

### Scottish Land Restoration Union Report.

Methven, Balshagray Terrace,  
Partick, Glasgow,  
27th September, 1897.

DEAR MR. PAUL.—I have read with great interest the Annual Report of the Union for the current year. It is an able, and I think may be made a very useful document. The illustrations and examples of the evils of land monopoly are very pithy and likely to catch the public eye. The progress of the movement during the year as shown therein is calculated to encourage our friends.

I think the report should be extensively circulated, and have pleasure in sending a special donation for £5 towards that object. With kind regards,—I remain, faithfully yours,  
G. GREEN.

Mr. James Watts, Manchester, also writes in praise of the Report, and sends £1 for its distribution.

### The Glasgow November Municipal Elections.

The undernoted are the names of the Councillors who retire in November, who voted against straight resolutions, moved in the Council during the year by Councillor John Ferguson, in favour of the Taxation of Land Values:—

*Tenth Ward*—Robert Anderson.  
*Twelfth Ward*—A. A. Cuthbert.  
*Fourteenth Ward*—John McFarlane.  
*Fifteenth Ward*—Robert Paterson.  
*Nineteenth Ward*—William Stevenson.  
*Twentieth Ward*—John Shearer.  
*Twenty-Second Ward*—John L. Oatts.  
*Twenty-Fourth Ward*—James M'I. Thomson.  
*Twenty-Fifth Ward*—Archibald Kerr.

### Ex-Bailie Burt, J.P., and the Springburn Ward.

A requisition, numerous signed by representative electors of the Sixth Municipal Ward, has been presented to Ex-Bailie Burt, inviting him to become a candidate for the vacancy in that Ward caused by the death of Councillor Main. We would respectfully urge our president to favourably consider this request. His work on the Taxation of Land Values is widely known and appreciated, and we feel sure that his election to the Council would greatly assist in the advancement of the question there, and throughout the community generally. Nothing would give the Glasgow Single Taxers more pleasure than to see Mr. Burt once more a member of the Glasgow Corporation.

### The Question in a Nutshell.

Just as the landowner increased his prices by restricting the importation of corn, so the trade unionist increases his wages by restricting the output. Who suffers? Principally the consumer. The landowner compelled the consumer to pay higher prices for his food than was necessary had free trade been in vogue, and similarly the trade unionist by his restrictive policy makes commodities unnecessarily dear. But he does a double evil. He raises prices on outsiders, and he raises prices on himself. When the miners, for instance, strike for higher wages, and by restricting the output succeed in coercing the masters, what happens? Coal goes up in price, and the sufferers are not the rich, but the poor consumers, who, by being limited to dealing on the retail system, are crippled. The artificial rise in a necessity like coal narrows the expending powers of the working classes. They must do with fewer clothes, and the tailoring trade suffers, and so on through the whole social organisation. What, then, is the root error of trade unionists? They make the ludicrous mistake of endeavouring to improve the distribution of wealth by lessening the production of wealth. They adopt a policy of restriction when what they should adopt is a policy of increased production. Labour should fight against whatever cripples the productive power of the country, and where can they find a better sphere for their reforming zeal than in a campaign against land monopoly?—*Edinburgh Evening News*.

### Northampton Radicals.

At the annual general meeting of the Northampton Radical Association, on Monday, 28th September, the item of replying to circular, re Radical programme, came up for discussion. Mr. W. Chapman Wright, of the English Land Restoration League, gave a brief address setting forth the programme adopted by the Metropolitan Radical Federation. Ultimately the following were unanimously selected as being matters for especial urgency—Payment of Members, Abolition of Breakfast Table Duties, Old Age Pensions, Taxation of Land Values, Universal Adult Suffrage, Home Rule all round.

### How they Value the Land.

Before the Royal Commission, sitting in Dublin, on the working of the Irish Land Acts, in reply to chairman, Sir Edward Fry, witness, W. F. Bailey, barrister-at-law, said:—

The practice is to value the land as if it were in an average position, and then add for proximity if it happens to be advantageously situated to some market town or railway. If it happens to be in a peculiarly remote place, we often made reductions for that remoteness. But I am aware, and it has been frequently discussed among expert valuers, that it would be a better method of valuation, to value it where it stands, having regard in the initial valuation to all the advantages or possibilities of position. I think there are cases where it is exceedingly difficult to find your datum line to know where you are, and it would be, perhaps, on the whole, as satisfactory to value the land having regard to its position.—*Glasgow Herald*.

The contention of the Single Taxer is here advanced by the opposition—"Proximity to market town," "advantageously situated to some railway," "peculiarly remote" positions have reduced value, "better method of valuation to value it where it stands, having regard in the initial valuation to all the advantages or possibilities of position."

Did the community or the landowner make the market town, which gives this added value? Did the landowner or railway shareholder make the railway, and who gets the advantage?

### Land Monopoly and Trade Unionism.

BY H. S. MURRAY.

The *Edinburgh Evening News* has recently been discussing the labour problem and the policy of Trade Unionism. Mr. H. S. Murray contributed several letters. We give the following which speaks for itself:—

"Will you allow me space to criticise some of the excellent articles you have been publishing lately on Trade Unionism? These articles have been directed to showing up the ignorant proceedings of Trade Unions with regard to working hours and wages, and their tyrannical interference with employers in the working of their machinery. That the result of Trade Union officialdom is to constitute an aristocracy of labour, which shall embrace 'the cream of the working classes,' no one who judges honestly can fail to see. The meaning is, that a section or inner ring of the working classes are to be kept going at good wages, while the great body of unskilled labour is entirely forgotten, and left to shift for itself. As you have clearly pointed out, where they have the power, Trade Unions prevent the workman of superior skill from getting reward according to merit, and drag him down to the level of his inferior neighbour. In fact, the whole organisation is against the free expansion of individual liberty and social freedom, for which you so earnestly and rightly contend.

### "TRADE UNIONISM, A FALSE AND SPURIOUS REMEDY."

"So far so good, and in the abstract you are quite right. But it seems to me, that while denouncing all this tyranny you might go a little further, and show why it exists, and what is the explanation and cure of the social disease, for which Trade Unionism is a false and spurious remedy. Mere negative denunciation will scarcely satisfy your readers. Trade Unionism then is an attempt to raise by methods which in themselves are generally wrong the condition of those who have to earn their living by manual labour. Like combinations of capitalists to keep up prices, their object is to keep up wages. Their aims may be legitimate enough, but they are carried out very often by illegitimate and tyrannical means. In dealing with their interference with employers in the working of their

machinery, however, you fall into a gross blunder. You are quite right in resenting this interference on grounds of principle, but while doing so you are quite wrong in trying to make out that labour-saving machinery benefits labourers. Let me quote from one of your articles: 'But, say the officials, we must protect our men against being ousted. At the bottom of this we get down to the old, old ineradicable idea, that machinery has hurt the working classes.' From this you, of course, assert that machinery and labour-saving inventions benefit the labourer; now I equally assert that as such they do nothing of the kind; in fact, they do the very reverse.

### "THE LAND QUESTION AT THE BOTTOM OF IT."

"You have omitted one fundamental consideration which knocks your proposition entirely on the head, and that is to take into account the fact that all these improvements in labour-saving machinery take place under a system of land monopoly, which deprives your argument of all its force. The effect of labour saving machinery under this system is not, as you assert, to raise wages, but to raise rent. Let me illustrate. Suppose that on a farm of 500 acres employment is given to 20 men, who get £1 per week, that will make a total labour bill of £1040 per annum. A labour-saving invention is introduced which does away with the labour of five of these men—that will save the capitalist farmer £260 per annum. But will the capitalist farmer get it? By no means. At the end of the lease the rent of the farm will go up exactly by the amount saved, £260. Competition will ensure that, for if the tenant won't pay it another will. Let me illustrate again. Suppose that in Messrs. Jenners' shop they require 100 attendants to do the work. Some improvement is introduced whereby a portion of the work is done by a machine or other contrivance, and in consequence 80 attendants only are now required, and 20 are dismissed. Suppose that £500 per annum is saved in the labour bill by this improvement. Will this go permanently into the pockets of Messrs. Jenner? Yes, if they are the owners of the land on which their shop is built, but not otherwise. If they merely rent the shop the rent will go up by the sum saved in labour, viz., £500. This extra rent will not arise because the building is of more value, but because the site will have risen in value. The rents of Princes Street shops are not high on account of the buildings, but because the land is valuable. The same rate of profit can now be made with the rise in rent added as could be made before the labour-saving invention was introduced. Competition for the shop will increase the rent.

### "LABOUR-SAVING MACHINERY BENEFITS THE LANDLORD."

"We thus see that labour-saving inventions do not benefit the labourer but the landlord. They do not raise wages, but they raise rent. Trade Unionists know that labour-saving inventions are a curse to the labourer, but they are too ignorant to know why, and not seeing the cause they adopt the wrong remedy. These ignorant and intolerant men think that it is a question between the capitalist and the labourer, leaving out of view altogether the man behind the scenes, the landowner, who is the real culprit. They talk of the antagonism of labour and capital, whereas it should really be labour and landlordism. If they devoted half the energy to showing the people how to destroy the land monopoly instead of inciting them to unjust and tyrannical attacks on what they ignorantly call capitalistic monopoly, the working classes would soon get that emancipation for which they are groping in the dark. In referring to the benefits of invention you say 'nothing which increases production and augments the national wealth can be a lasting evil for the working or any other class.' Yes, that is true, but only on one condition, viz., that ground rent is public property. As all inventions but increase rent, to insure their benefit to everyone the rent must go into the public pocket and not into that of a separate class of landowners. That is to say land monopoly must be destroyed, and that can only be accomplished by the Single Tax on the Values of Land."

If you are a Liberal and Radical ask the prominent members of the local Liberal Association to subscribe to the *Single Tax*—1s. 6d. per annum.

Ask all Candidates for Municipal and Parliamentary Honours this Question—