

sound and just principle. It is not a very easy principle to carry justly and simply into effect, but I have little doubt that with the keen brains that are now applied to it, we shall very soon aim at a workable result. (Cheers.)

Lord Rosebery has not as yet pointed out the difficulty he apprehends in giving legislative effect to the Taxation of Land Values; but though he may still be troubled on this score, he is right about the others more interested and a workable result has been found. It is the same old plan, invented and known long before Lord Rosebery gave his public attention to the principle; and though the Liberal leaders may affect to despise and ignore it, the time is coming, and rapidly too, when they will heed it, or pass away to make room for others who will.

Poverty and Abundance.

In the States in the west, farmers burn corn because there is too much coal.

Miners go hungry in Pennsylvania because there is an over-supply of pork and beans.

Men, women, and children are clothed in rags because too many clothes are made.

Children go barefooted because of an over-production of hides.

There is no lard in the workman's hovel because of an over-production of hogs.

Too many streets are unpaved because of an over-supply of brick.

Funny, isn't it?

Millions go hungry every day because there is too much bread.

There are free soup houses in the great cities because there are too many cattle and sheep.

The earth is too big—it raises too much.

The sun is too warm.

There is too much dew, and a sight too much grass.

There are too many trees out of which to build homes.

There are too many stars to shine at night; everything is wrong, nothing is right.

Funny, isn't it?

Johnstown, Pa., Democrat.

The Eight Hours Day.

The Amalgamated Society of Engineers ought to make a present of the following letter to the various employers associated for the purpose of resenting the demand for an eight-hour day:—

Transport Appliance Works, Smethwick, Birmingham, July 28, 1897.

Sir,—For a number of years I as an employer and also as a journalist have kept a record of all the particulars obtainable in connection with the shortening of the hours of labour, with the result that I have no longer any doubt about the advantages which will accrue to employer and employed alike by the general adoption of 48 hours per week in the workshops of the engineering and cognate industries.

Those of us who have gone through the experience as working lads of going out to bleak and dismal workshops on winter mornings at six o'clock without our breakfast, are aware that the great majority of journeymen, as well as apprentices, only "skulked" their work and "dodged" the foreman till the bell rung or the bull blew at 8.30 for breakfast; and in many cases the foremen exhibited as little desire as the youngest amongst us to do aught but "munch about" near a fire till breakfast time.

I am, therefore, thoroughly convinced that the output of our workshops will be equal to what it is now if we adopt the 48 hours per week, arranging the hours as follows:—From 7.45 a.m. till 12 noon, 12 till 1 p.m. for dinner, and from 1 p.m. till 5.30 p.m., so that the men turn in equipped with their breakfast. On Saturdays the hours will be from 7.45 a.m. till 12 noon, which, with the foregoing hours from Monday till Friday, make up the 48 hours per week.

I wish to add that 75 to 80 per cent. of the accidents in workshops occur before breakfast time, and the adoption of the 48 hours will be the best insurance employers can make against the Workman's Compensation Bill.—I am, &c.,—GILBERT LITTLE.

A Step in Advance.

Mr. O'Regan writes us that the borough of Palmerston North has taken advantage of the Rating or Unimproved Values Act, which became law last year in New Zealand. As our readers are no doubt already aware, the Act gives the ratepayers local option in taxation. It provides that a proportion of the ratepayers, by requisition to the Mayor, may cause a poll to be taken on the question, and the majority decides. The poll cannot be repealed for three years, and half the ratepayers must record their votes, or it will be invalidated. Palmerston North has been the first to adopt the new system, thanks to the efforts of Messrs. Edmonds,

Linton, and Pirani, M's.H.R. The opponents of the principle tried to nullify the poll by abstaining from recording their votes, but 24 beyond the required number voted, and the reformers won by 402 to 12. The result has given great satisfaction to the Single Taxers of New Zealand, and to many more who are with us in advancing the principle, without seeing its full significance.

Where are the Land Value M.P.'s?

"A Radical" writes complaining of the *Single Tax* for not giving more information about what our members do in the House of Commons on such occasions as John Dillon's motion for reducing the duty on tobacco.

It is a great hardship ("A Radical" continues), after paying for an organ specially devoted to the *Single Tax*, that it contains little or no information on such an important point. Our member professes on the platform to be in favour of the Taxation of Land Values. If we knew where he was and what action he takes in the House of Commons on such occasions, we would be better able to judge of his professions.

We have a great deal of sympathy with our correspondent, but we are hardly in a position to know where the various members are on such occasions. We know where they were not on this particular occasion, and said so; and this information should be useful to "A Radical," and to Single Taxers generally, when their various members come to give an account of themselves during the present session.

The Land Question and the Taxation of Land Values.

BY JOHN S. NEIL.

It is becoming more and more apparent to advanced reformers who interest themselves in municipal and national matters in this city that each improvement, every economy, and all progressive legislation towards bettering the condition of the people is neutralised by an equivalent increase in rent. Let the community purchase the ground for a new park or for any other purpose from one set of landowners, and immediately the value of surrounding ground goes up, and another set of landowners increase the rents in that neighbourhood, so that the people pay *twice* for the same thing, once as a community, and again as a section of that community. If taxes were levied on the Land Value and not upon rental the increased value of the land around the new park site would pay for the site, that is, those getting the advantage would pay for it, but only *once*.

OUR TRAMWAY SYSTEM

is owned by the city, and has been a great financial success. The extensions carried out at the expense of profits have enormously increased the price of land on the outskirts. In this way *our* tramway profits have been appropriated by these owners, whose land has been brought into touch with the city. Quicker service and reductions in fares in our Townhead district increased the rents within the sphere of the reductions, and we are forced to the conclusion that if the entire car system were free it would only re-appear in increased rent, for then Glasgow would be a better place to do business in, and for that reason the flow of population would set in that direction, the influx would increase competition for houses, and the demand for houses would go up till all inducement to change had been absorbed by the landowner.

We have

A CHEAPER GAS AND WATER SUPPLY

than most cities, but higher rents balance the advantage, thus are the benefits of our economics sucked in by the sponge of Land Values. If the increase were taxed we would get for community use what we made, but as things are the landowner says, "leave that to me," and well, we have to do it or shift our camp. Of course, there's no compulsion, only you have to do it, that's all.

Our great expenditure of city funds to do away with slum property has improved the localities, increased the Land Values around, and forced the people out further on the outskirts. The rent of land for building went up, and our city improvement money finds its way into the landowners' pockets. If the increase were taxed back into the city purse, it could be employed in carrying out other schemes for bettering the condition of the people.

The shareholders of the West Highland Railway Company expended their money in laying down a railway along the Gareloch, with the result that land increased in value. In other words,

THEY PAID THE LANDOWNER

for being allowed to make his land more valuable. Great scheme! isn't it? Of course, the shareholders are business men, and they will—if they can—make the passengers pay for it; but, then, the great B.P. are able to pay for a breath of fresh sea air. If it is too dear they can write to the papers about the extortion of the railway company. It never strikes the B.P. that it is the landowner who compels the railway company to put up the fares, as can be shown, for the railway dividends are not high, and in many the original capital has disappeared. Railways, the greatest aid that mankind has in reducing cost, have to buy at inflated value bit by bit the liberty to confer a benefit upon a city; yet, withall, our smart business men cannot see that the greatest obstruction in the way of progress is the landowner, for he can make the punishment (in rent) fit the crime (of being prosperous) by raising the rent. The fact is, our highly-respectable business man is so busy saving the drops at the spigot that he has no time to attend to the fellow who is pumping off the profits at the bung-hole. "Taxation of Land Values" will remedy this by taking that which the community produces for community expenses.

There is

A PROPOSAL TO PURIFY THE CLYDE

at a cost of £600,000. If carried out, the improvement in the health of the city and the comfort of the citizens will have a rental value, and without doubt we will have to pay an increased rent because we paid this vast sum to improve the city. Down at Clydebank ship-building is good, and brisk trade has caused a demand for houses, Land Values have gone up enormously, and—there you are—the advantages of "good trade" are "scooped in" by the landowner. Tax the increase and—well, you know.

EVERY IMPROVEMENT BENEFITS THE

LANDOWNER.

A new underground railway station increases rents in the vicinity, so also does a new city improvement of any kind. Make your people safer by a better police system, fire brigade, better streets, cheaper cab service, purify the air with a smoke regulation, and it will appear in higher rent; make your city a temperate one by licensing regulations, give great charity donations, make them better by means of churches, do anything for the benefit of the people, and it will crystallise in more rent. I might multiply instances indefinitely to show the power exercised by landowners, a power of life or death, as in Lord Penrhyn's case, for the miners can starve if they do not accept his terms. It is an injustice to allow them to appropriate all the benefits that advancing (?) civilisation should confer on the community. It is an injustice to permit them to prevent the natural expansion of every city. It is an injustice to every builder of a fine block or tenement that his taxes should be increased for adding to the accommodation of the people, and he is "fined" in this way as long as taxes are collected through rental, while we put a premium on holding ground out of use by taking little or no taxation from it, thus raising our own.

TAX LAND VALUES,

and the owners will be tumbling over each other to get it built upon and in use, so that they may be able to pay the tax; the increased quantity of ground thrown on the market will "burst" the monopoly price, and capital and labour can be employed on it at a profit; your slums will disappear; hard times will vanish; agricultural depression will not be heard of; and rents will come down to a point where it will not take the greater part of a man's earnings. This is the "Land Question"—a question of as much importance to the dwellers in the cities as it is to the country labourers. The mechanic, the professional man, business man, every man is a land user, and as such pays his proportion of rent to the landlord—mind you, I do not mean the householder, for he is a benefit to mankind, but the groundlord, who does nothing and takes everything from those who require land, and all men do.

Ask all Candidates for Municipal and Parliamentary Honours this Question—