hope to friends battling for the faith in other countries.

* * *

We are constantly being advised from far and near of the usefulness of the *Single Tax* as an agitator and gospel messenger in the Single Tax movement.

* * *

These favourable verdicts from competent Single Taxers are sure signs to us that we are steering in the right direction and we take this opportunity of sincerely thanking those friends who, by action—by voice, and pen, and purse, have enabled the *Single Tax* to serve the movement to advantage.

* * *

Mr. H. C. Fairlie has just given a special donation of £7 10s. for the *Single Tax* to be posted to 100 subscribers for twelve months. We have always maintained a considerable free list, and accept this addition to it with pleasure. We will be glad to send specimen copies of the paper for a time to any sympathiser; and will have pleasure in discovering fresh names for the free list for anyone who cares to follow Mr. Fairlie's lead.

* * *

The New Age, referring to the Budget debates, "regrets that little or nothing was said about the tax on land values in view of the fact that so many Liberal leaders have professed themselves in favour of such a tax."

* * *

Mr. W. P. Byles, Bradford, writes:—"I wish we could get it rubbed in in these Budget debates that the land is the true and should be the only source of revenue. M.L.A. object to the sugar tax and the coal tax, and they are required to propose some adequate alternative. Why do our friends say 'land'? Where are they?"

* * *

"Is Socialism reconcilable with Liberalism" formed the subject of a debate at Edinburgh last month between the Young Scots Society and the Independent Labour Party. A long discussion followed, and the vote was not taken close on 11 o'clock. By 81 votes to 54, or by a majority of 27, the negative motion, that the two parties were irreconcilable, was carried.

The steamer Kendal Castle had some remarkable experiences in the cyclone at Galveston. The Kendal Castle broke adrift when the wind was at its height, and was cast upon the land. She was thrown up on sandy soil a long way inland, and the captain determined to dig a canal to enable her to get out. A gentleman who staked the vessel round, and declared that she was on his land, and that nobody should touch her without his permission, had to be "squared" before anything could be done. Then an army of workers cut a passage-way for the vessel, and she was got into the open sea once more.—*Dundee Weekly News*, 25/5/01.

* * *

The report of the Executive of the English Land Restoration League for the year ending 7th May, 1901, is well worth perusal by readers of *The Single Tax*. Copies can be had from Mr. Fred. Verinder, Secretary, 376 and 377 Strand, London, W.C.

* * *

The report states *inter alia* that, "in addition to a very large number—certainly exceeding 300—of municipal authorities which have passed resolutions in favour of Taxing Land Values, special resolutions or petitions have recently been adopted by 13 Town Councils, 26 Urban District Councils, 3 Metropolitan Borough Councils, and 3 Metropolitan Boards of Guardians."

* * *

J. T. H., writing in the *Dundee Advertiser* on our absurd system of rating, says:—"If a man builds a substantial house, we demand from him a substantial sum of rates, and if he spends an extra £100 in beautifying his house, it is all marked up against him in the reckoning with the Assessor. If an insanitary house is put right, the owner is practically fined in higher rates. It must be clear to a novice in these matters that the effect of this is to discourage improvement of any kind."

* * *

During the Budget debate in the Commons, it was stated by Sir Wm. Harcourt that the proposed tax on coal would interfere with trade, to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied that "all taxes interfere with trade."

* * *

The Single Tax is the exception. It would promote trade by making it unprofitable for land speculators to keep traders from access to the raw material. But perhaps the Chancellor believes the Single Tax is confiscation or an attack on a particular class. We have met some Liberals and Socialists who held these views.

* * *

Mr. Alex. Ure, M.P., told his constituents at Fauldhouse, on the 24th of last month, that he objected to the new taxes on coal and sugar, and suggested as alternatives taxation of land values and mining royalties.

* * *

Mr. J. H. Dalziel, M.P., speaking at Burntisland on 11th May, said the money required by the Government might have been raised by the taxation of land values, and by withdrawing the dole from the country landlords.

* * *

These are very good views for the constituencies, and we could wish to have them more generally distributed; but why cannot they be stated in Parliament? Was there ever a better opportunity during the recent Budget debates on the sugar and coal taxes?

* * *

The Parliamentary Committee of the Co-operative Congress has issued a circular to its members strongly advising them to influence their members in favour of the Land Valuations Taxation (Scotland) Bill, and the Bill being promoted by the London County Council.

The London Correspondent of the *Glasgow Daily Record* says:—"This advice reveals what may be described as the political purpose of the Co-operators." We hope so.

* * *

Mr. G. B. Waddell, C.C., told the Bothwell Young Men's Religious Improvement Association, at a meeting held on 19th May, that non-church-going was the result of the Church's attitude on the social condition of the people.

* * *

Mr. Joseph Warwick, of North Shields, the President of the thirty-third Annual Co-operative Congress, held at Middlesborough on 27th May, 1901, said, in the course of his presidential address:—"There were other things that lay at the root of the housing question after capital had done all it could: he meant the land laws, which were acting as a block to the spread of industrial progress, and sucking the very life out of industrial effort." Mr. Warwick advocated the taxation of land values.

Letter from Tom L. Johnson.

The following letter comes from the Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A., in reply to letter from the Secretary of the Scottish Single Tax League, congratulating Mayor Johnson on his splendid Single Tax fight and victory, and inviting his name as a patron of the Bazaar:—

MAYOR'S OFFICE,
CLEVELAND, May 8, 1901.

Your letter of the 26th ult. is received; very few come to my hand that give me more genuine pleasure. Of course, I will consider it an honor to have my name enrolled as a patron of the Bazaar.

I hope you do not over-estimate my usefulness, but I do believe that the Single Tax fight was a little more clearly in the foreground in this campaign than in any other successful one. Of course, it was not more so than in Mr. George's campaigns.

I find my previous training is very useful, and that the work does not prove disagreeable. Much will be done along taxation lines, every step of which will make in our direction, and I am more than hopeful. I find the powers of the office can be exerted in favor of equitable taxes to a degree beyond my expectation.

The framers of our laws have counted with too much certainty on always having in office as Mayor a man in thorough sympathy with the interests of privilege. They have some surprises in store for themselves. But I am prophesying, and that is always bad; still, in your case, I know you will feel more interest in that than, probably, what has already taken place.

The result of the effort to clip my wings will surely carry this struggle into the Legislature, and I hope for much education and some success in the broader field. Along municipal ownership lines, we have not progressed as far in Cleveland as you have in Glasgow; but in taxation of land values we, of course, go further, and have an easier path to still further inroads on entrenched privilege.

The work is progressing, and from every quarter of the English-speaking people there comes favourable reports. You, of course, know of the success of Senator Bucklin in Colorado. He now has a campaign on, which at the end of eighteen months will probably make the Single Tax possible in every locality that is wise enough to vote that way. His beginning will likely be made in the larger cities, presumably Denver.

I am enclosing herewith a draft on Glasgow, which please accept from me at this long range as a small donation to the Scottish Single Tax League Bazaar.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely

TOM L. JOHNSON

Natal Lands Commission.

"A very powerful plea from the Natal Progressive League for the Taxation of Land Values."—*Times of Natal*, March 11th, 1901.

DURBAN, February 16th, 1901.

To the Chairman and Members
of the Natal Lands Commission, 1900.

DEAR SIRS,

1. In response to the public advertisements of the Land Commission appointed by His Excellency the Governor of Natal in October last, the Natal Progressive League have pleasure in offering to bear testimony on the subjects which are engaging the attention of the Commission.

ABSENTEE LANDLORDS.

2. The Commission is appointed to consider *inter alia* the question of dealing with lands in the Colony the property of absentees, in which connection copy of the Absentee Landlords Tax Bill of 1899 is forwarded by the Governor to the Commission for their information.

Under that Bill it is proposed to place an annual tax of 6d. in the £ generally on the capitalised value of unoccupied lands which are the property of persons not residing in the Colony. Clause 4 of the Bill says that rural land shall be deemed to be unoccupied unless a person of European descent has his ordinary residence thereon, and "is also beneficially cultivating or beneficially using the land in such manner as is suitable, having regard to the extent, nature, and capacity of the land."

3. The League assumes the taxation of the values of unoccupied lands held by absentees will be justified by the Commission not only on the peremptory ground of the necessity of raising from all available quarters revenue for the needs of Government, but also on the moral ground that the values of those lands are made, not by the absentees, but by the resident population—that they are the result of the presence, industry, and expenditure of the whole community, and that those who make the values ought in equity to receive them.

4. The League conceives it to be a glaring anomaly that a man living beyond the borders of the Colony should be able to keep land in the Colony out of use, awaiting the time when by the natural growth of population and quickening of human need for land, the value of his land is enhanced enough to satisfy him, and to induce him to dispose of his legal rights over it.

But the League is unable to see how an owner resident in the Colony, who acts in the same manner as the idle absentee, can be exempted from the same criticism. In both cases the land is held out of use by those who will neither use it themselves nor allow others to use it. In both cases the value which attaches to the land is made, not by the individual holder, but by the whole resident community, who, under any equitable system of land tenure, would have their communal claim to that value recognised.

BENEFICIAL OCCUPATION.

5. Legislation in the past has attempted to define, but has failed to secure, that condition with regard to land, varying with the circumstances and the views prevailing at different periods, which is commonly referred to as "beneficial occupation," and the clauses in the present Bill dealing with this part of the subject are equally vague and impotent. Indeed, it is admitted on all sides that it is impossible to frame conditions which will meet the demands of the case and be free from vagueness and ambiguity.

But were it possible to define what is meant by beneficial occupation, the contention of the League is that the question of occupation does not affect the principle at issue, namely, that the value of land is made, not by the holder or any

other individual, but by the presence and industry of all the people of the Colony, and that that value should therefore pass by taxation to the public treasury for the use of the public.

6. What is true, then, for the absentee non-user is true for the residential non-user, and what is true for the absentee user is true for the residential user, and there is no escape from this position. The same reasoning holds good in all four cases, namely, that the site value is made not in any degree by the owner as owner, but by the whole community, of whom the owner may or may not be one. Viewed in this light, the solution of the whole problem becomes simple and clear; apart from it, the consideration of the subject is befogged and unintelligible.

LANDS FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES.

7. The League observes that the whole question of the position of lands granted or supposed to have been granted by former Governors of the Colony for religious purposes is included in the scope of the Commissioners' enquiries, and apprehends that great difficulties must stand in the way of the Commission obtaining information respecting each grant, and graduating their recommendations to meet the merits or demerits of each case. But approached in the light of the principles enunciated by the League, all these difficulties recede and disappear. The grants, if made, were made by men who had no more moral right to confer on anyone ownership of the land than they had to confer the ownership of the people living upon it; and it is as impossible in morals for the Church of England or any other religious body to own land as to own men. Resumption of these "Grants" by the Crown is best secured by the taxation of the values of the lands: by land values being meant in all cases the site values—those values which are created by the presence and industry of the community, and not those which are due to the labour and expenditure of the individual owner.

LAND FOR SETTLERS.

8. In the same way the League respectfully points out to the Commission that the adoption in even a small degree of the fiscal reform they advocate would at once liberate from the grasp of the non-user large areas of land which are held for prospective increases in value, but which the holders could not afford to keep idle were they subjected to taxation; and thus the third question put by the Governor to the Commission, namely, that of the acquisition of land by the Government for the occupation of settlers, would solve itself. Any scheme for the purchase and re-sale of lands by Government would be but an endorsement of the immoral economy of the present system.

RAILWAYS AND THE BETTERMENT PRINCIPLE.

9. As a pertinent illustration of the harmonising influence of the proposed tax on all land values, the League may be pardoned for referring to the bickerings, delays, and inconveniences which the Colony has to face with respect to the question of the route to be taken by the projected railway from the main line to East Griqualand. A fight has already begun amongst the owners of the lands affected by the various possible routes, the true interests of the whole community being pitted against the spurious ambitions of the landlords. Were, however, the increased value—the unearned increment—which the construction of railways must necessarily create in the lands which they serve taken by the community who construct them, all interests would be harmonised, and all difficulties not of a physical nature would vanish. The full fiscal advantage of the construction of railways being reaped by the community, the question of railway construction would assume a new phase, and would enlist the active and intelligent attention and co-operation of all.

10. The members of the League are aware that they are presenting but one view—the principal view, but still only one view—of the land question, and that there are other

views which, with due regard to their proportionate importance, must receive consideration; and, as evolutionists, they are aware of the practical necessity of paying due regard to things as they are as well as to things as they ought to be. They do not propose that here and now a tax of 20s. in the £ should be imposed on land values. But they do say that that is the position towards which a movement should be made. They do urge that the imposition of a moderate tax upon all land values is the only just and practical direction in which to find a solution of the problems put before the Commission, and that until legislation takes this direction it cannot be said that the government of the Colony is conducted on lines which answer the claims alike of justice, morality, and economy.

11. In conclusion, the League desires to call the attention of the Commission to the fiscal method in actual operation in Australasia, which may properly be called the Australasian Land Values Tax, a tax which falls upon land according to its value, excluding all personal property and improvements therefrom. This tax is simply a tax on the benefits or privileges which Governments confer on land owners, in exact proportion to the benefits so received—in other words, an application of the betterment principle, that the owner of the property benefitted by law should bear the burden of paying for the benefits so received. Thus far the Land Values Tax has been substituted in Australasia for other methods to so slight a degree that in New Zealand it is only 6 per cent. of the total ordinary revenue of the Colony, while in New South Wales it is only 3.5 per cent., and in South Australia only 3.3 per cent. But it has had a wonderful economic influence out of all proportion to the amount of the tax collected. The simple expectation of an extension of this tax has had a wholesome effect in checking speculative land values.

Besides the Colonial Land Value Tax, a system prevails in addition in New Zealand which allows localities to raise local revenues exclusively by land value taxation if they so decide. Several localities have already availed themselves of the opportunity, with, it is said, excellent results.

12. In thanking the Commission for this opportunity of approaching them on the land question, the members of the League respectfully ask that they may have due intimation of the date of the next visit of the Commission to Durban, as the League would desire to appoint a deputation to wait upon the Commission and advance its views by personal interview.

I beg to remain,

Gentlemen,

Yours faithfully,

H. ANCKETILL,

Hon. Sec., Natal Progressive League.

521 West Street, Durban, Natal.

The following letter was received in reply:—

LANDS COMMISSION, NATAL.

MARITZBURG, March 2nd, 1901.

SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th of February, with its accompanying documents. Your long statement I had the pleasure of personally reading to the Lands Commissioners assembled. On their behalf, allow me to congratulate you on the able, forcible, and yet temperate manner in which your views are put forward. Let me assure you that the Commissioners will give the fullest possible consideration to the arguments placed before them by the Natal Progressive League.

I have the honour, &c.,

ROBERT ABABRELTON

Secy. Lands Commission

HENRY ANCKETILL,

Hon. Sec., Natal Progressive League, Durban.

THE simple wish to use the bodily powers of another person, as a means of ministering to one's own ease or pleasure, is doubtless the foundation of slavery, and as old as human nature.—Maine, *Ancient Law*.

WHO SHOULD OWN THE LAND?

By BISHOP NULTY.

(Continued from April Issue).

The Whole People the True Owners of the Land.

When, therefore, a privileged class arrogantly claims a right of private property in the land of a country, that claim is simply unintelligible, except on the broad principle that the land of a country is not a free gift at all, but solely a family inheritance; that it is not a free gift which God has bestowed on His creatures, but an inheritance which He has left to His children; that they, therefore, being God's eldest sons, inherit this property by right of succession; that the rest of the world have no share or claim to it on the ground that their origin is tainted with the stain of illegitimacy. The world, however, will hardly submit to this shameful imputation of its own degradation, especially when it is not sustained by even a shadow of reason.

I infer, therefore, that no individual or class of individuals can hold a right of private property in the land of a country; that the people of the country, in their public corporate capacity, are, and always must be, the real owners of the land of their country—holding an indisputable title to it in the fact that they received it as a free gift from its Creator, and as a necessary means for preserving and enjoying the life He has bestowed upon them.

Distinction between the Right of the Individual and the Right of the Community.

Usufruct, therefore, is the highest form of property that individuals can hold in land. On the other hand, I have shown that the cultivators' right of property in the produce of the land, in the improvements he has made in the productiveness of the land, and in its undisturbed occupation, as long as he continues to improve it—that these various rights are all founded on the strictest principles of justice, and that their recognition and protection by the State will secure for the land the highest culture and improvement it is capable of receiving, and will draw from it, without fail, the highest returns of human food it is capable of yielding. On these immutable principles of justice and right, the order, the progress and welfare of society depend. They allow free scope, and hold out the highest encouragement to the fullest development of the energy and activity of human industry and enterprise by securing to everyone the full fruits of his labour, and recognising in him a right of property to all that his hands produce. They guarantee to him immunity and protection from disturbance as long as he devotes himself with earnestness and zeal to his industrial pursuits. On the other hand, if a man, through indolence or incompetence, allows his land to run wild, to return to its primitive sterility and barrenness, so as to produce nothing at all, or, at all events, much less than it is capable of yielding, it is no hardship to that man if these principles call on him to surrender a trust which he held from society, and which, to the great detriment of society, he has so grievously abused. Finally, it is no injustice to refuse the remuneration of labour to those who have not laboured at all. This usufruct, therefore, is a right of property in land which is held mainly for the benefit of the public and for the advancement of the general interests of the community.

And yet the general interests of the community are hardly distinguishable from the private interests of the usufructuary. The larger the amount of permanent improvements made in the soil, the richer and the more abundant returns it will yield, the better will it be for both interests. An usufructuary or farmer who labours might and main for his own self-interests, labours with the same amount of earnestness and zeal for the interests of the public as well. But it is the consideration of the public interests that will determine the continuity of his occupancy. The continuity of his occupancy entirely depends on the continuity of its real,

practical effectiveness for the advancement of the interests of the public. The moment it ceases to be useful and beneficial to the public welfare, that moment it ceases to have a right to exist any longer. If individuals could have a right of private property in land, that right would not be fettered by these responsibilities; in fact, it would not be liable to responsibility at all. The ownership of reclaimed tracts of land like the Bedford Level approximates closely, without, however, fully realising, to a right of private property in land. The owner of the Bedford Level is not responsible to society for the management of that property, nor is he bound to have any regard to its interests in the use he wishes to make of it. Being master of his own free actions, he was not bound to create that property for the benefit of society, but for his own, and he may now make whatever use he pleases of it. If through mismanagement it produces less than it is capable of yielding, that is his own affair altogether. If he allowed it to return to its original sterility, society might regret that it suffered a great loss, but it could not complain that he did it an injustice or a wrong.

The distinction, therefore, between the two rights of property in land is essential and fundamental, and it is absolutely necessary to apprehend it clearly, and to bear it distinctly in mind. Now, there is nothing novel or startling in the common and inalienable right of property which I have shown every people possesses in the land of its country. I know of no writer in political economy who disputes it, although I am familiar with the works of many of the most eminent of them.

That the Rent of Land should go to the Community a Design of the Divine Providence.

I think, therefore, that I may fairly infer, on the strength of authority as well as of reason, that the people are and always must be the real owners of the land of their country. This great social fact appears to me to be of incalculable importance, and it is fortunate indeed that on the strictest principles of justice it is not clouded even by a shadow of uncertainty or doubt. There is, moreover, a charm and a peculiar beauty in the clearness with which it reveals the wisdom and the benevolence of the designs of Providence in the admirable provision He has made for the wants and the necessities of that state of social existence of which he is the author, and in which the very instincts of nature tell us we are to spend our lives. A vast public property, a great national fund, has been placed under the dominion and at the disposal of the nation to supply itself abundantly with resources necessary to liquidate the expenses of its government, the administration of its laws, and the education of its youth, and to enable it to provide for the suitable sustenance and support of its criminal and pauper population. One of the most interesting peculiarities of this property is that its value is never stationary; it is constantly progressive and increasing in a direct ratio to the growth of the population; and the very causes that increase and multiply the demands made on it increase proportionately its ability to meet them, as I shall clearly show further on.

Landlordism takes the Patrimony of the People.

Learn the democracy of England, as well as of Ireland, learn the melancholy fate that has overtaken this splendid inheritance which God has placed in their hands, and which would have saved them the £80,000,000 which they now annually pay by direct and indirect taxation for the government of the country. That patrimony was once theirs by right, and by right it is theirs still; but, in fact, it is theirs no longer; a class wrested the land from the people of the country, and now hold a strict monopoly in it. They sell to the people as if it were an ordinary article of private property, and solely the result of their own capital and labour. The rents which the landlords draw from their lands is an income which they derive from the sale of what

are avowedly God's gifts, which "no man made." If they had only claimed the right of selling the use of the permanent improvements they had in the soil, by the capital and labour they had expended on it, no one could dispute the justice of their demand; but any element of income that might possibly be derived from this source is called, in the language of political economy, not rent, but profit.

If the "Bedford Level," and the rich tract of land in Meath with which I have compared it, were to be leased out to tenant farmers for a given term of years, the one would fetch quite as much as the other. The farmer would not concern himself much in inquiring into the *source* from which the fertility of the land was derived; all his solicitude and inquiries would be directed to the existence of the fact that the fertility was there, and which of them possessed it in the highest degree. The rent which the owner of the "Bedford Level" would receive for the use of his land would be a just and equitable remuneration, to which he was entitled for the expenditure of his labour and capital, whilst the Meath proprietor would receive as high a reward for having done nothing at all. Only that his income is so wofully wanting in justice, the condition of the Meath proprietor would certainly be enviable.

The Price of Land a Monopoly Price.

But this privileged class not merely sells the use of God's gifts, but extort for them a price which is most unjust and exorbitant; in fact, they hardly ever sell them at less than scarcity or famine prices. If a man wants to buy a suit of broadcloth, the price he will be required to pay for it will amount to very little more than what it cost to produce it—and yet that suit of clothes may be a requirement of such necessity or utility to him that he would willingly pay three times the amount it actually cost rather than submit to the inconvenience of doing without it. On the other hand, the manufacturer would extort the last shilling he would be willing to give for it, only that he knows there are scores of other manufacturers ready to undersell him if he demanded much more than the cost of production. The price, therefore, of commodities of all kinds that can be produced on a large scale, and to an indefinite extent, will depend on the cost required to produce them, or, at least, that part of them which is produced at the highest expense. But there is a limited class of commodities whose selling price has no relation or dependence at all on the cost at which they have been produced; for example, rare wines, that grow only on soils of limited extent; paintings by the old masters; statues of exquisite beauty and finish by celebrated sculptors; rare books, bronzes and medals; and provisions or articles of human food in cities during a siege, and more generally in times of scarcity and famine—these commodities are limited in quantity, and it is physically impossible in the circumstances to increase, multiply, or augment them further. The seller of these commodities, not being afraid of competition, can put any price he pleases on them short of the purchaser's extreme estate of their necessity, utility, or advantage to themselves. Fabulous sums of money, therefore, have been expended in the purchase of such commodities—sometimes to indulge a taste for the fine arts; sometimes to satisfy a passion for the rare and the beautiful; and sometimes, too, to gratify a feeling of vanity or ambition to the *sole proprietors* of objects of antiquarian interest and curiosity. On the other hand, enormous sums of money have been paid in times of scarcity or during a siege for the commonest necessities of life, or, failing these, for substitutes that have been requisitioned for human food, the use of which would make one shudder in circumstances of less pressing necessity. Now, the land is a commodity that strictly belongs to this class. It is limited in extent, and no human power can enlarge or extend its area. The competition for it is excessive, and the competitors are struggling for its attainment—not for the purpose of satisfying a taste for the fine arts, or to gratify a passion for the rare or the beautiful, but to secure the necessary means of existence;

* (1880). Now 130 millions.—Ed. S.T.

for they must live *on* and *by* the land, or they cannot live at all. The owner, therefore, of that land can put on it any rent he pleases, and the poor people competing for it have no choice but to accept his terms or die in a ditch or a poor-house. Under the present system of land tenure, the owners are not only enabled, but actually exact for the use of the land the last shilling the tenant is able to pay, leaving him only what is barely sufficient to keep him from dying. Mr. Mill, who is the highest of all authorities on this subject, thus writes on the letting of land as it is actually carried out in Ireland:—"With individual exceptions (some of them very honourable ones) the owners of Irish estates do nothing for the land but drain it of its produce. What has been epigrammatically said in the discussions on 'peculiar burthens' is literally true when applied to them—that the greatest 'burthen' on the land is the landlords. Returning nothing to the soil, they consume its whole produce, minus the potatoes strictly necessary to keep the inhabitants from dying of famine."

Landlordism confiscates the Work of Improvers.

But the present system of land tenure not merely enables a class to exact from the people of the country a famine price for the use of the land which God made, but it also enables them to charge a rent for the use of the improvements on the land which the people themselves made, which is purely the result of their own industry and capital, and which is, in fact, on the strictest principles of justice, their own private property. With the knowledge and experience which we have acquired all our lives long of the transactions that are daily taking place between landlords and tenants, the clearest and most convincing proof that can be given of this fact will perhaps be found in the plain and simple statement of it.

The land of Ireland would at this moment still be in its original state of nature, had it not been drained, cleared, reclaimed and fertilized by the enormous outlay of labour and capital which has been expended on it by the people of the present day and their forefathers in past generations. The landlords contributed nothing, or next to nothing, for its improvement.

What has become of this enormous property? The correct answer to this question will, I think, be found to be that one part of it had been wantonly wasted and destroyed, that the landlords have coolly appropriated to their own use a second part of it, and that the people pay, at the present moment, a rent for the use of the residue of what was once all their own property. In the one County of Meath, in this diocese, there are about 369,000 acres of land laid down in grass seeds or pasture. That vast territory was nearly all parcelled out about the commencement of this century in farms of various sizes, ranging from ten to seventy, eighty, or a hundred acres each. These farms were dotted over with clean, commodious, comfortable, white-washed dwellings, with offices, outhouses, and the plant of well-to-do farmers. These dwellings were occupied by a race of the most laborious, industrious, hard-working and virtuous people that ever lived in any country. But, owing to the iniquitous system of land tenure, they have been almost all mercilessly evicted and swept away, and every vestige of the vast amount of human life, industry, contentment, and happiness that once flourished on these lands has been so carefully obliterated that, looking at them in their present melancholy solitude, one would imagine them to have been "prairie lands" since the creation. The property which these poor people possessed in their dwellings and farm houses has been thus wantonly destroyed, and the permanent improvements they had created in the productiveness of the soil were coolly appropriated by the landlords who evicted them. Until the Irish Land League interfered with their operations, these exterminators sold out by public auction every year the use of the people's property, as well as the natural productiveness of the soil, to cattle dealers for a term of nine, ten, or eleven months, and at a rent ranging from £4 to

£6 an acre, and they drew from their estates an income twice, and in many instances three times as large as the few honest and honourable proprietors in their neighbourhood who never evicted any one at all. I need hardly direct attention to the notorious fact that those who have been suffered to remain were only too glad to be allowed the privilege of paying a rent for the use of the residue of what was once their own property.

Landlordism prevents Improvements.

But the truth is, if the landlords *only* confiscated the enormous property created on the land by the people's capital and labour for ages up to the present moment, a word of complaint would not be heard against them. The great grievance of which the people would complain is that, even still, if the tenant has the folly to expend his labour and capital in the permanent improvements which the soil so sadly requires, the landlords are on the lookout to appropriate it at once, and put a fresh increase of rent on him for the use of his own property. Quite recently, therefore, the nation has earnestly appealed to the Legislature, through the Bessborough and Richmond Commissions, to protect the property which the people were ready to create in the permanent improvement of the soil, by barring the landlord's right to appropriate it, or charge a fresh rent for the use of it. Even the Tory section of the Richmond Commission were so struck with the manifest injustice of the arbitrary power by which the landlord can claim any rent he pleases, not only on the land, but on the tenant's permanent improvements in the land, that they virtually recommend the Government to leave the tenants no longer at their mercy. "Bearing in mind," they say, "the system by which the improvements and equipments of a farm are very generally the work of the tenant, and the fact that a yearly tenant is at any time liable to have his rent raised in consequence of the increased value that has been given to his holding by the expenditure of his own capital and labour, the desire of legislative interference to protect him from any arbitrary increase of rent does not seem unnatural."

An Open Violation of the Principles of Justice.

Under such a state of things, one may well ask—is it in human nature that anyone could have the heart or the enterprise to expend his labour and capital on the permanent improvement of the soil exclusively for the benefit of others, and with the certainty that he will be charged an increased rent for the use of his own property? How can any Government allow the land of a nation to remain in the hands of a class of men who will not improve it themselves, or allow others to improve it either? How can any just Government suffer any longer a system of land tenure which inflicts irreparable ruin on the general industry and prosperity of a nation, and which is maintained solely for the purpose of giving the landlords an opportunity of plundering the class of industrious, improving tenants which it is specially bound to protect and encourage? Such open violations of the fundamental principles of justice and of public morality would make one who has thoroughly thought the case out ask himself whether he was really in the region of hard, stern facts and realities, or only in an ideal of fancy or of fiction. The essential and immutable principles of justice used certainly to be—that everyone had a right of property in the hard-earned fruits of his labour; that whatever property a man had made by the expenditure of his capital, his industry, and his toil, was really his own; that he, and he alone, had a right to all the benefits, the advantages, and the enjoyments that that property yielded; and that if anyone else meddled with that property against his will, or interfered with him in his enjoyment, he was thereby guilty of the crimes of theft and of robbery, which the eternal law of God, as well as the laws of all nations, reprobated and punished with much severity.

(Continued in our next).

Cranks and Progress.

Our enthusiastic and able co-worker, Henry Ancketill, late lecturer for the English Land Restoration League, now resident in Natal, South Africa, is contesting a seat for the Legislative Assembly for the Borough of Durban. We need hardly say that his address to the electors is framed on sound democratic lines, and that we wish him every success. Our readers will be amused by the following comments on his candidature, which appeared in a friendly local paper called *The Review and Critic*:—

"We have a new candidate in the field in the person of Mr. Henry Ancketill, who is well known to many of our readers as a man of advanced thoughts and sympathies. Curiosity has led me to make a few enquiries as to the impression his candidature has made upon the people, and I am bound to confess that the only objection raised by some few, and only a few, is that, while he is a man of ability, he may be styled a "crank." As every man of marked personality is subject to such classification, I would like to draw the attention of our readers to what an American humourist is said to have written about them in the *Alliance News*—

"Cranks, my son? The world is full of them. What should we do were it not for cranks? How slowly the tired old world would move did not the cranks keep it rushing along. Columbus was a crank on the subject of American discovery and circumnavigation, and at last met the fate of most cranks—was thrown into prison, and died in poverty and disgrace. Greatly venerated now? Oh, yes, Telemachus, we usually esteem a crank most profoundly after we starve him to death. Harvey was a crank on the subject of the circulation of the blood; Galileo was an astronomical crank; Fulton was a crank on the subject of steam navigation; Morse was a telegraph crank; all the old abolitionists were cranks. The Pilgrim Fathers were cranks; John Bunyan was a crank; any man who does not think the same as you do, my son, is a crank. And by-and-by the crank you despise will have his name in every man's mouth, and a half-completed monument to his memory crumbling down in a dozen cities, while nobody outside your native village will know that you have ever lived.

DEAL GENTLY WITH THE CRANK, MY BOY.

Of course, some cranks are crankier than others, but do you be very slow to sneer at a man because he knows only one thing, and you cannot understand him. A crank, Telemachus, is a thing that turns something; it makes the wheels go round, it ensures progress. True, it turns the same wheel all the time, and it can't do anything else; but that keeps the ship going ahead. The thing that goes in for variety, versatility, that changes its position a hundred times a day, that is no crank—that is the weather-vane, my son. What? You nevertheless thank Heaven that you are not a crank? Don't do that, my son. Maybe you could not be a crank if you would. Heaven is not very particular when it wants a weather-vane; almost any man will do for that. But when it wants a crank, my boy, it looks about very carefully for the best man in the community. Before you thank Heaven that you are not a crank, examine yourself carefully, and see what is the great deficiency that debars you from such an election. If a man is too much for you in argument, or so much better informed than you are that you do not enjoy his conversation, call him a crank. If his conscientious devotion to principle makes you ashamed of your own loose morality, political or otherwise, just call him a crank, and get even with him. It is really quite an honour to be called a crank (under such circumstances), but the fools who use the term so freely have not yet found it out."

GRIMLY the spirit of progress looks into the law of property and accuses men of driving a trade in the great, boundless providence which has given the air, the water, and the land for men to use and not to fence in and monopolise.—*Emerson.*

English Land Restoration League.

The 18th Annual Meeting of the English Land Restoration League was held in the Hall of Clifford's Inn, London, on Wednesday, May 22nd.

The Chairman, Mr. Lewis H. Berens, opened the meeting with a review of the work of the League during the past year, and moved the adoption of the Annual Report and Statement of Accounts. The motion was seconded by Mr. W. Martin Wood, late editor of the *Times of India*, and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Arthur Withy proposed the election of the General Committee and Officers of the League for the coming year, and gave a brief account of the progress of the movement in New Zealand. Mr. Joseph Greenwood, of Accrington, in seconding, reported the work of the Accrington Single Tax Association. The proposed list was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Henry Taylor (from South Australia) moved, and Mr. T. F. Walker (Birmingham) seconded:—

"That this meeting of members and friends of the English Land Restoration League again emphatically declares that the land and the rent of the land belong of inalienable right to the whole body of the people, and that, 'Land being the natural element necessary to labour and life, it cannot be treated as private property without enabling the idle to live upon the industrious, and giving to individuals undue control of the industry, happiness, homes, and lives of their fellow citizens.'"

The following resolution was moved by Mr. W. P. Byles (Bradford), and seconded by the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, M.L.S.B., Hon. Treasurer of the League:—

"That this meeting energetically protests against the iniquitous and reactionary proposals of the recent Budget, and affirms that Land Values, which are created by the presence, the growth, the industry, and the expenditure of the whole community, and which consequently belong to the people, afford the only just basis for taxation."

Mr. Crompton Llewelyn Davies moved, and the Rev. W. A. Morris (Vicar of St. Ann's, South Lambeth, and Borough Councillor), seconded—

"That, in the opinion of this meeting, the present system of assessment and rating fosters land monopoly and discourages building, and that the substitution of land values for the net annual value of occupied premises as the basis of assessment is the first step towards the solution of the housing problem."

All the resolutions were carried unanimously, and the proceedings were throughout enthusiastic, a specially warm welcome being accorded to the colonial speakers. In spite of the great meeting being held at the same hour by the Penrhyn Quarrymen's Choir in a neighbouring hall, the attendance was larger than for several years past.

English readers of the *Single Tax* who are willing to help the League in its work should communicate with the General Secretary, Mr. FREDK. VERINDER, 376 and 377 Strand, London, W.C.

NOTHING in my whole experience as a Chinese subject—long resident under the British flag—more forcibly convinces me that the country of my adoption is barbarous than a study of its land laws, which embody the grossest favouritism to great landlords and corresponding injustice to the bulk of the people. In contrast to the equitable and beneficent regulations affecting land in my own country, the English land laws clearly point to a savage origin. The most hasty glance at their practical operation shows them to be the most direct and active cause of the destitution, squalor, pauperism, and crime which brood over the United Kingdom like a hideous nightmare.—*England through Chinese Spectacles.*

THE SINGLE TAX.

Published Monthly, Price One Penny.

Post Free in Great Britain and Ireland, 1/6 per annum.

Post Free in United States and Canada, and South America, 50 cents.

Payable in advance.

All Communications to be addressed to THE EDITOR,
13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW.

CONTENTS.

Notes and News.

Letter from Tom L. Johnson.

Natal Lands Commission.

Who should own the Land? By Bishop Nulty.

Cranks and Progress.

English Land Restoration League.

The Premiers of South Australia and New Zealand on the Taxation of Land Values.

Bazaar Notes.

District News.

Lord Rosebery's "Gold Mine."

An Appeal to all Englishmen to judge between Bondage and Freedom.

Receipt of a free copy of the *SINGLE TAX* by post is an invitation to become a Subscriber.

THE PREMIERS OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND ON THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

IN accordance with a resolution of the Senate of the State of Colorado, U.S.A., Senator JAMES W. BUCKLIN was sent on a Special Mission to Australia and New Zealand to investigate into the systems of taxation in force in these advanced and progressive countries. His report is undoubtedly, as our bright contemporary, *The Liberator*, of Auckland, New Zealand, says, "the most important contribution to the literature of the land question that has appeared for a long time."

The following extract from Senator BUCKLIN'S report indicates his matured views on the taxation of land values. He says:—

"One of the most persistent objections to a system of land-value taxation has been the claim that such a system was a mere theory and not practical. The system of land-value taxation now existing in the colonies of Australasia for ever silences all such contentions. The practical working success of that system can no longer be questioned. All that I claim for this report is strict accuracy in detailing facts, and that the conclusions drawn therefrom are conservative. My hope is that the American States, and first of all my own State of Colorado, may likewise find relief from intolerable fiscal and economic conditions, by adopting the rational system of taxation which has been so successful in the progressive colonies of Australasia."

In order to test the effect of the Australian Land Value Tax, Mr. BUCKLIN put formal questions to the Premiers of South Australia and New Zealand, and received replies as follows:—

Mr. F. W. HOLDER, Premier of South Australia, wrote:—

"Dear Mr. Bucklin,—I have yours, dated Wellington, N.Z., February 9th, 1900. You ask—First: 'Has the Land Value Tax been a success in South Australia?' I answer, unhesitatingly—Yes.

"Second—'Has South Australia prospered under it, and, if so, has it been a factor in such prosperity, or otherwise?' South Australia has had to contend for several years past against very low prices for all our staples, coupled with very bad seasons in long succession. The revenue from the Land Value Tax has helped to meet our needs, and complaint against it is almost unheard. It has in no way tended to work against prosperity.

"Third—'What are the prospects for its repeal?' There is no prospect of its repeal, and no general desire that it should be repealed. The trend has all been the other way. . . .

"There is no political party whose platform includes any repeal of the tax. There are one or two who advocate either an all round increase of the rate, or else another step to touch the large holdings."

Mr. R. J. SEDDON, Premier of New Zealand, wrote:—

"Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 9th instant, and am pleased to make your acquaintance. It was a pleasure to me to have been able to assist you in your research, and, as far as possible, to have given you such data as will enable you to form a perfect and positive opinion upon the subject matters which you have, during your visit here, investigated.

"In reply to your first question: 'Has the land tax, as imposed in New Zealand, been a fiscal success?' The answer is in the affirmative, and this is further demonstrated by the fact that during the last general election, which took place in this colony in December last, those who in former years opposed this policy have gone the length of saying that they would not disturb it, and there was not a single candidate, so far as I know, who advocated its repeal.

"As to question No. 2: 'Has New Zealand prospered under this policy, and has it been a factor in such prosperity?' The tax has been imposed upon the lands of those people who are best able to bear it, and whilst encouraging thrift, it has been just in its incidence, and there can be no doubt that it has been a factor in bringing about our existing prosperity.

"The third question refers to rating on unimproved values. The rating on unimproved values for local purposes has proved a success, and the opinion of the Government, which is generally shared throughout the colony, is that it should be made compulsory; at the present time it is optional.

"The replies to the second and third queries practically dispose of the fourth, as to the prospect of the laws in question being continued or repealed. Popular opinion is very strong in their favour—so strong that repeal is out of the question."

Such replies from men of such responsible and honourable positions are well calculated to dissipate

prejudice against our question, and to lift it into the field of practical politics in every English speaking country.

These two letters are worth tons of abstract argument for or against the taxation of land values. They are powerfully supported too, by the fact that 60 Local Rating Authorities in New Zealand have already, by special public vote, adopted the Local Rating Act, which enables them to raise local revenue by a direct tax on land values, irrespective of improvements, and by the recent passing of a similar Act in South Australia.

Our Colonial fellow-citizens seem to us to have reason to be proud of their public men, and our co-workers there are to be heartily congratulated. Much of the success is undoubtedly due to their unceasing and untiring efforts. They have their reward, and in their own day. In these two pronouncements of the Premiers of South Australia and New Zealand they present to the Single Tax movement, and to the world, convincing proof of the soundness and utility of our immediate aim and object—the taxation of land values.

The Social Problem in Parliament.

Mr. McKenna said he rose to call attention to the appointment of a Birmingham doctor to be an inspector of schools. (Laughter.) This Dr. Irvine had been charged before the Medical Council with advertising, and, while proceedings on the charge were not concluded, he was appointed a school inspector.

Mr. Chamberlain, in reply, said certain gentlemen in Birmingham, among whom were his (Mr. Chamberlain's) brother, Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, and the Chairman of the Liberal Association, devised a new charity in order to secure for the working classes in the city the advantages of consultation with eminent practitioners, which they could not get under existing circumstances without a payment beyond their means. Dr. Irvine was chosen, and the choice was some indication of his professional standing. Of course, such an appointment might injure the business of other practitioners who were receiving higher fees for similar work, and it was only natural that the matter should be brought before the General Medical Council. The Council decided that if Dr. Irvine did not retire from the position to which he had been appointed by this charitable association they would strike him off the register. Dr. Irvine retired some time before receiving this new appointment, of which he (Mr. Chamberlain) had just heard. He believed it was the intention of the charitable association to appoint another gentleman of professional eminence.—*Glasgow Herald*, 24/5/01.

This should be a good illustration, quite a parliamentary lesson, for those people who are constantly assuring themselves and others that there is no social problem. The working classes cannot have the medical skill they require because of their poverty. A charity is devised, and a doctor of high professional standing is appointed to meet the case. But as explained by a member of the Government, in his place in Parliament, the doctor had to walk the plank as his appointment might reduce the fees, for similar work, of other practitioners.

The poor hard-pressed doctors struggle to keep up their wages in the very teeth of a working class charity. What a sordid exhibition of the struggle for a living. Under the Single Tax all this will be altered. Any charities organised will be for the idle or helpless classes; the working classes will be quite able to take care of themselves, and yet,—there are some people who oppose the Single Tax!

BAZAAR TO PROMOTE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

THE Executive of the Scottish Single Tax League have resolved to hold a Bazaar in aid of the funds of the League, with a view to extending the work of the League, and the usefulness of the *Single Tax*.

Many of our subscribers and friends have often expressed the wish to have the power to assist us better financially. Here is the opportunity.

The Bazaar will be held in Glasgow in the early part of next year, and all interested, especially the ladies, are cordially invited to join in making this effort a decided success.

PATRONS.

The following gentlemen have already consented to become Patrons:—

Lord Carrington.	
The Hon. Lord Provost Samuel Chisholm (Glasgow).	
Hon. Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.	
Mr. Alex. W. Black, M.P.	Mr. Geo. Cadbury (Bournville).
.. H. Broadhurst, M.P.	.. Jas. Campbell, J.P. (Tullichewan).
.. T. Burt, M.P.	.. A. Dewar, ex-M.P. (Edinburgh).
.. Robt. Cameron, M.P.	.. A. Dewar, ex-M.P. (Edinburgh).
.. John Colville, M.P.	.. A. Dewar, ex-M.P. (Edinburgh).
.. J. H. Dalziel, M.P.	Coun. Dr. Erskine (Glasgow).
.. George Harwood, M.P.	Baillie Fairlie (Falkirk).
.. W. H. Holland, M.P.	Mr. H. C. Fairlie (Glasgow).
.. William M'Killop, M.P.	Baillie Ferguson ..
.. D. V. Pirie, M.P.	Coun. Dr. Garey ..
.. Edmund Robertson, M.P.	.. G. Lamb, ex-Mayor (Bootle).
.. Thomas Shaw, M.P.	.. Wm. Martin (Glasgow).
.. Arthur W. Soames, M.P.	Mr. J. A. Murray Macdonald (London).
.. Chas. Trevelyan, M.P.	.. Richard McGhee, ex-M.P. (Lurgan).
.. Alex. Ure, M.P.	.. Richard McGhee, ex-M.P. (Lurgan).
.. J. H. Whitley, M.P.	.. Richard McGhee, ex-M.P. (Lurgan).
.. J. Wilson, M.P. (Durham).	Ex-Bail. J. D. M'Gregor (Greenock).
Provost Ballantyne, Peebles.	Mr. H. H. Pain (London).
Mr. Lewis H. Borens (London).	.. P. S. Peat (Glasgow).
Mr. A. Billson, ex-M.P. (Liverpool).	Coun. A. H. Scott (Manchester).
Baillie Bilsland (Glasgow).	Provost Spite (Clydebank).
Coun. Thos. Burke (Liverpool).	Baillie D. M. Stevenson (Glasgow).
Mr. W. P. Byles, ex-M.P. (Bradford).	Ex-Prö. Watson (Falkirk).
	Coun. D. Willox (Glasgow).
	Baillie R. Wilson (Pollokshaws).

The Executive invites and will receive with pleasure the names and addresses of those willing to assist in any way. Subscribers outside Glasgow, and abroad, are specially invited to give the Bazaar their enthusiastic support.

PERSONAL AND INTERESTING.

The following are among the replies to the letter addressed by the Executive of the League to known representative supporters of the taxation of land values, asking the favour of their names, as supporters, as Patrons of the Bazaar:—

The letter was in the following terms:—

“DEAR SIR,

“The Executive of the Scottish Single Tax League have resolved to hold a Grand Bazaar in Glasgow in the early part of next year, to secure Funds to be devoted

to the cause of the Taxation of Land Values, and I have been requested to invite you to give your name as a Patron.

"There are a great many opportunities available for educating the public mind on the question which the League are unable to touch at present. The proceeds of the Bazaar will be entirely devoted to this purpose."

The Hon. Lord Provost CHISHOLM (Glasgow) writes:—"You may use my name as Patron of the Bazaar. I wish it and the cause it seeks to aid all success."

The Hon. TOM L. JOHNSON, Mayor, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A., sends a cheque for £10 as a donation to the Bazaar, and writes:—"I will consider it an honour to have my name enrolled as a Patron of the Bazaar."

LORD CARRINGTON writes:—"If my name is of any use as a Patron to the Single Tax Bazaar, you are most welcome to it."

Mr. CHARLES DOUGLAS, M.P. (N.W. Lanark), writes:—"I am afraid I must decline to be named as a Patron of the Single Tax League Bazaar. With every respect for the good work done by the League, I have never been able to identify myself with it; and it is better to avoid what might create misunderstanding."

Mr. THOMAS SHAW, M.P. (Hawick Burghs), writes:—"I have much pleasure in consenting to become a Patron of the Bazaar."

Sir JOHN LENG, M.P. (Dundee), writes:—"I am not able to give you my name as a Patron of the proposed Bazaar, because, while I am favourable to the taxation of land values, I cannot go the length of advocating what you call the Single Tax, and I do not wish to mislead anyone as to my views on that subject."

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, M.P. (Dundee), writes:—"I shall be pleased to have my name associated with your Bazaar, as you suggest."

Sir ROBERT REID, M.P. (Dumfries Burghs), writes:—"I prefer not to become a Patron of your Bazaar, as I do not wish to take part in any more associations for specific purposes. I already belong to so many."

Mr. ALEX. URE, M.P. writes:—"I have pleasure in complying with your request."

Mr. G. M. BROWN, M.P. (Central Edinburgh), writes:—"I regret that I cannot see my way to become a Patron of the Single Tax League Bazaar."

Mr. ALEX. W. BLACK, M.P. (Banffshire), writes:—"I shall be glad to become one of the Patrons of your proposed Bazaar."

Hon. A. O. MURRAY, M.P. (Midlothian), writes:—"I may say I am in favour, as an essential principle, of the taxation of ground values, and have always supported a drastic reform in this direction at the various elections which I have fought. If you will excuse my saying so, I am not certain that the scheme which you put forward is the best solution of the problem, and I am therefore a little reluctant to actually tie myself down to the particular method by associating myself officially with your Society. Apart from this, I need hardly point out that I am in sympathy with your efforts to seriously grapple with this difficult and far-reaching question; but in the meantime I prefer to keep a free hand in the matter, and for this reason have not joined any organisation advocating Land Reform. Trusting that your Bazaar will prove the success you desire."

Mr. J. H. DALZIEL, M.P. (Kirkcaldy Burghs), writes:—"I shall have much pleasure in becoming a Patron of the Bazaar."

Sir WM. DUNN, M.P. (Paisley), writes:—"I am quite in favour of the taxation of land values, but I am already pledged to open or otherwise interest myself in so many bazaars in the near future that I cannot undertake to increase the number."

Mr. D. V. PIRIE, M.P. (Aberdeen) writes:—"I shall be very glad to be one of the Patrons of the Bazaar."

Mr. J. EMMOTT BARLOW, M.P. (Fronce), writes:—"I regret that the calls upon my time and purse are so numerous that I do not see my way to become a Patron of the Bazaar. Wishing you every success."

Mr. JOHN COLVILLE, M.P. (N.E. Lanark), writes:—"I have no objection to your using my name as a Patron of the proposed Bazaar."

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON, M.P. (Holmfirth, York), writes:—"I cannot accept your invitation: 1st—because I have no time to attend to it; 2nd—because I am not sure that I fully agree, though to a large extent I may."

Mr. JOHN WILSON, M.P. (Durham), writes:—"I shall have much pleasure in becoming a Patron of your Bazaar."

Mr. A. PRIESTLY, M.P. (Grantham), writes:—"Whilst being in hearty agreement with the objects of the Bazaar, I do not feel at liberty, considering the heavy demands upon me, to accept your invitation to become a Patron."

Mr. W. H. HOLLAND, M.P. (Rotherham, York), writes:—"You are welcome to the use of my name as a Patron of your Bazaar."

Mr. A. CAMERON CORBETT, M.P., Glasgow (Tradeston), writes:—"I have just as much sympathy with stealing umbrellas and watches as with the stealing of land, and believe that precisely the same sort of benefit would accrue to the community from the one course as from the other."

Mr. CHAS. TREVELYAN, M.P. (York, Elland), writes:—"I shall be very pleased to become a Patron of your Glasgow Bazaar in favour of taxation of land values—the question which, I believe, will obtain a great deal more attention in the immediate future."

Sir JOHN STIRLING MAXWELL, M.P. (Glasgow, College), writes:—"So far as I understand the immediate object of the Single Tax League, I am not in favour of it. There is much to be said for a Single Tax upon all kinds of property; but for the rating of land values (which are already taxed), I have never heard any argument that was economically sound."

Mr. J. H. WHITLEY, M.P. (Halifax), writes:—"I am heartily glad to give my support to your proposed Bazaar."

Mr. JOHN WILSON, ex-M.P. (Govan), writes:—"Regret being unable to accede to request to become a Patron of your Bazaar, as I never have done so for the purpose of *Kirk or Market*."

Mr. HENRY BROADHURST, M.P. (Leicester), writes:—"I certainly give my name, as you wish. I regret I cannot give other help."

Mr. WALTER MENZIES, J.P. (Liberal candidate, South Lanark), writes:—"I must ask you to excuse me from giving my name as a Patron of your forthcoming Bazaar. I feel very much that there is in this refusal an appearance of thanklessness for the work you did in South Lanark at the General Election. Believe me that I have always appreciated your work; but, as I do not believe in the "Single Tax," it is better that my name does not appear."

Mr. J. A. MURRAY MACDONALD (Liberal candidate, Falkirk Burghs), writes:—"If my name can be of any use as a Patron of the Bazaar which the Scottish Single Tax League proposes to hold, I gladly consent to its publication. I hope that the Bazaar will be a great success."

Baillie J. M. M'CALLUM (Paisley), writes:—"I regret it is not possible for me to accede to your request. I will be glad to send a contribution to the Bazaar, but on principle I have always objected acting as a Patron, and have invariably done so to all similar applications. Trusting your Bazaar will be a success."

Mr. THOMAS BURT, M.P. (Morpeith), writes:—"I fear I can render no substantial help, but my name is at your service. You certainly have my sympathy and approval."

Mr. GEORGE HARWOOD, M.P. (Bolton), writes:—"I am glad to be a Patron of anything for taxation of land values."

Mr. WM. M'KILLOP, M.P. (Sligo, N.), writes:—"I shall be quite pleased to allow my name to be added to the list of Patrons of your forthcoming Bazaar."

Mr. ARTHUR W. SOAMES, M.P. (Norfolk, South), writes:—"If my name is of any use to you as a Patron for your Bazaar, you are very welcome to use it."

Mr. ARTHUR DEWAR, ex-M.P. (Edinburgh), writes:—"It gives me pleasure to lend my name for the Bazaar towards the advancement of the question of the taxation of land values."

Mr. ALFRED BILLSON, ex-M.P. (Halifax), writes:—"I am glad you are to have a Bazaar. Of course I am willing you should put me down as a Patron, and I earnestly hope you will succeed in your enterprise."

Mr. W. P. BYLES, ex-M.P. (Shipley), writes:—"By all means, if my name is of any use."

Mr. RICHARD MCGHEE, ex-M.P. (South Louth), writes:—"You ask me to allow you to use my name as one of the Patrons of your great Single Tax Bazaar, which is to be on the boards early in 1902. While such a request flatters me, it also surprises me. I have been in the full possession of my name myself for nearly fifty years, and up till the present I have not been able to put it to any profitable use; nor did I ever entertain the opinion that it could be profitably used by another person. As, however, you appear to think that you can make it serve your exchequer on the occasion, I have only to say that you are at full liberty to try your hand, and I hope your success will be abundant."

"I will promise you a contribution to the Bazaar, which will be more profitable than my name. It will consist of a parcel made up from the industries of Ulster."

Mr. ANDREW H. PETTIGREW (Pettigrew & Stephens, Glasgow), writes:—"I have considerable sympathy with the cause, but much regret I do not see my way to accede to your request."

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL, J.P. (Tullicewan), writes:—"I shall be glad to have you use my name as one of the Patrons of your proposed Bazaar. I have been narrowing my doings in this way, as my health has not been good lately, but I make this an exception."

Bailie JOHN FERGUSON (Glasgow), writes:—"By all means."

Bailie BILSLAND (Glasgow), writes:—"I have much pleasure in complying with your invitation to become one of the Patrons of the Taxation of Land Values Bazaar."

Councillor Dr. GAREY (Glasgow), writes:—"Will be very glad to have my name added to your list of Patrons for your Bazaar in the early part of next year."

Councillor WM. MARTIN (Glasgow) writes:—"I shall gladly allow my name as a Patron of your Bazaar."

Bailie D. M. STEVENSON (Glasgow), writes:—"I do not think that my name will be of any use to you. If, however, you think otherwise, you are welcome to it."

Councillor Dr. ERSKINE (Glasgow), writes:—"I will feel highly honoured by having my name in the list of Patrons of the proposed Bazaar."

Councillor D. WILLOX (Glasgow), writes:—"Re Bazaar, I am willing to assist in any way you deem best, and trust your efforts may be crowned with success. If I can do anything to enlist the sympathies of outsiders, I will."

Provost BALLANTYNE sends his name as a Patron, and adds:—"I hope the Bazaar will be a great success."

Provost SPITE (Clydebank), writes:—"If you think it will be of any service, I am agreeable that my name should be included in your list."

Councillor LAMB, ex-Mayor of Bootle, who has just returned from a visit to Egypt in greatly improved health, sends his name, and "trusts the Bazaar will be a huge success."

Mr. GEORGE CADBURY (Bournville), writes:—"The object of the Association appears to me so just that I do not like to refuse."

Bailie ROBERT WILSON (Pollokshaws), writes:—"I have much pleasure in granting your wish, and hope for the success of the undertaking."

Coun. BURKE (Liverpool), writes:—"I shall be glad if my name can be of any help. In any case a guinea will, no doubt, and that you will have toward the expenses. I shall endeavour to secure Mrs. Burke's co-operation as well."

Mr. LEWIS H. BERENS (London), writes:—"You are a plucky lot, and I am not surprised that nothing less than a Bazaar will satisfy you. I am sanguine that you will get contributions from many parts of America and Australia. Mrs. Berens and myself will do what we can to help, and if possible induce others to do so. By all means put me down as a Patron if that will help."

Mr. ROBERT CAMERON, M.P. (Durham, Houghton-le-S.), writes:—"If my name is any use to you as a Patron to your Bazaar, you are welcome to it, Mrs. Cameron's also if you wish it. Mrs. Cameron will have pleasure in sending a few articles for sale. I am sorry I am not a rich man, so that I could send you a more substantial proof of my entire sympathy with you."

Coun. A. H. SCOTT (Manchester), writes:—"I shall only be too pleased to give my name as a Patron to your Bazaar, and send a subscription to the good cause."

Signs of the Times.

The following letter appeared in last week's issue of *Farm and Home*:—

Why the Labourer Leaves the Land.

To the Editor of FARM AND HOME.

SIR,—The above subject seems to be a very much discussed one in journals devoted to the farming interest; all sorts of reasons are given why the labourer leaves the land, and many schemes are suggested to bring back the rural population. In my humble opinion none have quite hit upon a workable scheme. I think it is wise, before discussing remedies, to consider well the cause, and to remove the cause first, and all will be well. Why does the labourer leave the land? I have no doubt the reason will vary according to the district. As I am best acquainted with the north, I will try to show what are the particular enticements offered to the labourer. Take the case of an able bodied young man who labours on a farm. His wages will probably be about 10s. per week, with board and lodging; for this he will have to work 80 or 90 hours a week; he must have no half holiday; he must stay about the farm all day on Sunday—well, in fact, in winter time he will have to work some eight or nine hours on that day. Now I ask, is it unnatural that a young man working under such conditions, seeing others no better endowed than himself, but who have the good fortune (as he thinks) to be working in the mines or other public works, riding their cycles, or playing football or cricket, and going to the theatre and making 22s. to 30s. per week, should think of getting himself into the same work? I fear labourers are getting too enlightened to submit to the drudgery of farm work, and yet more education is the cry. The labourer, like other workers, likes to have as much spare time as he can get.

To talk of allotments under conditions like these is simply ridiculous. It must be clear to everyone that it is not in the power of the farmer to pay higher wages, or to reduce the hours of labour; so we must look to the landlords and ask them to lower the rents so that the farmer can offer the labourer something as good as he can get elsewhere, but here a difficulty arises which would have to be dealt with by Parliament. But what can we expect from an assembly of landlords? I believe higher wages are paid to farm labourers in the north than in the south, but still the labourer leaves the land; he prefers 48 hours in the mines or 54 at other works to the long hours on the farm.

J. W. H.

District News.

Dundee.

UNDER the auspices of the Dundee Single Tax League, open-air meetings are now being held in and around the town. Friends willing to assist should communicate with the Secretary, Mr. H. Davidson, Station Line, Løchee

Renton.

AT a meeting of the Liberal Association, held in the Rooms on 17th May—Mr. James Glen in the chair—Mr. Wm. D. Hamilton, Glasgow, read a paper on "Labour Questions and Empire." A good discussion on the taxation of land values followed, at the close of which Mr. Hamilton was warmly thanked.

Brighton.

A LECTURE on "The Ethics of the Land Question" was delivered by Mr. W. W. Bartlett, of the English Land Restoration League, on Wednesday Evening, May 29th, at Hurst's Dining Rooms—Mr. W. Hards in the chair.

San Francisco, U.S.A.

JOSEPH LEGGETT writes, San Francisco, May 7th, 1901:—"Please find enclosed a P.O. money order for another year's subscription for your invaluable paper. I would not know how to get along without it now. We are, I believe, on the eve of great events, both in your country and in ours. The work which has been done, and especially by publications like the *Single Tax*, has produced its effect upon the thought of the English-speaking world. The people are now ripe for action. What is needed now is the advance to the front of true leaders. I do not see any one in sight yet on your side of the water for real leadership, perhaps because I am so far away. But on this side of the pond the leader is coming into view in Tom L. Johnson, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio. Our American newspapers of every kind are full of notices of him. He has suddenly swept into view like a newly discovered planet in the political firmament, and I believe he will not only hold his place but increase in brilliancy and power as the months and years roll round. Bring out your man over there, and let us see on which side of the Atlantic the day of Industrial Emancipation will first dawn."

Australia.

MR. CRAWFORD VAUGHAN (Adelaide, 24th April, 1901), writes:—"The Federal Elections should open the eyes of our American cousins to the fact that Australia as a whole is no longer Protectionist. It is true that Barton can boast of a majority of 4 or 6 in the House of Representatives, but amongst those are included men like Sir Philip Fysh, who still claims to be a staunch free trader, but who, like other Tories, thinks that Barton "should be given a show." The fact is the Tories do not like G. H. Reid's tendency towards land values taxation.

It speaks volumes for the progress of thought in Australia, that S.A., Tasmania, and West Australia, hitherto Protectionist states, each returned a majority against Protection, West Australia sending in an overwhelming majority.

In Victoria, the "black hole" of Australia, the Protectionists practically swept the boards, and this immense preponderance of fiscal coercionists swamped the substantial majority of revenue tariffers returned by N.S. Wales.

However, in the Senate the Protectionists are in a minority, and the first Federal tariff must therefore be very mildly Protectionist indeed.

I regret to report the defeat of Mr. Max Hirsch, who scored 3000 votes against his opponent's 3600, single Electorates prevailing in Victoria for the Representatives as in all the other States excepting South Australia and Tasmania.

In West Australia, Mr. J. A. Thompson, President of the W.A. Single Tax League, a candidate for the Senate, had the misfortune to be placed seventh, six only being required.

Mr. Lonsdale of N.S.W. enjoyed still worse luck, for he was beaten by only four votes.

In this State I made my debut as a candidate, running for the House of Representatives. The campaign was a hard one, the whole colony being one electorate. I addressed 50 meetings exactly in about eight weeks, speaking in the concluding week to three a day. I had to face the opposition of being youthful, a defect which I stated "would be remedied every day that I lived." The result was that I came eleventh on the poll, out of seventeen standing—seven being required—and the total votes polled in my favour amounted to 11,800. This is exceedingly respectable seeing that three years ago, at the Federal Convention Election, the highest number of votes scored by a Single Tax candidate amounted to 2000.

This is an advance of nearly 10,000 votes in three years. The fight was fought on the straight out Single Tax ticket, and the vote recorded, especially in the farming districts, is exceedingly gratifying. At nearly every place at which I addressed the electors, I polled one fourth of the votes, but of course it was simply impossible to traverse the whole State, the area of which is a good many times larger than Great Britain.

When opponents of protection are spoken of kindly, understand that they are *not* free traders. They are revenue tariffers, and it will be the duty of the Single Taxers to point out the gross iniquity of endeavouring to place all the burden of taxation on the backs of the poor.

We have three years in which to labour in the vineyard, and I hope to be able to report by the next Federal Election the return of a few out and out Single Taxers to the Federal Parliament.

Had the Hare-Spence system of proportional representation been in force in Victoria and S.A. as it was in Tasmania, Max Hirsch and probably one S. A. Single Taxer must have been returned. Like the American Single Taxers we look to proportional representation to lift our cause ahead by a generation.

MR. H. H. WELCH (Echuca, Victoria, 8/4/01), writes:—"The Australian Battle has been fought and practically won for a low tariff, a fact of which we as reformers should be indeed proud. That we have had a local disappointment at the rejection of our local representative, Mr. Max Hirsch, still, on the whole, we should indeed rejoice at the national outlook for the principles of true democracy.

Taking the voting for two leading men in the Senate in each State proves conclusively that the tide is turning in our favour.

	High Tariff.	Low Tariff.
Victoria, ...	61,000	50,500
N.S. Wales, ...	47,000	78,000
Tasmania, ...	3,800	4,500
S. Australia, ...	38,900	39,700
W. Australia, ...	9,000	11,000
Queensland, ...	28,500	28,600
	<u>188,200</u>	<u>212,300</u>

This table shows that in a poll of 400,000 votes given for representative men (two in each State), there is a substantial majority in favour of Low Tariff.

In taking the Senate as a test on the fiscal question is to my mind the true analysis of the position, inasmuch as each respective State polled as one constituency, and local personal feelings were thus to a considerable extent eliminated from the contest.

Voters would thus exercise their franchise on principle more than on personal grounds. The Echuca constituency was a case in point. Mr. Hirsch, the Low Tariff candidate,

was defeated by some 500 votes for the House of Representatives. Yet in the Senate vote which was polled the same day on the same franchise, the Low Tariff led throughout the Electorate by some 1,000 votes, proving clearly that the voting for the Lower House was mainly personal and not on principle. Mr. McCall being a member of the Local State Parliament for some ten years and also a Minister of the Crown, which had a powerful influence in the contest.

The first Australian Federal House of Representatives will consist of Ministerialists (moderate Protectionists) 36, Oppositionists (Free Traders), 31, Labour (Independent), 8. By this you will see the parties are very evenly matched with the balance of power in the hands of the Labour Party.

And as G. H. Reid, the Opposition leader, has always had the support of the Labour Party in the State Parliament, we can look hopefully at the prospect of his party in the Federal politics.

And we may depend that no party will be scanned with greater interest by Mr. Reid than that formed by the representatives and sympathisers of labour. The most prominent consideration with regard to the future is that the elections have placed us in the position generally foreseen by Single Taxers as a result of federation in which the old case of Protection *v.* Free Trade would have to be re-heard. It will now be re-tried under the guidance of new leaders, and influenced by a wider field of operations in which party feelings and the petty jealousies of the several small States will be eliminated, and in its place we will have the higher and nobler national character of Australia as a united whole. Many of the elements will be new, and many of the old will disappear. It will be impossible for Protectionists to draw from the rivalries of each respective State as previously, and when the logic of circumstances has had its effect, there must be a total loss of the agricultural vote from Protection, as under no conditions can Custom House Protection benefit our farmers. With interstate Protection such was possible, but not so now under these new conditions. So far as we can judge all the changes will be in the favour of Free Trade, and everything points that Australia as a nation will not be cursed with the blighting influence of a policy under which the great U.S. Republic is groaning to-day, which is misnamed Protection.

During the progress of these elections, the straight-out issue of Single Tax has been practically marking time, but now the heat and worry of the battle is over we will at once start active operations, nor will we be satisfied until absolute justice is established throughout Australia, *i.e.*—freedom of production and freedom of exchange in this Greater Britain of the sunny South.

New Zealand.

Sixty Rating Bodies now rate land values for local purposes.

THREE VICTORIES AT ONCE!—Sydenham, Onslow, and Grey Lynn (says the *Auckland Liberator*, 11/4/01) have adopted the reform within four days of each other. It was carried at Sydenham (near Christchurch) on 16th ult., by 353 to 193; at Grey Lynn on 20th by 140 to 69; and at Onslow (Wellington district) on the same day by 140 to 8—over 17 to 1! It has now been adopted by 60 of our local rating bodies, *viz.*, 11 boroughs and 49 road boards and country districts. The reform is spreading without the assistance of press or pulpit, or the support of the orthodox leaders of public opinion. In fact, it is spreading in spite of them, for their influence, as a rule, is used against it.

Important Letters from the Premiers of New Zealand and South Australia on the Taxation of Land Values.

In accordance with a resolution of the Senate of the State of Colorado, U.S.A., passed on 27th March, 1899, Senator James W. Bucklin journeyed to New Zealand and Australia to enquire into the methods of taxation in operation in those colonies.

Mr. Bucklin's report has now been published. It contains 48 closely-printed pages of argument and statistics which we shall quote at length in future issues.

In his preface Mr. Bucklin says:—"One of the most persistent objections to a system of land-value taxation has been the claim that such a system was a mere theory and not practical. The system of land-value taxation now existing in the colonies of Australasia, for ever silences all such contentions. The practical working success of this system can no longer be questioned. All that I claim for this report is strict accuracy in detailing facts, and that the conclusions drawn therefrom are conservative. My hope is that the American States, and first of all my own State of Colorado, may likewise find relief from intolerable fiscal and economic conditions, by adopting the rational system of taxation which has been so successful in the progressive colonies of Australasia."

In reference to the tax on land values, Mr. Bucklin put formal questions to the Premiers of New Zealand and South Australia, and received replies as follows:—

Letter from the Premier of New Zealand.

"Premier's Office,

"Wellington, N.Z.

"Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 9th instant, and am pleased to make your acquaintance. It was a pleasure to me to have been able to assist you in your research, and, as far as possible, to have given you such data as will enable you to form a perfect and positive opinion upon the subject matters which you have, during your visit here, investigated.

"In reply to your first question:—

"'Has the land tax, as imposed in New Zealand, been a fiscal success?'

"The answer is in the affirmative, and this is further demonstrated by the fact that during the last general election, which took place in this colony in December last, those who in former years opposed this policy have gone the length of saying that they would not disturb it, and there was not a single candidate, so far as I know, who advocated its repeal.

"As to question No. 2:—

"'Has New Zealand prospered under this policy, and has it been a factor in such prosperity?'

"The tax has been imposed upon the lands of those people who are best able to bear it, and, whilst encouraging thrift, it has been just in its incidence, and there can be no doubt that it has been a factor in bringing about our existing prosperity.

"The third question refers to rating on unimproved values. The rating on unimproved values for local purposes has proved a success, and the opinion of the Government, which is generally shared throughout the colony, is that it should be made compulsory; at the present time it is optional.

"The replies to the second and third queries practically dispose of the fourth, as to the prospect of the laws in question being continued or repealed. Popular opinion is very strong in their favour—so strong that repeal is out of the question.—I am, dear sir, your faithfully,

"R. J. SEDDON.

"February 13th, 1900."

Letter from the Premier of South Australia.

Premier's Office,
Adelaide, S.A.

"Dear Mr. Bucklin,—I have yours, dated Wellington, N.Z., February 9th, 1900. You ask—first:—

"Has the land value tax been a success in South Australia?"

"I answer, unhesitatingly—Yes.

"Second—'Has South Australia prospered under it, and, if so, has it been a factor in such prosperity, or otherwise?'

"South Australia has had to contend for several years past against very low prices for all our staples, coupled with very bad seasons in long succession. The revenue from the land value tax has helped to meet our needs, and complaint against it is almost unheard. It has in no way tended to work against prosperity.

"Third—'What are the prospects for its repeal?'

"There is no prospect of its repeal, and no general desire that it should be repealed. The trend has all been the other way. . . .

"There is no political party whose platform includes any repeal of the tax. There are one or two who advocate either an all round increase of the rate, or else another step to touch the large holdings. Trusting these replies will help you, I am, yours, &c.,

F. W. HOLDER,
Premier and Treasurer, S.A.

February 22nd, 1900."

Lord Rosebery's "Gold Mine."

Industrial development is responsible for the bulk of the wealth of the great landed proprietors; it has been the means of cities being built on their lands, enormously swelling their rent-rolls, of tapping the mineral treasures within their possessions, and of utilising in a thousand ways property and products that formerly yielded but meagre revenues. Industrial development has not only taken riches out of the ground, but put riches into it. Where trade has been stagnant, where industry has failed to establish itself, the value of land has decreased; but wherever an industrial colony has been started it has been largely to the benefit of the landlord. The late Marquis of Bute's wealth was in a great degree the outcome of the industrial growth of Cardiff on his ancestral lands; the Duke of Devonshire owes much of his riches to the expansion of towns on or near his estates in Yorkshire, Lancashire, and Sussex; the Duke of Norfolk has been lifted into great wealth by the steel industries of Sheffield; the Earl of Derby's ground proprietorship in the neighbourhood of Liverpool has immensely augmented the family wealth; Sir John Ramsden's practical ownership of the land on which the manufacturing town of Huddersfield stands yields him the best part of his wealth; and so through the ranks of the richest of the aristocracy may be traced the direct influence of modern industrial development in the augmentation of their fortunes. The new industrial men have made the lords of the old hereditary acres what they are.

ANOTHER CLASS OF MILLIONAIRES

stands out very prominently in these days—the class of great landowners who have become such through the purchasing power of money acquired by success in trade, industrial endeavour, or financial speculation. In this category one of the most noted examples is that of the Astors. The immense fortune owned by the Astors of

to-day was founded by the energetic, plodding, and shrewd trading of John Jacob Astor, who, as fast as he made those first dollars of his by buying furs from the Indians at ridiculously low prices, and afterwards selling them at high figures in New York, invested the money in real estate in that city. After that it was sufficient to leave the properties to grow in value year by year to ensure one of the biggest fortunes the world has known. Each succeeding generation of Astors has held fast to the property, which has doubled in value again and again since old John Jacob died in 1848. For three generations no Astor has been connected with trade. There is no instance in Great Britain that can at all compare with that of the Astors in America in a swift enrichment by simple process of natural improvement in land-values. Many of our industrial princes lay out large portions of their wealth in acquiring landed possessions, however, and some of their descendants may one day come in to "unearned increment" of this kind that may tell a parallel tale to that of the Astors' houses and lands. A score of names might be mentioned of Englishmen, made rich by trade within the last two or three decades, who have joined the ranks of the great landowners, and put their families in the way of realising what it is to be wealthy without the effort of making wealth.—From "A Study in Millionaires," *Chambers Journal* (April).

MILITARISM THE KERNAL OF REACTION.

In a review of a work just published on "The Progress of the Nineteenth Century," the *Manchester Guardian*, 28/5/1901, says:—"Not only did the Franco-German War introduce Europe to a period of militarism—and militarism is the kernal of the reaction—but there runs throughout German thought, which has so profoundly influenced the modern world, a strong vein of antipathy to the liberal ideas (we use the words in no narrow or party sense) which count for so much in the forward movement of the century. But the causes of the change lie deeper than this. The wave of political idealism has, in a sense, exhausted itself. The idealists themselves have felt it, and have been for years consciously seeking for new principles or for new meanings and applications to give to those which they already recognise. But as soon as the grasp of principles is in the least degree weakened, the strong hand of the practical man takes the reins and the world rises itself to administrative efficiency, to "practical" issues, and to materialism. There sets in an epoch of contempt for "sentimentalism" and of admiration for "strong" men, who show their strength principally at the expense of third parties. Fortunately, perhaps, for the best interests of the world, history is wont to avenge itself on this sort of practicality, which, when its workings are seen over long periods, is apt to reveal itself as mere shortsightedness."

LIBERTY AND PROPERTY, the two conditions of social order, have been invoked as names by those who know nothing of any liberty but their own privileges to do wrong, and no property but that which custom has allowed them to appropriate and fence.—*Thorold Rogers*.

BEFORE laws were made, there were relations of possible justice. To say that there is nothing just or unjust but what is commanded or forbidden by positive laws, is the same as saying that before the describing of a circle all the radii were not equal.—Montesquieu, *The Spirit of Laws*, book I., ch. 1.

FOR many years past, there has been sufficient evidence to warrant the assertion that the oldest discoverable forms of property in land were forms of collective property, and to justify the conjecture that separate property has grown through a series (though not always an identical series) of changes out of collective property or ownership in common.—Maine, *Village Communities*, (p. 77).

An Appeal to all Englishmen to Judge between Bondage and Freedom.*

PUBLISHED MARCH 26TH, 1650.

BEHOLD, behold all Englishmen, the Land of England is now your free inheritance; all Kingly and Lordly entanglements are declared against by our Army and Parliament. The Norman power is beaten in the field, and his head is cut off. And that oppressing conquest that hath reigned over you by King and House of Lords these 600 years past, is now cast out by the Army's sword, the Parliament's Acts and Laws, and the Commonwealth Engagement.

THEREFORE let not sottish covetousness in the Gentry deny the poor or younger bretheren their just Freedom to build or plant corn upon the common waste land, nor let slavish fear possess the hearts of the poor to stand in fear of the Norman Yoke any longer, seeing that it is broken. Come those that are free within, turn your Swords into Ploughshares, your Spears into Pruning Hooks; take Plow and Spade, break up the common land, build your houses, sow corn and take possession of your own land, which you have now recovered out of the hands of the Norman Oppressor.

The Common Land hath laid unmanured all the days of his Kingly and Lordly Power over you, by reason whereof both you and your Fathers (many of you) have been burthened with poverty. And that land which would have been fruitful with corn, hath brought forth nothing but heath, moss, furzes, and the curse, according to the words of Scripture: **A fruitful land is made barren, because of the unrighteousness of the people who ruled therein, and would not suffer it to be planted, because they would keep the Poor under bondage, to maintain their own Lordly Power and Conquering Covetousness.**

But what hinders you now? Will you be Slaves and Beggars still when you may be Freemen? Will you live in straits and die in poverty, when you may live comfortably? Will you always make a profession of the words of Christ and the Scripture, the sum whereof is this—Do as you would be done unto, and live in love; and now it is come to the point of fulfilling that righteous Law, will you not rise up and act, I do not mean act by the sword, for that must be left? But come, take Plow and Spade, build and plant, and make the Waste Land fruitful, that there may be no beggar or idle person amongst you. For if the waste land of England were manured by her children, it would become in a few years the richest, the strongest, and most flourishing land in the world, and all Englishmen would live in peace and comfort. This Freedom is hindered by such as yet are full of the Norman base blood, who would be Freemen themselves, but would have all others Bond-men and Servants, nay Slaves to them.

The Law of the Scriptures gives you a full freedom to the Earth, and makes mankind free in all its members, for God, or the Creating Spirit, is no respecter of persons.

WELL ENGLISHMEN, the Law of the Scriptures gives you a free and full warrant to plant the earth and to live comfortably and in love, doing as you would be done by, and condemns that covetous, kingly and lordly power of darkness in men, that makes some men seek their freedom in the earth, and to deny others that freedom. And the Scriptures do establish this law, to cast out kingly and lordly self-willed and oppressing power, and to make every Nation in the World a Free Commonwealth. So that you have the Scriptures to protect you in making the Earth a Commonwealth Treasury, for the comfortable livelihood of your bodies while you live upon Earth.

THEREFORE you Englishmen, whether Tenants or Labouring-Men, do not enter into a new bond of Slavery, now you are come to the point that you may be free, if you will stand up for Freedom. For the Army hath purchased your Freedom; the Parliament hath declared for your Freedom; and all the Laws of the Commonwealth are your protection; so that nothing is wanting on your part but courage and faithfulness to put these Laws in execution, and so take possession of your own Land, which the Norman power took from you and hath kept from you about 600 years, and which you have now recovered out of his hand.

And if any of you say that the old Laws and Customs of the Land are against the Tenant and the Poor, and intitle the land only to Lords of Manors still, I answer that all the old Laws are of no force, for they were abolished when the King and House of Lords were cast out. And if any say that the Parliament made an Act to establish the old Laws, I answer that this was to prevent a sudden rising on the cutting off of the King's head; but that afterwards they made these two Laws, to cast out Kingly Power, and to make England a Commonwealth. And they have confirmed these two by the Engagement which now the people generally do own and subscribe; therefore by these Acts of Freedom they have abolished that Act that held up bondage.

WELL, by these you may see your Freedom; and we hope the Gentry hereafter will cheat the poor no longer of their land; and we hope the Ministers hereafter will not tell the poor that they have no right to the land. For now the land of England is and ought to be a Common Treasury to all Englishmen, as the several portions of the Land of Canaan were the common livelihood to such and such a Tribe, both to elder and younger brothers, without respect of persons. If you do deny this, you do deny the Scriptures.

AND NOW we will give you some few encouragements out of many to move you to stand up for your freedom in the land by acting with plow and spade upon the Commons—

(1) By this means, within a short time, there will be no beggar or idle person in England, which will be the glory of England, and the glory of the Gospel, which England seems to profess in words.

(2) The waste and common land being improved will bring in plenty of all commodities, and prevent famine, and pull down the price of corn.

(3) It will prove England to be the first of Nations to fall off from the covetous beastly government, to set the Crown of Freedom on Christ's head, to rule over the nations of the world, and to be the joy and blessing of all Nations. This should move all Governors to strive who shall be the first to cast down their Crowns, Sceptres, and Governments at Christ's feet, and they that will not give Christ his own glory shall be shamed.

(4) This Commonwealth's Freedom will smite the hearts of all Englishmen together in love, so that if a foreign enemy endeavour to come in, we shall all with joint consent rise up together to defend our Inheritance, and shall be true to one another. Whereas now the Poor see that if they fight and conquer the enemy, yet either they or their children are like to be Slaves still, for the Gentry will have all. This is the cause why so many run away and fail our Armies in time of need. So through the Gentry's hardness of heart against the Poor, the Land may be left to a foreign enemy for want of the Poor's love sticking to them. For say they, we can as well live under a foreign enemy, working for day wages, as under our own bretheren, with whom we ought to have Equal Freedom by the Law of Righteousness.

(5) This freedom in planting the common land will prevent robbing, stealing and murdering, and Prisons will not so mightily be filled with Prisoners; and thereby we shall prevent that heart-breaking spectacle of seeing so many

* Abridged by L. H. BERENS from a Broad-sheet, issued by the Levellers, the "Diggers," the Land Reformers of the Seventeenth Century, evidently mainly written by JERARD WINSTANLEY, and signed by him and thirty of his adherents.

hanged every Session as there are. And surely this imprisoning and hanging of men is the Norman Power still, and cannot stand with the freedom of the Commonwealth, nor warranted by the Engagement; for by the Laws and Engagement of the Commonwealth none ought to be hanged nor put to death, for other punishment can be found. And those who do hang and put to death their fellow Englishmen, under colour of Laws, do break the Laws and Engagement by so doing, and cast themselves from under the protection of the Commonwealth, and are traitors to England's Freedom and upholders of the Kingly murdering power.

(6) This Freedom of the Common Earth is the poorer's right by the Law of Creation and Equity of the Scriptures. For the Earth was not made for a few, but for the whole of mankind, for God is no respecter of persons.

Now these few considerations we offer to all England, and we appeal to the judgement of all rational and righteous men whether this we speak be not the substantial truth, brought forth into action, which Ministers have preached up and all Religious Men have made profession of; for certainly God, who is the King of Righteousness, is not a God of words only, but of deeds; for it is the badge of hypocrisy for man to say and not to do. Therefore we leave this with you all, having peace in our hearts by declaring faithfully to you this light that is in us, and which we do not only speak and write, but which we do easily act and practice.

Likewise we write it as a letter of encouragement to our dear Fellow Englishmen that have begun to dig the Commons, thereby taking possession of their Freedom, waiting to see the chains of slavish fear to break and fall off from the hearts of others in other Counties, till at last the whole land shall be filled with the knowledge and righteousness of the restoring power, which is Christ himself, who will spread himself till he become the joy of all Nations.

Signed by JERARD WINSTANLEY, and thirty others, and also on behalf of "divers others that were not present when this went to press."

March 26th, 1650.

MR. WILLIAM WATSON ON THE WAR.

The following sonnet, headed "Achievement," appears in the "Speaker":—

Who says we fail? We prosper beyond dreams.
As architects of ruin we have no peers.
We thought to fire but farmsteads; we have lit
A flame less transient in the hearts of men.
We are ill at building? Yet have we at least
Destroyed to better purpose than we knew.
We have raised up heroes where we found but hinds;
We have ravaged well; our rapine is not vain.
Redder from our red hoofprints the wild rose
Of freedom shall afresh hereafter spring,
And in our own despite are we the sires
Of liberty, as night begets the day.
Sufficient claim to memory this I deem,
Title enow, were other passport none.

WILLIAM WATSON.

THE essential principle of property being to assure to all persons what they have produced by their labour and accumulated by their abstinence, this principle cannot apply to what is not the produce of labour—the raw material of the earth.—John Stuart Mill.

CHARLES DICKENS ON THE OVER-POPULATION THEORY.—Man, if man you be in heart, not adamant, forbear that wicked cant until you have discovered What the surplus is, and Where it is. Will you decide what men shall live, what men shall die. It may be that in the sight of Heaven you are more worthless and less fit to live than millions like this poor man's child. Oh God! to hear the insect on the leaf pronouncing on the too much life among his hungry brothers in the dust.—Marley's Ghost.

LIST OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Which may be had, Post Free, by sending Postal Order or Stamps to SECRETARY, SCOTTISH SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, 13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW.

By HENRY GEORGE.

	Cloth.	Paper.
Progress and Poverty,	1/6	1/
Social Problems,	1/6	1/
Protection or Free Trade,	1/6	1/
The Conditions of Labour: a reply to the Pope's Encyclical Letter on the Labour Problem, ...	1/	6d.
A Perplexed Philosopher,	1/6	—
The Science of Political Economy,	7/6	—
The Peer and the Prophet,	—	6d.
The Land Question,	—	3d.
The Crime of Poverty,	—	1d.
Thou Shalt Not Steal,	—	1d.
Taxing Land-Values,	—	1d.
The Kingdom Come,	—	1d.
Causes of Business Depression,	—	2/- per 100.
Outlines of Lectures, with coloured charts (by Louis F. Post),	—	1/
Japanese Notions of European Political Economy, ...	2/	1/
The Story of my Dictatorship (Anonymous), ...	2/	1/
Government by the People (by the Authors of The Story of my Dictatorship),	—	1/
Evolution of Landlordism (by James Philpott), ...	—	7d.
Taxation of Land-Values (by Alfred Billson, M.P.),	—	1d.
A Just Basis of Taxation (by Frederick Verinder), ...	—	1d.
Official Report of Conference at Glasgow, 20th October, 1899, to Promote the Taxation of Land-Values: contains Glasgow Corporation Bill for the Taxation of Land-Values, as printed by House of Commons,	—	4d.
The Taxation of Ground-Values (by J. F. Moulton, M.P.),	—	1d.
Individualism and Socialism (by Grant Allan), ...	—	1d.
The Taxation of Land-Values (by H. S. Murray), ...	—	1d.
Studies in Landlordism (by H. S. Murray), ...	—	1d.
Free Trade, Social Problems, and the Taxation of Land-Values (by Edwin Adam, M.A., LL.B.), ...	—	2d.
The Taxation of Land-Values: an address to the Bearsden Liberal Association (by William D. Hamilton),	—	1d.
Work and Wages (by James Fairlie),	—	1d.
The Great Problem of Our Great Towns (London Echo extra),	—	1d.
Shortest Road to the Single Tax,	—	7d.
The Land Question (2pp. leaflet),	—	3/6 per 1000.
Birthing in Land (by William Ogilvie). Written between 1776 and 1781,	3/	—
Economic Principles (by Mrs. Eliza Stowe Twitchell),	—	6d.

"THE SINGLE TAX."

MONTHLY—ONE PENNY; Post Free, 1s. 6d. per annum to all parts.

Office—13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW.

TO LAND REFORMERS.

The Executive of the Scottish Single Tax League appeal to all sympathisers to become members of the League. Minimum Annual Subscription, 1/-

- 2/6 Secures membership of the League and a copy of the "SINGLE TAX," post free, for twelve months.
- 5/- Secures membership, the "SINGLE TAX" for twelve months, and copies of Pamphlets and Leaflets published during the year.

TO ADVERTISERS.

We have NO WASTE COPIES WHATEVER, all our "returns" being distributed at Political, Literary, Social Reform, and other Public Meetings.

The "SINGLE TAX" finds a place in the Public Libraries and Reading Rooms, and in Social and Reform circles in the cities and towns throughout Britain, in all British Colonies, and in the United States of America.

Published for the Proprietors by JOHN PAUL, 13 Dundas Street; and Printed by JOHN CALDER & Co, 126 Renfield Street, Glasgow.—June, 1901.