

affected by public improvements, let them do the work in the locality. There is no sense in going to London. As Treasurer Gray said—"some of the mistakes that had taken place in connection with the railway schemes in Glasgow had arisen through the inquiry having been conducted in London. He was quite sure that no mistakes would have happened had the inquiry been conducted on the spot."

THE ERROR OF SOCIALISM.—In the motto of Socialism—"From each according to his ability—to each according to his needs"—specious, altruistic as it may seem, lurks the essence of slavery. We say this with all due regard for the sincere belief of noble men and women who think relief from present conditions can be obtained only through Socialism. It implies the determining by "society" of both the abilities and needs of its individual members—the setting of tasks and doling out of rewards. Stated in the language of the Ruskin Co-operative Association's bye-laws (sec. 14, art 5), this rule is—"A man's endowments fix the measure of his duty, and the employé of great endowments who does not do all he might shall be deemed a less deserving worker than the employé of small endowments who does his best." As an abstract proposition this may be correct, but its error lies in the assumption that this duty is to "society" and that "society" is competent to measure endowments. If the conferring of greater endowments imposes a greater obligation, that obligation is logically, to him who conferred the endowment, and he alone is competent to measure it. Omnipotence alone is equal to the task. There is, however, a plain obligation of men to each other to secure the fulfilment of which is the cohesive force which holds "society" together. It is the obligation of each to observe the equal natural rights of all, and this is the basis upon which Fairhope rests.—*Fairhope Courier.*

HORACE GREELY ON THE LANDLORDS.—"That wealth and penury advance hand in hand, that the stately, sumptuous mansion implies the lowly, desolate hovel, was long ago noted. We may rehearse the babble of the accredited political economists till our brains are addled and our eyes bightened, and still the fact remains that so long as one man shall be authorized to draw an income of, say 100,000 dollars per annum, from the cultivators of a township for the use of the naked earth they stand on, to be increased as power shall dictate and need perforce assent, so long must the reward of the labour expended thereon be meagre and its subsistence scanty and precarious. So long as the millions whom God has doomed in the sweat of their faces to eat bread shall be constrained to solicit of others the privilege of so doing, and to propitiate a land-owning class by such share of their products as cupidity may exact and necessity must concede; the increase of population will be paralleled by the depression of labour and the labourer."

In the Second Ward Mr. James Willock, a thorough supporter of the Single Tax faith, was returned by 1,000 of a majority over his Tory opponent.

Ex-Bailie Morrin kept his seat easily in the Fifth Ward against his Socialist opponent. The Bailie's main plank has been the Single Tax for quite a number of years now. He is a member of the St. Rollox Single Tax Association.

Councillor Fife who was also opposed by a Labour man has been returned by quite a sweeping majority. He is a firm believer in the taxation of land values and supported Councillor Ferguson's motion in the Town Council.

Altogether the results are most encouraging to the Single Taxmen of Glasgow to continue their propaganda. They have a good case and one that the logic of events is driving towards solution with greater and greater speed. The Single Tax is winning whichever party is triumphant.

You can fool some of the people all the time. You can fool all the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time.

THE SINGLE TAX IN AMERICA.

BY A CASUAL VISITOR.

Having recently enjoyed the privilege of taking a holiday trip across the Atlantic and back in the great record-breaker the "Lucania," and of spending some idle days in New York City and its vicinity, I have been asked to write down for the benefit of the readers of the *Single Tax* a brief account of what I heard and saw of the Single Tax agitation there. My visit being but short, I had really little time to see anything. But I did hear something, as our New York fellow-agitators received me with extreme kindness whenever I announced myself as a Scotch Single-Tax man, and put themselves to great trouble to introduce me to a considerable circle of our friends in that city. I found all of them exceedingly anxious to hear what news I had to give them from Scotland, and very ready to give me in return what information they could of the speed of our cause in New York and throughout the United States generally. I assured them that I was not on a visit to America with a view to writing an exhaustive treatise on the present conditions and future prospects of the great republic; but I said that I did want as much information as I could gather about their movement and propaganda, as I knew how our friends here would torment me on this subject when I came home.

First, as to the

GROWTH OF SINGLE-TAX IDEAS

throughout the United States generally, I never heard anything like a doubt expressed. "Is the advance of our cause rapid and steady?" I asked. "Not always both rapid and steady," was the answer; "sometimes steady and sometimes rapid, but always certain." Which made me think of our progress in Scotland, sometimes going at a leisurely walking pace, sometimes making great runs. They did not seem to put very much stress on the success or failure of this or that political party. "Whoever wins, we are winning," was the almost universal sentiment.

In the field of

FEDERAL POLITICS

most of the American Single Tax men vote with the Democratic Party, as being the party pledged to tariff reform. But they have not been at all pleased with the recent action of that party as a whole, as they are strongly of opinion that during its tenure of office it has not been faithful to the pledges it gave to the electorate, and has, indeed, thrown away the chances it got. They complain of the delay that took place before any intimation was made as to the character of the tariff measure proposed. And, while that measure (the Wilson Tariff Bill), even as drafted, was not by any means a sweeping one, the form in which it emanated from the senate and became law made it almost totally worthless, the duties under it being, on the whole, higher than those in force before the imposition of the high McKinley Tariff some years ago.

All the Single Tax men with whom I spoke on the subject prophesied that the then coming elections would result in a great victory for the Republicans. They said that the electorate had been quite turned against the Democratic Party in power, owing to their broken pledges and other faults, and to the long time during which their tariff proposals had been kept hanging, to the detriment of business throughout the country on account of the uncertainty involved. Since my visit to New York their predictions have been even more than fulfilled by the complete manner in which, as we now see, the Republican Party has swept the country at the polls. Many think that the Republicans may make no alteration on the tariff as fixed by the Democrats, though I fancy it is quite problematical what may be done once the clamour of the interests affected, or which suppose themselves affected by the recent changes, is free to be heard. Perhaps the more changes that are made the better, as, now that the public gaze is directed to the subject, every tariff alteration will form a lesson in political economy to the American people. And I was assured that, despite the Republican reaction, the old Protectionist ideas are not nearly so strong as they used to be.

Meantime, the Single Tax principle is ably

represented in Congress by Tom L. Johnson, of Ohio, whose name is well known to friends of the movement on this side, and around whom a band of Single Tax and other advanced Free Trade Congressmen has gathered. Just as this goes into the hands of the printer, however, the news reaches me that Mr. Johnson has been defeated in the recent elections, and so unseated.

In

STATE POLITICS

the efforts of our friends are at present being largely directed towards obtaining what is called "local option" or "home rule" in matters of taxation. In America, local (*i.e.*, municipal, county, etc.) rates and taxes have to be levied according to *State Law*, just as in this country they have to be levied according to national law. The aim of the movement for "local option" is to put an end to this by having measures passed through the various State Legislatures permitting each locality to levy its rates in the way it judges best itself. This is a thoroughly democratic measure, and is enlisting considerable support quite outside of Single Tax circles. I was told that one or two of the States are already almost ripe for it; and I was also assured that whenever and wherever such a step is achieved there will almost certainly be some localities which would, either at once or in a short time, choose to levy their rates either wholly or partially on land values. The force of example involved in such a thing would be even greater than the results achieved to the localities themselves. For, as we believe in our principles, we must believe that every such locality would become a "burning and a shining light" among its neighbours, and a rousing voice calling upon them to "go and do likewise."

In New York a general

EDUCATIONAL PROPAGANDA

continually goes on, as I am told it does everywhere throughout the States. The methods by which this is prosecuted are very similar to our own Scotch methods, consisting as they do in the familiar circulation of literature, the running of propaganda organs, the holding of out-door and in-door meetings according to the season, the arranging of debates with opponents, the pushing of our principles in the columns of the press whenever possible, the pledging and attempted pledging of political candidates, the bringing of arguments to bear on political conferences and assemblies, and, generally, the preaching of the gospel whenever and wherever an opportunity can be found. Of large works, the one that is being circulated most extensively just now is George's "Protection or Free Trade," several million copies of which have, within a year or two, been scattered over America in various cheap editions.

I took the opportunity of being present at one of the

OUT-DOOR MEETINGS

held in Madison Square, New York, every Tuesday evening, under the auspices of the Manhattan Single Tax Club. I found there an audience of about 100, more than half of which seemed to be highly sympathetic, the remainder being evidently neutral or callous; just such an audience as I have again and again seen gathered under the auspices of the Scottish Land Restoration Union, on this side. The speeches delivered also bore a very strong family resemblance to those of the orators of the S.L.R. Union, with which I am so familiar—with the exception that all the examples and illustrations were, of course, American. I was accorded the privilege of making a ten or fifteen minutes harangue to the crowd. This I found was not a very easy thing to do without preparation, as I had to take great care to avoid making references to things British which might hardly have been understood. Besides I was quite well aware that my strong Scotch accent sounded strange to the ears of a New York audience.

I am glad to say that

HENRY GEORGE

is well, and active. He is at present engaged on his treatise on political economy which he expects to finish in the spring, and which I know will be eagerly waited for by his disciples in this country. The work would have been completed before now were it not for the frequency of the calls that are almost continually being made upon him to lecture

Ask all Candidates for Municipal and Parliamentary Honours this Question—

throughout different parts of the United States, and to enter into controversial and other work. On the completion of his book, he intends to make a holiday visit to Great Britain.

To a man who has a little knowledge, and a little observation, and a little sympathy with his fellows, and a little poetic feeling, a voyage across the Atlantic furnishes a great many new and

STRIKING THINGS.

But, I think the thing that struck me most was the similarity of the Single Tax men I met in New York with the Single Tax men I meet in Scotland. I ought not to have been surprised at this; and, indeed, I expected to find such a similarity. Yet it seemed curious! To leave this country; to sail on and on, day and night, and day and night, and day and night, with a velocity equal to that of an ordinary Scotch railway train—a velocity so great that, breaking the record as we did on the westward voyage, I can boast that I crossed the Atlantic faster than anybody ever did before. To sail on and on—now through a belt of storm and now over a region of calm, now on a warm current where the weather was summerlike, and again on a cold current where it was wintry; hour after hour under cloudy skies, hour after hour over white and angry waves, hour after hour through rippling sunny seas. And then at last to come to another country where so many things, down even to the weeds on the roadsides, are different from here. And to find there, knots of men with the identical faith of the friends I had left behind; puzzling their brains in the same way to find means to spread the same truth; with the same hope in their hearts, and the same arguments, and even the same phrases in their mouths. I had really expected to find all this. Nevertheless, it struck me very much; and, somehow, it gave me a greater appreciation of our movement and a bigger hope than ever I had before.

NORMAN M'LENNAN.

By the Way.

It is stated that the present House of Commons is made up as follows:—

41	per cent.	represent the Lawyer and Monied Interests.
34	”	Employers of Labour.
17	”	Landed Interests.
2	”	Workers (direct).

Payment of Members and the Second Ballot might change these figures a little.

The recent Tory Conference adopted the following resolution:—“That lodgers paying a yearly rent of £10 and upwards should be entitled to be put on the electoral roll.” There will be a few more Forfarshires if the Liberals don't hurry up and get something done.

Mr. John Inglis, president of the Institution of Engineers and Shipbuilders, says:—“The prayer of the collectivist or socialist contained but two petitions—‘Give us our daily bread, and forgive us our debts.’”

Lord Salisbury, commenting on the invasion of the “rights of property” by the London County Council, says:—“The incisor tooth of predatory radicalism was only sharpened by the food which they gave it to stay its appetite.” The chickens are coming home to roost. The London County Council was the gift of Lord Salisbury's government.

Discussing the House of Lords in a speech recently Lord Tweedmouth remarked that:—“Because a particular individual may at a particular time have been exalted for a particular work, his descendants ever afterwards should be considered heaven-sent and God-born legislators.” Commenting on which the Glasgow *Citizen* says:—“Perhaps he speaks a good deal of truth. Only, if he carries his principles out, they won't end at the House of Lords. When those lawmakers are abolished, the people will begin to ask why a few gentlemen, because they are the sons of their fathers, should inherit the land of the United Kingdom to the exclusion of the masses. Why should Lord Tweedmouth own thousands of acres, when a poor wretch of a voter can hardly get sufficient soil in which to bury himself?”

The *Citizen* is about right. This is just the question that is, not slowly, gathering momentum. The people who are crushed into single apartments, built three and four flats deep in back lands, and those who own thousands of acres, are social contrasts that will surely disappear. The yeast of Demos is at work.

“No man ever riveted a chain of slavery round his brother's neck, but God surely welded the other round the neck of the tyrant.”—*Lamartine*.

“But if the people, by the exercise of constitutional means, passed an Act through Parliament making the estates of the nobles the property of the nation, with or without compensation, that would be neither brigandage nor revolution; it would be a legal, righteous, and constitutional reform. The titled robbers of England have always done their robberies in a legal manner. We propose to enforce their cessation in a legal manner. Moral right or economic reason the landlord and the capitalist have none to lean on. Only by law is their property theirs, only by law are their privileges upheld. And laws which were made by the State can by the State be altered.”—*Nunquam*.

QUERY.—If the landlords have neither moral right nor economic reason to lean on, what gives them the claim to compensation—and if they are to be dislodged without compensation, let it be said straight out. The day has gone by for this miserable shuffling indecision.

Mr. Stephen Williamson, M.P., says he is not a follower of Keir Hardie and he does not expect to be one. “If Mr. Keir Hardie” he said, “had any definite proposal, he had never put it into the form of a bill.” Surely Mr. Williamson has forgotten Mr. Hardie's Mines' Bill, where he proposes to purchase out the present owners in the interest of—the workers of course.

Mr. Hall Caine dreams of a greater novel than we have ever yet seen, that shall be compounded of the penny newspaper and the Sermon on the Mount.

Sir Charles Dilke says:—“The Liberal Party are still hampered by men who want peerages for themselves or their sons, and he should not believe that the leaders are in earnest until the Liberal Party gave over making peers.”

Forfarshire was lost to the Liberals it is generally stated either because the Liberal candidate was a member of the “carpet-bagging” fraternity or that the Tory candidate's programme was quite as attractive on social questions as the one put forward by the Liberal. However that may be, the Tories are advancing in the ways of democratic thought. Let the Liberals act, and act quickly, if they desire to continue in the van of progress.

“The Labour Party mean to work,” so says Mr. Shaw Maxwell, “that though they do not win the seat, it would not be won for the Liberal Party.”

Sir James Carmichael, M.P., told his constituents the other night at St. Rollox, that he thinks highly of the *Single Tax*, and reads it with care and pleasure every month. He also complimented Single-Tax men on the manner of their independent attitude within and without the ranks of the Liberal Party.

Single Tax men permeate the Liberal Party from within, and the Labour and Tory Parties from without. The Labour-Socialist candidates at Glasgow Municipal Elections, in November, had nothing more important to talk about than the taxation of land values. Mr. Keir Hardie advised them to take this stand. And now the Tories are wanting a revision of the whole system of taxation, so that the burden may be equitably adjusted.

It was simply lamentable though to witness the Labour men advocate in the same breath the *Single Tax*—taxation of land values up to 20s. in the £—and a tax on empty houses also.

It reminds one of Keir Hardie's innocent declaration that “he was in favour of the *Single Tax*, and a few other taxes.”

We have received from the London Electoral Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, “Tracks for the Times, No. 2.” It is brimful of up-to-date political matter, and deals in the most trenchant manner with the land question. It is well worthy the perusal of every reformer, and is simply invaluable as a guide and teacher to all speakers who are really desirous of having the truth spoken. Space forbids us in this issue dealing with the publication as we desire, but we hope to have an early opportunity of doing so.

Foreign News.

Victoria has returned at the recent General Election 15 Free Traders, 40 Tariff Reformers, and 40 Protectionists. 49 members of this total advocated the taxation of the unimproved value of land. 20 of these did so in real earnest.

A SINGLE TAX VICTORY.—“Mr. Wm. H. Irvine, M.L.A., of Melbourne (Victoria), who won the phenomenal victory of the elections, and has the distinction of being the first member of the Victorian Legislature who relied for his return upon the purest exposition of Free Trade and land value taxation. Just thirteen days before the polling day he, for the first time, saw the electorate which was to return him to Parliament with an overwhelming majority. His opponent, the Honourable R. Baker, had represented the electorate for twelve continuous years, and had, moreover, the advantage of being a Minister of the Crown. Yet in spite of all these adverse circumstances, Mr. Irvine was returned by the phenomenal majority of 258 votes. No wonder the politicians stand aghast before this wonderful victory and ask themselves how it was won. Yet in reality there is nothing to wonder at. The simple explanation is that Mr. Irvine, being well versed in the facts of the case, could show the electors that Customs House and railway taxation were the causes of their distress, and that their repeal and the taxation of the unimproved value of land was the only remedy. This he did, without concealment or evasion, taking his standpoint on the broad principle, that the land is the people's, and each man's earnings his own.”—*Melbourne Beacon*.

PROGRESS IN NEW ZEALAND.—“If a measure which the Government has now before Parliament becomes law, a change of a very radical nature will soon be made as regards the rating of property in this colony. The Colonial Treasurer has introduced and carried successfully through the House of Representatives a Bill which proposes that for the future the rating of land shall be upon its unimproved value. This proposal aims directly at large land owners who do not improve their holdings, and at people who purchase sections as a speculation, and hold on without doing anything to them in the shape of improvements until the improvements effected by their neighbours have the effect of giving these sections an enhanced value at no expense to themselves. The Bill absolutely releases all improvements from taxation. Supposing, for example, two sections of land adjoin each other of equal extent and quality, and that upon one of them no improvements are made, while upon the other improvements to the extent of £5,000 or £10,000 are carried out, the improving owner will not be rated on account of these improvements. His property will be rated in accordance with what the value of his land is, supposing nothing had ever been done to it by the hand of man. He may be deriving a big profit from the improvements he has carried out, but he will not be rated a single penny more than the owner of the adjoining section, who has allowed it to remain in its primitive condition, and is deriving no profit from it whatever. It is quite possible, that the Upper House will strangle the Bill when it gets there.”—*Age*.

“Are you in favour of Taxing Land Values?”