

# The SINGLE TAX

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE CAUSE OF TAXING LAND VALUES.

VOL. IV.—No. 37.

GLASGOW, JUNE, 1897.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

## LABOUR'S REAL ENEMY.

**D**URING the year many stubborn battles were fought besides the Belfast strike and Clyde lock-out. Chief of these was, perhaps, the strike at Hull over the rating of a milling machine. Our members there objected to the placing of a low-paid, unskilled man upon the machine in question. . . . The employer, on the other hand, claims absolute freedom to exercise authority in the selection and placing and paying of workmen, because he says he provides the machinery and plant."—*Annual Report of the A.S.E.*



**T**HE labourer provides his skill, and the employer the machinery; but what does the landowner provide? A higher standard of wages, or a successful attempt to keep wages from falling—often secured at the expense of much suffering—does not prevent the rent or values of land from advancing on both labour and capital. When the trades' unionist and the employer devote their time and attention to their common enemy—the land monopolist—they may hope for a solution of the difficulty.

### Notes and Comments.

The *Buteman* seems to have got fairly on the track of the "new tax." In a recent issue it remarks—"Another plot of ground has been sold for £200. When will people see that ground like this is made valuable solely by the presence of the community, and for that reason they should benefit by it. If Taxation of Land Values was applicable the town would have been benefited annually to the extent of (on a 5 per cent. basis) £10, and the proprietor would scarcely have cared to hold it out of use and pay the tax. For years numerous people have been eagerly seeking a site to build on and unable to obtain it, while this ground has stood unoccupied, becoming more valuable year after year, and yet the owner paid only a nominal tax. *When will Millportonians see the 'cat'?* It will be a glorious day for Cumbræ when 'Land Monopoly' goes down before the 'Single Tax.'"

#### Right-of-Way.

Colonial Harrington Stuart, a local owner of a small part of Scotland has been having a "flutter" in the correspondence column of the *Hamilton Herald* over the Maxweltown Right-of-Way case. Mr. James Whyte has classed the Colonial amongst "the landed loafers and drones in the industrial hive," to which he replies—

God knows my time has been taken up enough lately with answering unwarrantable attacks and false charges that have been made against me by such as him—but I know what people of his kidney would say if I made no reply: "That I was silenced; that the reason I did not answer was that I could not."

The natives of the district regard the letters as a kind of weekly pic-nic, and the outcome of the right-of-way is quite overshadowed by lively anticipations of a general solution of the land question in which the people will have restored to them their common lands and village greens, and the landowners exalted into working for their living. Henry George once said: "Get the landowners out into the open to defend their claims to the land and the battle for land restoration would be as good as won." We congratulate Mr. Whyte on having "drawn the badger" in Maxweltown.

### A Compliment to Single Taxers.

"One thing is sure," says the *Boston Advertiser*, commenting on a recent address by Dr. McGlynn, at a meeting organised by the Boston Single Taxers, "the Single Tax movement has gained marvellous momentum in the little more than a dozen years since Henry George's remarkable book, 'Progress and Poverty,' began to make a stir in the world. At first the movement was supposed, by people who knew about it only from hearsay, to be merely another outbreak of some kind of labour agitation; a sort of new socialism, or perhaps a comparatively mild form of anarchist lunacy. Now the truth is, and there is no use in denying it, whatever one may think about the book and its author, that almost from the day of its publication, 'Progress and Poverty' has exercised a strange fascination over the minds of many highly intellectual people. It is no more than fair to say that thus far, certainly in greater Boston, the Single Tax movement seems to have fallen into excellent hands. Those who most strongly dissent from their economic doctrines must admit, if brought into close quarters with the members of the league, that they are delightful people. Their zeal, warm as it is, is wholly free from what so often, in connection with other subjects, makes zeal repugnant; that is, bitterness. The Single Taxers hereabout are in the true sense ladies and gentlemen. They are more than willing to try to convert the economic sinner from the error of his ways; but they are the kindest and sweetest-tempered of proselytisers. And they have brains."

### The Socialist Programme.

The Independent Labour Party in their recent amended programme begin by declaring—"The land being the storehouse of all the necessities of life should be declared and treated as public property."

Plank 2 proposes *inter alia* "to purchase" this "storehouse of all the necessities of life" and that "rates be levied on the rental values of the district and money borrowed on the security of such rates for this purpose."

Plank 7 advocates "abolition of indirect taxation and the gradual transference of all public burdens on to unearned incomes with a view to their ultimate extinction."

What a farce this is. We are told that the land belongs to the people, but they can't have it unless by purchase; that they are to tax themselves for the sum necessary, and borrow money from each other on the strength of their ability to pay the new rates; and as a sort of compensation they are to relieve themselves of all public burdens present and to come by taxing their own "unearned incomes." It seems to work out something after this manner. The landlords are to hand over the land to the people for so much money to be borrowed on the security of the rates. The landlords will now have this as their "unearned incomes" which they will hand over in due course under the rule of plank 7.

It is a positive excursion into the sphere of economics, which can only be accounted for by the teachings of the pseudo economists, and a want of mental ballast on the part of the leaders of this Socialist emancipation movement, or to both.

### Progress.

The *Single Tax* with this issue enters upon its fourth year. We feel justified in stating that the paper has done its work during the past three years to the advantage of the Single Tax cause. We have every assurance of this from friends of the movement, wherever they are to be found, and we take this opportunity of thanking those friends at home and abroad who have so generously assisted us in our task, financially and otherwise. Since the inception of the *Single Tax* we have realised that it is around such a messenger that organisation can best be maintained. It brings the men of the movement into closer touch with each other, and encourages them, even in isolated cases, to press onward with greater zeal.

We are conscious at times that we have left undone some things that might have been done, but we can look back with confidence on our work in its numerous and varied spheres. The

reform for which we stand is not slowly gaining in the public mind, and the Taxation of Land Values in Britain can only now be a question of time. By giving news of the progress of the movement in Britain, the *Single Tax* does no small service to the organised Single Taxers of other countries, which in turn reflects back and strengthens us in our aspirations here. It is imperative that this agitation and education be maintained, and we ask our friends and supporters to assist us in the work. The best way to do this is to add to our subscribers list. If every present subscriber will respond to this appeal, they will be doing something to strengthen our hands, and so help the cause to its ultimate and successful issue.

#### The Church and the Land Question.

Dr. Macmillan, moderator of the Free Church, in his opening address at the Assembly in Edinburgh last month said:—

Labour was at constant strife with capital and capital with labour. The depressed condition of agricultural had depopulated the country districts, and the large towns had grown immensely larger. The slums of the cities offered the most perplexing problem to the social reformer and the Christian worker. Could the inflow of the new evil be stopped there might be a hope of dealing with it with some success, but there was the ever-renewing mass of it, in spite of all remedies, that filled the most sanguine almost with despair and made them almost weary in their well-doing.

The strife between capital and labour, the depopulation of the country, and the slums of cities are serious problems, and God knows it is uphill work getting church dignitaries to even make such acknowledgements. But more is wanted than mere passing references such as moderator of the Free Church makes on this occasion. The speaker said social misery is increasing "in spite of all remedies." What remedies? Apart from the bandages provided by the rich what remedy has been applied to any social wrong? The poor have been preached at and consoled with and even helped on the way, but no remedy has been tried to put a period to their afflictions. The root cause of their misery and society's bane is the monopoly of the land, the free gift of the Creator to the children of men, by the few who have turned the people from the country to the towns and driven then these into the filthy slums. The Church may shirk this issue but it is there all the same.

#### "Betterment."

The "Betterment" clause of the Glasgow Corporation Improvement Bill has been withdrawn. No Land Value Taxation supporter need regret this. "Betterment" suggests the possibility of "Worsement," and as embodied in this bill, it was a mere attempt to adjust the "unearned increment" affected, in favour of one property owner as against another; it could bring no relief to the general ratepayer. It was altogether away from the Taxation of Land Values, and had its promoters understood the Land Question, the enthusiasm they displayed over this proposal should have found expression in a clause in the bill that would have benefitted the ratepayers at the expense of the land speculator. Such an effort would have been in accord with Bailie Burt's motion, adopted by the Town Council on 5th October last, and to which the majority of the present members of the Council were pledged in November.

Not one of these gentlemen talked to the electors of "Betterment." Every one of them made it explicitly clear that they would tax land values, and stand up for it on every occasion. This is their first attempt to implement their pledges. It has been said that Betterment is an admission of the principle of Taxing Land Values, a "half loaf," as it has been called. But we must demur to this. There is nothing in the proposal approaching the principle of Taxing Land Values, in any sense of the term. The application of the Betterment principle, granting that it can be applied, can only alter the incidence of taxation on the present basis. The occupier, as such, can obtain no immediate advantages; and inasmuch as the new charge will fall on the use value of land, it only tightens land monopoly closer on the citizens generally. It does not make for the opening up of land, and is altogether useless—a mere palliative that won't even palliate.

The Taxation of Land Values is a different proposal entirely. It will fall on the values of land, vacant land included, and at once it will tend to not only diminish the rates on property and the earnings of the wage-earner, but open up the land free from the grasping control of the land speculator. The weakness of Betterment is its want of radicalism. The straight Tax on Land Values alone can bring the radical change so much needed and desired.

#### "The Keighley Labour Journal."

Our comments last month on a deliverance of this Labour Socialist journal on the Single Tax, has set the editor talking to himself in a column of sixty-four lines. The "palaver," which is after—a long way after—the *Clarion* front page, complains that in our remarks we "did not answer or controvert any single argument" the *K. L. J.* advanced; and further, that "our criticism is bluster specially suited to the mental calibre of Single Taxers." We are sorry we could not argue the case with our friend, but the man who says "land is capital," and that "if the *Single Tax* were instituted [the italics are ours] there would be nothing to prevent a syndicate of capitalists from buying up the land and paying the tax to themselves, for they would then be virtually the State, and land monopoly would remain the same, only more so," is a fit subject for education and not for argument. We once met a Socialist who declared that he could not only believe in contradictories, but in anything he liked. He must have been graduating for the editorial chair of the *Keighley Labour Journal*.

#### Nemesis.

(FOUNDED ON FACTS.)

Jupp's orchard was quite a notable feature of the little village of Birkhampton when I was a youngster, and everyone who happened to visit the district was sure to hear how it came to belong to old Jupp.

"Aye, he was a good sort was old Squire Winald," the villagers generally commenced the story, when they had the rare good fortune to talk to a stranger. "Ye see that there orchard over there; well, did ye ever hear how it came to belong to old Jupp, the father of George? No; then I'll just tell you how it was. One morning, about twenty years ago, Squire Winald he comes to old Jupp—he was young Jupp then, and a real good workman too in those days. 'Jupp,' says he, 'that road fencing round that bit orchard of mine has broken down; will you see to it for me?' Jupp took the job, and a real good job he made of it—why the fence he made still stands to-day and is 'most as good as ever it was. And when the Squire came to see it, 'Jupp,' he said, 'this is real good work, and I like good work. That bit of orchard isn't much good to me, so you can have it as your own, and I only hopes that you may live long to enjoy the fruits of it.' Them were his very words. So old Jupp took the orchard, paid the taxes but no rent for it, mind ye, looked after it and reaped the fruits of it until he died, and now it belongs to young George, old Jupp's son."

Such was the story as I heard it repeated over and over again when I was a boy, and I was vividly reminded of it last summer, when paying a long-promised visit to my old school master. For I could not but mark the altered appearance of the little orchard. In the old times the fences were always in irreproachable order, the trees carefully pruned and tended, and the borders gay with the more hardy garden flowers. To-day the fences were in parts quite broken down, the trees had evidently been allowed to run wild, and were covered with moss. In short, it betrayed, in every aspect, marked signs of neglect and decay. So painful was the contrast, that I could not refrain from commenting on it, when talking to my host after tea that evening.

"Aye, aye," he replied, slowly and sententiously, "to me that orchard is a constant reminder that suffering is inseparably connected with injustice; that all evildoing revenges itself on this earth, though it is not always the greatest sinners who are the greatest sufferers. But it is a long story, and I'm one of the few men who know the rights of it. Poor George

told me all that had happened, on the fatal evening Lord Horne was drowned."

"Pray tell me all about it," I exclaimed eagerly.

"Well, may be I will; it can injure no one: George and his children are now far away somewhere in the back blocks of Canada; and as for Lord Horne, he left no near relations, the estate is still in Chancery, pending the discovery of the next-of-kin. So light your pipe and I'll tell you the whole story."

And after a moment or two of reflection, he commenced as follows.

"You say you remember the story of how the little orchard came into the possession of old Jupp. Well, when old Squire Winald died, his estate was inherited by some rich Londoner, who had no desire to live down in this quite place, so the whole estate was sold to Lord Horne, who already owned nearly the whole county. Old Jupp, however, was left in undisturbed possession of his orchard, and after his death, his son George took possession of it, as a matter of course. At the same time, young Jupp moved into the cottage in which his old father had lived for so many years, which, like every other cottage in the village, belonged to Lord Horne, from whom he had also recently hired a small holding, of about three acres, for which he paid ten pounds a year, and on which he grew his corn and other produce.

"Except the possession of his 'wee bit o' freehold,' as he delighted to call it, there was nothing to distinguish George from the rest of his neighbours. He was a quiet, simple minded man, whose conversation was ordinarily confined to the weather and the crops, and who, having been used to unremitting toil and rough fare all his life, was fairly contented with his humble lot—in fact, like millions of his fellows, knowing of nothing better, he aspired to nothing higher. There was, however, one trait in his character which both illumined and ennobled it, and transformed the docile toiling animal into a human being; this was his deep, honest affection for his wife Mary, 'his little missus,' as he used fondly to call her. The devotion of the big hulking fellow to the little fragile woman he had courted and wed, was one of those beautiful features in an otherwise commonplace life, that a master-pen alone could worthily depict. If, as the noblest and most philosophic of English novelists expresses it, the first condition of human goodness is something to love, the second, something to reverence, then George Jupp found these two conditions combined in his feelings towards his wife. Aye, my boy, I've lived amongst them all my life, and I tell ye there's a wealth of goodness, gentleness, honesty and love, deep-hidden in the hearts of the toiling peasantry of England, which in due time, under better and more equitable conditions, under conditions which will secure them their equal rights to life and to Nature, of which they are now so shamelessly and shamefully deprived, will transform them into one of the noblest races the world has yet beheld.

"But to my story. The first time after his father's death that George went to pay his half-yearly rent for his cottage and small holding, the agent informed him that he must also regard himself as tenant of the orchard, for which he would have to pay five shillings a year rent. George indignantly protested, but the agent retained the extra half-crown from the money he had paid, and told him that if they heard any more about it, he would be turned out of his cottage. The next rent day the same thing happened. But the third time, George, fearing to lose all claim on the orchard, paid exactly the amount due, and curtly refused to pay any rent for his own land. The landlord's answer was soon forthcoming. The next week Jupp received notice to leave his cottage, and on asking the reason, was told that unless he remitted the tenancy of the orchard, he must clear out of the cottage; and this was all the satisfaction he could get from the estate office. In December he got notice to quit, but took no heed of it. In April he received notice that proceedings were being taken to recover possession of the cottage, farm and detached orchard. In May he was summoned to the local County Court, and in

Ask all Candidates for Municipal and Parliamentary Honours this Question—

June an order was served on him to give up possession of the cottage.

"In August, George's beloved Mary was delivered of a child. The babe was not strong, and the mother regained her strength but slowly. This was reported to the estate office, and a plea for delay advanced on that account. Thirteen days after the birth of the child, George received notice that unless he forthwith gave up possession of the cottage, farm, and detached orchard, he would be evicted on the following Wednesday. The appointed day arrived. George, his sick wife and three young children, the youngest nineteen days old, together with their poor belongings, were turned out on to the open common. It was a bitterly cold day; the rain fell in torrents, and continued off and on during the night. The following day Lord Horne's men took possession of the little orchard; the gate was broken in, another padlock fixed, chains were fastened round the staples, and two of the trees were cut to signify a change of ownership. George Jupp stood outside the fence, the very fence his old father had erected so many years ago, as if in a haze, and kept repeating the words—"The land is mine, the land is mine, and they shan't have it, they shan't have it."

"For a fortnight the poor family remained encamped on the open common, none daring to offer them shelter. All their effects suffered from the exposure, one of their cows died, and poor Mrs. Jupp became daily weaker. After the first eight days George surrendered, and wrote to the estate office withdrawing all claims to the orchard, and humbly craving permission to return to his cottage and farm; but no answer was vouchsafed to his petition. Such an opponent was no longer to be feared, hence no longer to be conciliated. At last old farmer Meldrum, unable to bear any longer the sight of so much misery, offered the outcast family the shelter of a large empty barn; and George, now quite broken down, thankfully accepted the kind offer. Two days later the farmer received a message from the estate office that the Jupps must be sent away or he himself would be turned off his farm. Burning with honest indignation the brave old man turned on the messenger, saying—"Ye may tell those who sent ye that, do what they will, they'll not compel me to deprive a dying woman of the poor shelter I am able to offer her."

"Yes, my boy, it was true, too true. George's Mary, his 'little Missus,' was dying; dying from the effects of exposure to the cruel piercing winds of the bleak open common. The miserable husband watched by her side broken-hearted despairing, helpless, alone in his grief, for not one of the villagers dared openly manifest their sympathy with their oppressed neighbour. Even at the funeral no one was present, save myself—who that day had returned from a visit to my son in Yorkshire—the village undertaker, and the officiating clergyman, the vicar of the parish. As we turned to move from the graveside, the vicar approached George, saying: "My good man, you must not despair. Remember all our troubles are from God; if it be His will that you should be thus afflicted—"

"Here George, who had kept his grey eyes steadily fixed on the speaker's face, interrupted him, saying—"Nay, Parson, from such as you can come no comfort. When ye might have helped me, ye stayed away; and now ye bid me lay on God the ills wrought by man. You may call it a visitation of God—I call it—manslaughter."

\* \* \* \* \*

"During the next few years George, having received some assistance from a few kindly-disposed persons who had heard of his undeserved misfortunes, earned a living as a sort of itinerant pedlar, and travelled all over the country in a kind of house on wheels, such as may still often be seen in rural districts, stocked with brush, basket, and tin-ware. But he was no longer the same man; the shadow of his great loss darkened his whole life. To his native village he never came to trade; but once every year, on the anniversary of his wife's death, he came to the village graveyard to tend the sacred spot endeared to him by a thousand tender though painful recollections. It was on the eve of such an anniversary, in the year 18—, that George was slowly wending his way across

the great common on the borders of which he had camped three years ago. The past was specially vivid to him that evening. "Aye," he muttered to himself, "I met Lord Horne once, and I hope to meet him again face to face before God's judgment seat; but I do hope never again to set eyes on him while on this earth."

"At that moment a shrill cry for help aroused him from his mournful meditations. "Why, there must be someone in Moor End pond," he exclaimed, and snatching up a long rope that hung from the side of his cart, he rushed in the direction of the sound. Yes, sure enough, there was a man in the water, striving to cling to one of those frail canoes worked by a paddle, for which there was such a craze a few years back. To fasten a stone to the rope and hurl it towards the struggling man, was the work of a moment. It reached him, and the man clung to it as only drowning men can cling. George pulled him slowly towards the shore—but a few yards more and he would be able to drag him up the steep bank on which he stood. But a few yards more; when suddenly the last rays of the setting sun fell full on the face of the struggling man. George recognised him, shuddered, turned ashy pale, the rope glided through his now nerveless fingers—and Lord Horne sank beneath the deep dark waters of Moor End Pond."

L. H. B.

### "Fabian Tract, No. 76."

We have been favoured with a copy of the above pamphlet which deals in some sixteen pages with the question of *Houses for the People*. Its purpose is to show the failure of individual enterprise from the Socialist standpoint, but in point of fact it is an indictment against the land speculator. In the first page it is stated that "The provision of house accommodation for the industrial classes has hitherto been left almost entirely in the hands of private enterprise, with the inevitable result that high rents are exacted for the privilege of occupying squalid dwellings whose every existence is a grave social danger." And further, "Private profit seeking adventure having failed to secure adequate provision for the housing of the working classes it becomes necessary for the community acting through its local authorities to take the task in hand."

A considerable amount of information dealing with acts, powers, and possibilities of the local authorities follow, and on the last page we are told that "the landlord who churlishly refuses to build himself, or to let others build, the houses required by the necessities of the district is the one man who deliberately inflicts on his neighbours and tenants all the unspeakable evils, moral and physical, of overcrowding."

Verily the Socialists put themselves into strange situations when they attempt to square their faith in our "elected persons" with the facts of the case. How can private enterprise have failed if it has been choked by the land speculator, "the one man who deliberately inflicts the unspeakable misery of the slums upon society?" If he alone is responsible then private enterprise has failed only because of him. Our Fabian friends should tell us how local authorities are to do better than private enterprise.

But what they really propose, apart from their notions of salvation through local authorities, is to abolish some extra charge of 10 per cent. which land owners at present receive over the market value of their land when they are compelled to sell. If the Fabians would advocate a tax of 10 per cent. on Land Values, and even then they would only be 6 per cent. ahead of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, they would be advocating a *solution* of the land question, which must precede any genuine effort at superior house accommodation. But as it is they are behind the age, behind even a Royal Commission composed of ignorant and selfish upholders of this dreadful individualism, that is such a failure because of the exactions of the landowner. "the one man" who is the cause of the whole trouble. "Off the Track, No. 76," would be a fitting caption for this latest piece of Fabianism.

### An Island of the Blessed.

BY J. BRAND.

It lies to the south of Italy, between Sicily and the mainland. It is indicated on the map by a dot, and the name Panaria. I could wish you no better fate than to be born there and to spend your days among the only really happy community I have met in my wanderings. There is neither wealth nor poverty, each has enough for his simple wants, and you may roam the length and breadth of the island without meeting a beggar or an idle person.

The policeman and the lawyer are unknown, yet there is no crime; doctor there is none, but the people live to a good old age. A priest there is, and a church that looks, from a distance, as if it had been dropped there, as the birds dropped the seeds of the olive trees that have sprung up in every nook and crevice of the stony slopes.

Panaria, which is some three miles in length, by about two in breadth, is of volcanic formation, like all the islands of the Lipari groupe to which it belongs. Nature has not done a great deal for Panaria. The soil is fertile enough in places, but the obtrusive rocks thwart the husbandman at every turn.

The island produces olive oil and wine in abundance, but it is not otherwise so well dowered as Salina with its salt springs; Vulcano with its stores of sulphur and borax; and Lipari, which supplies Europe with pumice stone, reaping thereby sufficient revenue for municipal expenses of the whole group.

Although Lipari is the chief island, and the Seat of Government, Salina is the richest of the seven, and, on that account, has proudly preferred to stand alone and bear all the burden of her administrative expenses. The Italian Government exacts a small *land tax*, but otherwise Panaria is free of financial burdens.

The population all told is barely four hundred, and each family has its own plot of ground, which yields grain, vegetables, oil, and wine, sufficient for home needs, with some oil and wine to spare for exportation. The proceeds enable them to buy the few simple materials which the housewife needs for clothing the family. They have no use for tailors or milliners, and the one cobbler makes sandals for the whole island. The grain, vegetable, oil, and wine of their farms are supplemented by the produce of the sea, fish being their only animal food, save for a few chickens on festive occasions.

The one priest combines in his own person the offices of the church with all the public offices of the community—mayor, harbour-master, schoolmaster, postmaster, chief of the submarine telegraph, and everything else. It is many years since the good priest drafted to Panaria, and there he has remained ever since devoting himself with single-hearted zeal to the simple islanders, baptising, marrying, burying, preaching, and teaching. To him they owe their church and their school, the little post, the postal service, the submarine cable to Sicily, and other benefits. They pay his devotion with a simple affection and respect very pleasant to see.

A very short time is sufficient to explore the island from its precipitous crest to its crinkled shore; from the ruined towers—relics of the days when pirates infested the Mediterranean—to the pretty little hamlets of Iditella, San Pietro, and Deatto. Although so tiny, these places have an air of calm prosperity that is soothing to the senses of a traveller fresh from the fevered bustle of great cities. There is no hurrying and scurrying, yet everyone is occupied. Every foot of soil is utilised, and, where there is no soil, the olive trees have established themselves in every nook and crevice of the rock-ridden slopes, yielding abundant crops, and making the place beautiful with green and silver of foliage and trunk. The ferruginous character of the soil is exactly suited to the vine, and if you would drink malvoisie in perfection then go to Panaria, for the natives have cunning in the mingling of that wine, the like of which you will find nowhere else. I could have wished them more skill in the baking of bread, but though it is hard it is wholesome, and the Panarian has no use for a dentist.—*From "Pearson's Magazine," October, 1896.*

"Are you in favour of Taxing Land Values?"

## The Single Tax.

Published at the beginning of each Month.  
PRICE ONE PENNY. Post Free, 1/6 per annum,  
payable in advance.

All Communications to be addressed to the EDITOR,  
*Single Tax*, 56 GEORGE SQUARE, GLASGOW.

Will Correspondents who send us Newspapers please  
pencil-mark the matter they wish us to notice.

### Charity Organisation.

On the invitation of the Glasgow Charity Organisation Society, the Annual Conference of Delegates from various kindred bodies throughout the country was held in Glasgow last month. The Duke of Montrose, president of the Glasgow Society, presided at the opening meeting. In his opening remarks the Duke said "that while our nation had advanced in prosperity during the past 30 years, alas! the poor and helpless were still with us, which, through a combination of circumstances, was always obliged to be so;" and further reminded the Delegates that "their proceedings would be watched by those who were not satisfied with them because they had not yet reached the millennium when the lion lies down with the lamb."

The Duke is about right. The poverty of the people that reduces them to the care and custody of organised charity is due to a combination of circumstances. But the Delegates, unfortunately, did not discuss nor consider in any way this aspect of the question. They wandered into the old ruts of Savings Banks, Corporate and individual charity and the able-bodied poor of Scotland, winding up with the usual Municipal banquet. The discussion of these subjects brought no new light, except that Professor JONES said it had been computed "that in Edinburgh £250,000, and in Glasgow, something like £1,000,000 was annually given in charity;" and argued, "to divide the city into districts and to erect in each of them a board of benevolent workers who know its needs in detail:" while the Rev. Dr. DONALD M'LEOD, who recently distinguished himself by appearing in the capacity of a speaker at the annual meeting of the Wine, Spirit, and Beer Merchants' Association, asked the question—"What were they to do with those who did not deserve at all?"

These are questions which are quite interesting enough in themselves, but they are quite apart from the one suggested by the chairman. This charity organisation at best is an attempt to mitigate the sufferings of the poor and destitute. Its advocates and supporters accept it as a profession, and ignore entirely the cause of this poverty. Most of them, like the Duke of Montrose, regard it as the outcome of "a combination of circumstances" which it is not their business to inquire into. Their duty is to meet this poverty and to provide for the world's unfortunates.

But why should they waste all their time and energy in grappling with this particular phase of the problem, and refuse to devote one single hour to "the combination of circumstances" responsible for the disease. If they imagine charity will satisfy the people and keep them all the time in contentment, under present day social mal-adjustments, then they are feeding themselves with the east wind.

To say that the association of poverty with progress is in the nature of things, and must be accepted, is bad political economy, to say nothing of the blasphemy of throwing the onus of the misery of the slums on the Creator. The Duke of Montrose sneers at the aspirations of those who are working for the millenium,

when "the lion will lie down with the lamb." But we reply that this is the position that already exists, the lamb being inside the lion.

It is notorious that the poor have been persistently driven from the country into the towns by men who, like this duke, have by law the power to own and control the land God gave the children of men as their inheritance. The Government blue books are eloquent testimony of the depopulation of the country which has been turned into a playground for the rich, to satisfy the greed and caprice of these "landed loafers."

Driven into the towns to seek a home and find employment, the people find themselves cursed with the same form of brigandage. Their very presence here adds grist to the mill of the landowner, whose demand for his price to the use of the earth drives the poor into polluted atmospheres, many of them in families condemned to herd in hovels 12 feet by 12 feet. Landlordism is the cause of this poverty. In its train comes crime, disease, and incapacity, and a condition of misery that, as THOROLD ROGERS says—"For its inhumanity is unexampled, not only in the history of this country, but in the history of the whole civilised world."

In the midst of all this comes the Charity Organisation Society, and the Duke of Montrose, forsooth, who coolly brushes aside inquiry into the root cause of this social problem, and in the light of day set themselves to the discussion of savings banks, and a more perfect system of dealing with the deserving poor.

"What are we to do with the undeserving?" asks the Rev. Dr. DONALD M'LEOD. He evidently desires to be economical in the annual distribution of that £1,000,000, and would like the goats to be separated from the sheep. A more pertinent question would be—What are we to do with the undeserving rich, who live lives of idleness on the ground rents created by the people? The poorest, even those assisted by the Charity Organisation Society, have to contribute to this fund, the absorption of which by the idlers, as HENRY GEORGE says, "robs the shivering of warmth, the hungry of food, the sick of medicine, and the anxious of peace."

Charity should find a place in the heart of every true man and woman, but justice must precede charity, else how can we know what is truly needed of us, and what is ours to give? If we would assist the poor, we must first of all act justly by them. Why do we tolerate them living in the slums, while there is abundance of land at every turn upon which to erect comfortable houses? If these idle acres could speak, would they not cry out against such a crime. It is not the intention of our common Creator that the earth should be so misused, and the reward of this abomination must necessarily be pain, and sin, and death.

This monopoly of the land is the main cause of the involuntary idleness that forces poverty on the people, for it is only on and through land that labour can be exerted. Its effects are as far reaching for evil as its overthrow would result in good. It is like baling the sea to grapple, through charity organisation, with the poverty produced by this bottom injustice, the denial of man to the use of the land. Increase the sum of £1,000,000 ten times for distribution among the deserving poor in Glasgow, it will only induce the land speculator to hold on closer for "a rise." Destroy his power to keep land from use, and this can be done by taxing him on its value, and at once the land will be put to use, labour will be employed, and poverty will correspondingly disappear.

Why should we hesitate to abolish this bottom wrong? What superior virtue do these dukes and land speculators possess that their unjust privileges should be so recognised and respected? Are they to be permitted always to live on the earnings of the people? These are questions we do not expect our Charity Organisation friends will find time to consider. We appeal to the reformer, and to the public spirited citizen who take active part in doing the world's work. We say that this poverty can be removed, and we submit that the first step to its removal is in the overthrow of land monopoly, and that the remedy is only to be found in taking for public uses that value imparted to land by the presence and industry of the people.

### Here and There.

The editor of the *Single Tax* (Sydney, N.S.W.) writes that "The *Single Tax* (Glasgow) is to be congratulated upon its bright, lively style, its aggressiveness, and the variety and interest of the matter."

The Kilpatrick Dock scheme has been rejected, and it is the opinion of the *Glasgow Herald* that most of the witnesses in favour of the Dock had axes to grind. The axe the landowner, Lord Blantyre, had to grind, was £19,000 for seven acres of swampy ground.

The *G. H.* also notices that for some time efforts have been made to get up a land question in Wales. This is the dry humour of the *Herald*. We suppose it alludes to Lord Penrhyn's attitude in locking-out the Bethesda quarrymen.

He was a romancer who wrote that "editors of newspapers were men who every day gave the Almighty advice which they deem of great worth, and whose wives take in sewing to keep things going while they superintend the earth."

The workers not included in the Workmen's Accidents Bill of the Government are—all merchant seamen, agricultural labourers, persons engaged in building operations, unless steam power is employed, domestic servants, persons working in workshops. The *Single Tax* will benefit all workers, and put them in a position to be independent of mere Government exemptions. It will do this by destroying land monopoly.

It is the opinion of Lord Overton that many, more especially young men, were led away from the paths of virtue through the opportunities afforded for drinking at the Glasgow Exhibition of 1888. It is our opinion, and the opinion of Miss Frances E. Willard that poverty is largely the cause of men taking to drink, and that landlordism is the cause of poverty.

The Liberal Publication Department, London, have just issued three more of their very readable leaflets—*The Integrity of the Ottoman Empire*; *The Tory way of Facing the Music*; and *The Workmen's Accidents Bill*. Liberal Associations who desire to do some educational work could not do better than secure quantities for distribution. (Price 3s. per 1,000.)

Sir William Harcourt says if he were Chancellor of the Exchequer he would reduce the duty on tea out of the surplus. Very good: but when are we to hear about the "New Tax?"

The executive of the English Land Restoration League have just issued their Annual Report for the year ending 12th May, 1897. 530 lectures and meetings, including those of the Red Van, have been organised by the League and addressed by its lecturers and agents during the year. The report pays a compliment to Mr. W. Chapman Wright for his services in organising and joining members in the Midlands, on the South Coast, and in Yorkshire, and the executive appeal to sympathisers to join the Association and otherwise assist in the work of educating the public mind on the land question.

Land Values being created by the community, belong solely and exclusively to the community; and as soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes Land Values a basis of taxation, these will gradually become public property according to law, just as they are public property now by "every canon of moral rectitude."

The land question is not solved when the State collects Land Values and pays them out again as interest to the real proprietor in the background; it is solved only when the State collects Land Values and defrays State expenses with them, and abolishes absolutely all other rates and taxes.

In the very practical discussion on Land Values now going on in the *Hastings Times* a Socialist sails in after the manner of the following:—

It appears that some unreasonable section of the Radical, Liberal, and Conservative politicians in Hastings and St. Leonards propose, for the purposes of taxation, to tax what has hitherto been erroneously and economically described as Land Values.

This correspondent, who winds up his contribution with thirty-four lines from Shelley's "Queen Mab" further says, in explanation of his creed as a Socialist—

To us collectivism means that every adult member of the State will by the Legislature be bound to contribute his personal labour towards the production of a liberal means of subsistence for the entire population of the United Kingdom, and consent to its equitable distribution amongst the individual members of the State.

This Socialism, which would bind men by government, is a thing that ought to be kicked every time. The hope of the true reformer is in liberty. The State, disrobed of the flowery confectionery of the Socialist, is a sickly alternative.

Single Taxers do not propose to "come down" on one species of property; what we do propose is to put a stop to public property being drained into the pockets of the ground landlords.

Mr. Justin M'Carthy, M.P., says, in the latest volume of his most interesting work "A History of our own Times," that "When Mr. Chamberlain entered Parliament the notion of the average Tory or Whig member of the House of Commons was that his main object was to overthrow first the throne, then the altar." Poor Joe.

A correspondent writes to the *N. B. Daily Mail* that he has been lamentable deceived as to the position of Scotsmen. He arrived in Glasgow one day lately and had a turn round Saltmarket, Gallowgate, and Cowcaddens, and in the inhabitants he can find no resemblance to the "bonnie Highlanders" he has seen in pictures. It is a picture puzzle to trace the connection of the poor of Glasgow to the sturdy Highlander. The land speculator is the key to it.

The revenue of the Glasgow Corporation Cars for the year ending 31st May, 1897, is estimated by the *Glasgow News* at £365,539—£7,029 per week. The public have a better and cheaper car service, and are making a profit out of the business. There is no official record of the amount scooped in by the ground landlord in increased rents, nor how much the value of vacant land along the routes has gone up to monopoly prices. The tenants, present and prospective, make this interesting discovery for themselves. They just growl and pay up, most of them taking the swindle for legitimate business. Some day they will see the imposition of paying for a value created by their own industry and activity in all its injustice, when there be a new knocking at the door of the legislature.

The man who holds land idle ought to be taxed on its value just as much as the man who uses his land. The *Single Tax* advocates this for 1s. 6d., it will be posted to you for twelve months.

The English Land Restoration League has just issued an interesting and instructive leaflet on "Land Values: the Country's Bank" Striking examples are given of how benefits of public improvements are confiscated by the

landowner. The case is thus summed up—"For various reasons the process of absorption as rent is complex, but the 'accumulated intelligence' is made to feed the one final reservoir of wealth, Land Values; the landowner sleeps but thrives; and thus the important step in social reform is to obtain control of the country bank—the land."

We heartily recommend the new *Single Tax* story, advertised on cover, called "A Tramp in Society." It tells of how landlordism creates the unfortunates in society, and how in "Freeland," a new colony set up on *Single Tax* lines, brought peace and happiness. By post, One Shilling, from *Single Tax* office.

The *New Age* says that the real reason why the universities of Oxford and Cambridge refuse to allow women to take degrees is that these ancient seats of learning may be kept as residential social and athletic clubs for idle young men of the upper classes, and that the universities of Oxford and Cambridge are laughed at as seats of learning by both European and American scholars.

Mr. Wm. Webster, of the Scottish Liberal Association, has been promoted to superintend the organisation of the party in the North of Scotland. Mr. Webster is undoubtedly one of the most capable of the Liberal organisers, and has won for himself in Glasgow and the West of Scotland the confidence and esteem of his friends, and commanded at all times the respect of his political opponents. Commenting on his arrival at Inverness, the *Highland Times* says:—"Mr. Webster is an able organiser of much experience, and is most gentlemanly and agreeable in his manner—just the man for the duties he will have to perform." Mr. Webster is a genuine land reformer, and we wish him in his new duties all manner of success.

The Receipt of a copy of this paper from the office is an invitation to subscribe.

If the space below contains a Blue Pencil mark, please take it as an indication that your Subscription is due. In remitting, will you try to send us the name of a new Subscriber?



#### TO LAND REFORMERS.

*The Executive of the Scottish Land Restoration Union appeal to all sympathisers throughout Scotland to become members of the Union.*

*Minimum Annual Subscription, 1s. 2s. 6d. secures membership of the Union and a copy of the "Single Tax," post free, for a twelvemonth. 5s. secures membership, the "Single Tax" for twelve months, and an assortment of Single Tax Pamphlets and Leaflets, including those published during the year.*

#### Death of Mrs. W. J. Atkinson.

ELDEST DAUGHTER OF HENRY GEORGE PASSES AWAY UNEXPECTEDLY AT THE HOME OF HER PARENTS.

NEW YORK.—The many friends throughout the world of Henry George, will be grieved to learn of the death, on 2nd May, of his eldest daughter, Mrs. W. J. Atkinson. Mrs. Atkinson was the wife of William J. Atkinson, of Baltimore, Maryland, and was thirty years of age. Her death was entirely unexpected, as she had been ill but a few days. The family is overcome with grief by the sudden bereavement. Mrs. Atkinson was a great student of political economy, and previous to her marriage she assisted her father in all his literary work, and took personal supervision of the preparation of his speeches. She continued the work as far as she was able after her marriage, and her death, aside from parental grief, is a great loss to her father, who found in her a sympathetic helpmate.—*National Single Taxer*.

Single Taxers everywhere will sympathise with Mr. George and the bereaved family in their severe loss. Their Glasgow friends avail themselves of *The Single Tax* to express their deepest sympathy.

#### "A Tramp in Society."

*A Single Tax Story by Robert H. Cordrey. Published by the Schulte Publishing Co., Chicago, U.S.A. Sole Agents in Britain, Proprietors of the "Single Tax," 56 George Square, Glasgow. Paper covers, 9d.; by post, 1s.*

The purpose of this book is to explain the Social Problem in a manner that will be grasped by the ordinary reader, to whom works on economics do not too readily appeal. It is well written, and the interest of the reader is sustained throughout its 240 pages. The story begins by an incident only too common in society to-day, namely, an outcast "tramp" soliciting the price of a night's lodging from a passer-by, who happens in this instance to be a millionaire. The tramp, Edgar Bartlett, tells the same old story of failure in the social struggle, and is assisted by Mr. Seers, the millionaire, into business as a merchant, from which he is successfully carried into a position of material prosperity. He afterwards establishes a colony, the name of which is "Freeland." The *Single Tax* is in operation, and the colony becomes the wonder and envy of neighbouring districts. A syndicate of capitalists take adjacent land on syndicate lines. The promoters are much concerned at the progress of Freeland, and an attempt, which is very interesting, is made to reduce it to present-day commercial ideas through the ruin of Mr. Bartlett, and by sending paid emissaries into the colony to corrupt the inhabitants. This conspiracy ends in failure, however, and Freeland creates a new world where peace, prosperity and happiness take the place of the poverty, want and crime that are now so well known. The following is from the chapter on

#### THE SEQUEL TO "ROBINSON CRUSOE."

The writer devoted a few lines to the description of how Crusoe was shipwrecked on the island, how he won his man Friday, and then proceeded to tell how other shipwrecked sailors were forced by fate to join him, and how all by general consent came to regard Crusoe as the natural ruler and owner of the place.

Then he told how Crusoe and his men were compelled to work like beavers to obtain enough food, because their capacity to produce was limited by their crude means of catching fish with wooden spears. As it took all their time to obtain food, they had but few of the comforts of life. Still they were happy and contented, because each one had all he produced, and each new-comer was welcomed and given a chance. At last one of the islanders, through his inventive skill, was able to fashion fish-hooks, and thus increased the number of fish they could catch to such an extent that they all rejoiced at the prospect of having time to make their lives more comfortable while on shore.

But as soon as Crusoe saw they could produce more than they needed for themselves, he himself left off fishing, and took from the fishers almost all of the increase, and they were but little better off than before. Then another fisher fashioned a seine out of the wreckage that was strewn along the shore. Again Crusoe took nearly all of the increased production, so that he soon had more than he could use. Then he called in some of the fishers from their nets and offered them as many fish as they could catch for themselves if they would work for him in making his surroundings more comfortable, by supplying him with such luxuries as they could produce. This they readily consented to do, and after he had paid them their wages he sold the surplus to the captains of the trading ships that now came to the island, and in exchange received many things that were better than his men could make, and many things they could not make at all.

Thus each invention that increased the productive power of the people simply added to the wealth of Crusoe; but the producers received only a very small share. With this little share, however, the fishers struggled to improve their condition, and so they left the best makers of clothing and shelter to stay on shore to make those things, while the best fishers devoted all their time to fishing, and were able to pay them out of the surplus thus obtained.

Now these labour-saving inventions increased so rapidly that Crusoe could not dispose of all that was produced, and to stop the over-production he refused to allow the poorest grade of fishers to continue fishing, and they were turned away in idleness to starve. When these men found there were no other opportunities open to them, they went to Crusoe and offered to work for just enough to keep them from starvation, and Crusoe contrived to give them employment by discharging some of the other fishers, and giving their places to these men. Then began a desperate struggle for the privilege of working, in which the men in every occupation were forced to bid against each other until their wages were so low that the poorest of the workers could not live on what was left after Crusoe had been paid. These lost hope and all ambition, and became beggars in the streets. The people saw them travelling from place to place, vainly looking for some means whereby they might relieve the misery of their lives. Crusoe soon discovered that the young men could live on less than those who had families to support, and gave them employment until he forced the men with families to work for the same wages he paid the unmarried men. This forced the wives and daughters into service to assist in their own support;

READ THE APPEAL TO LAND REFORMERS.

and, seeing this, the young men refused to marry and assume so great responsibility. And by this means crime was made to prosper in the land.

Soon all the men and women, and the little children too, were straining all their powers in the struggle for existence, until their health and strength and reason were broken by the strain. The wealth of the island was greater. Each year saw it piling higher and higher. Crusoe's storehouse was running over with the abundance, and his granaries were bursting with wealth. Poverty and crime were constantly increasing, though the prisons were full and poor-houses were running over. The fishers were filled with lamentations, and business men were blindly hoping for better times. And each class was laying all the blame on the other.

When Crusoe saw the discontent among the people he called about him certain of their leaders, to whom he gave special rights and privileges for themselves, and he sent them out among the people to make them satisfied with their lot; and to those in actual distress they were instructed to give some little aid. These leaders then became the strong allies of Crusoe; they grew wealthy from the riches their special grants and privileges gave them, and a small share they presented to the very needy as charity.

But the eyes of the workers and the business men were finally opened by the terrible strain, and they saw that all alike were suffering from the same cause. They joined their forces, went to Crusoe and demanded that they be heard. But Crusoe was too wise a ruler to wait for them to seem to urge him. He told them that he had long and carefully studied their condition, and that he now saw that all they needed was more work; that he had found a way to make work plenty for them all; that, whereas, in times past, the merchant ships from foreign shores had been allowed to freely land the goods that others made, in the future he would tax them, and thus prevent them from bringing things his people wanted in exchange for those they desired to sell. "In this way my people can be given work making these things for themselves," said Crusoe. His glowing words of promise of the prosperity so sure to follow set the people rejoicing, and Crusoe was greatly magnified in their eyes.

Then the fishers' boats were drawn up on shore, and their nets were folded away, and the people were set to work making these things for themselves. They sang and danced, and were happy once more as they thought of the way that Crusoe had made work for them all. But when their work was done, and their wages were paid, they found that Crusoe had taken just as much as before. Then it was that they set to thinking, and studying the means by which, with all their labour, Crusoe was growing richer while they were all growing poorer. The farmers and merchants and all the other industrious people came together, and one among them arose and declared: "The priests and leaders are but a part of Crusoe's scheming to take tribute from our toil. Let us boldly ask him why we should give him any portion of our production. For, so long as we do it, he no doubt will gladly take it, and we shall be his slaves forevermore."

Then the people sought Crusoe and demanded by what right he took tribute on their toil.

"Well," said Crusoe, "I own this island, and have a right to charge you for its use. I could sell it for many millions, but to do so would take me from you, and this I know you do not desire, for someone must employ you; and I could not if I sold the land. It may seem a heavy burden to pay me this large share; still I hold that in all justice, six per cent. is not too large a portion for my part."

Then the people boldly demanded that Crusoe show them by what right he held the island as his own.

"By the consent of all the people," was Crusoe's prompt reply.

"That was when they were deluded into thinking that it made no difference whether you or they were owners. Now they see that this has given you the power to oppress them by laying tribute on their toil, and while you are growing richer, they on all sides are growing poorer, until some are starving in the streets. Now, if to each is given all he earns, there will be no paupers with us. There will be want and misery no more. We will leave you all you have taken in the times that have gone by; but from this time and forever to the people who must live here and the children who succeed them this island shall belong."

"Now," said Crusoe, "I have waited for this moment to arrive. You speak truly of the time when you thought it made no difference whether you or I were the owner of this land. You have seen that each invention, each improvement you have made, only added to the tribute I received. All your bidding against each other only added to my store. I remember quite distinctly when we lived and worked together, and in all the island there was not a discontented man. For my part, I have not been happy as in the days gone by; and to you the lesson has been severe. Let us now, for all the future, give each one the perfect freedom to trade, to live, and to labour, without paying tribute to any man."

And from that day the people were prosperous and contented. The prisons and poor-houses were destroyed; the young men took the maidens, and the old men their wives from unwomanly work, because they were able to support them, and feared neither poverty nor want. And all the people prospered, each according to his ability and industry. That is the story, almost word for word.

"If there be any object of value which is equitably open to growing taxation, it is the rent of land, because its value increases spontaneously, or without effort on the part of its owner."—*Professor Thorold Rogers.*

### Single Tax Success in New Zealand.

EVEN AN ATTEMPT IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION BRINGS BETTER TIMES TO THAT COLONY.

BY WELLS DRURY.

Premier Sedden, of New Zealand, is in this city, and in every conversation touching fiscal reform in his country, gives testimony of the good effects of Single Tax legislation in that colony. Although not perfected in its details, and though burdened with an ill-advised income tax, this New Zealand Single Tax legislation has given those people a prosperous and happy country, while the rest of the world is suffering from business stagnation, labour troubles, trampism, and those other evils that grow out of monopolisation of land, and a consequent denial of equal opportunities for all the people.

Premier Sedden supplements and confirms the report of United States Congress Connolly in regard to the beneficial workings of the Single Tax plan in New Zealand. He declares that "the present industrial and business condition of the colony is first class; that it was never better."

This is particularly gratifying to the people there, since it is in such marked contrast with the dreadful demoralisation which prevailed before the inception of Single Tax legislation in 1892. Five years have been sufficient to show the great good that such a fiscal system will bring. All classes are helped—the rich as well as the poor—proving the truth of the Single Tax theory, which asserts, that this is not a class question, but is, in fact, as broad as humanity.

In order to maintain a majority in the Colonial Parliament, it became necessary for Premier Sedden to grant certain concessions to small landowners that were not contemplated by his predecessor, the late Mr. Ballance. The most important concession, and one that is by Single Taxers regarded as an unfortunate departure from the true doctrine, is to exempt from taxation individual landholdings to the extent of £300. Mr. Sedden says he does not observe any present inclination to repeal this objectionable provision. With a growth of knowledge on the part of voters, however, repeal of this unwise statute may be confidently affected. An administration that has done so much, and is willing to do so much more for the prosperity of the country, may be pardoned for temporarily yielding even a point like this for the purpose of placating an opposition that would have proven fatal, and relying on the education of the masses for final application and success of the true doctrine.

Local option legislation, such as has been advocated by Single Tax missionaries in Delaware, Washington, California, and elsewhere in the United States, was adopted at the last session of the New Zealand Parliament. The first municipality to vote on the local option issue, adopted it by a good majority. This shows progress in the right direction. The general law of New Zealand now exempts personal property and improvements, such as houses, etc., to the extent of £3,000. The local option plan has for its object the exemption of all personal property and improvements. The light is spreading.

Women have been admitted to the franchise in New Zealand, and the result of two pollings has shown that a majority of them favour the Single Tax, since they enthusiastically supported the Liberal candidates, who adopted for their motto—"Taxation of Land Values."

The women of the Antipodes have seen the cat. They clearly realise what will make for the best interests of themselves and their children.

The full play of the Single Tax principles has been hindered in New Zealand by some vexatious Socialistic restrictions, but these restrictions will be swept aside when the people are convinced that true Single Tax legislation in the strength of its majestic simplicity is sufficient to bring the good they yearn for; and then the present current of substantial, intellectual, and moral advancement, which so plenteously blesses that country, will be increased to a generous flood of spiritual, industrial, and commercial prosperity.

Other countries, ours and yours included, may have like prosperity on similar terms.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., 8th May.

### The Social Condition of Glasgow's Poor.

The following is from an article, in a recent issue of the *Glasgow News*, on "the Housing of the Poor":—

"When a sanitary inspector finds a dwelling-house in the city containing air space of less than 2,000 cubic feet, he is entitled to nail on the door a metal ticket stating the space and the number of adults permitted to live there. Of itself this would be a small matter, but under the Act that ticket becomes practically a perpetual search warrant, and empowers the sanitary officer to enter the house at any hour of the day or night and assure himself that the number of persons there does not exceed that stated on the permit. This authority is never openly resisted, probably because the officers generally take a policeman or two with them when going round some of the worst quarters. Word soon passes round, however, when the "sanitary" are about, and many are

THE SUBTERFUGES RESORTED TO

to bring the number of inmates into apparent correspondence with the number on the ticket. He is a very green officer indeed who on a midnight visit is to count the number of people in bed and go away satisfied. The experienced man takes a look under the bed and into any cupboards which may be in the house. A couple of children have been discovered before now in a large trunk, and in old-fashioned garrets the surplus inmates have occasionally been found outside on the roof shivering behind the chimney-heads, waiting till the coast might be clear. Generally speaking, all single-apartment houses fall short of the 2,000 feet limit, and even some of the old-fashioned two-apartment houses have to submit to the ticketing. So far as overcrowding is concerned, the sanitary authorities have comparatively little control over unticketed houses. If only one family occupies such a house, no prosecution for overcrowding can be raised, no matter how many may be in it, and even where lodgers are admitted the authorities can only serve the householder with a schedule stating the number allowed to reside in the house. There is

NO RIGHT OF ENTRANCE

and search as with a ticketed house, and it is this that renders houses of over 2,000 cubic feet so much desired of those who from poverty or other causes desire to make their own estimate of how many a given space can accommodate. Ever alive to their own interests the owners have raised the rents of such houses until they are beyond the reach of most of those ordered out of the smaller houses. The order of the Court to "Get a bigger house within fourteen days" is never supplemented with any information as to how the bigger rent is to be paid, and this is how the poor householders are beginning to work it out for themselves. Two families ordered out of ticketed houses agree to combine and rent a house big enough to lift them clear of the constant supervision of the sanitary officers. A two-apartment or sometimes an old three-apartment house is taken by one of them, and then they both move in, occupying the place in common or each taking one end."

A TEN PER CENT. TAX

on land values would put an end to this shame, because it will overthrow "the one man responsible" for this dearth of suitable house accommodation. The land speculator has got to remove. He can afford to laugh at such articles, prayers, and lamentations, and even subscribe to the Charity Organisation Society. When the Taxation of Land Values is enforced he will pass away, and along with him will go slums, ticketed houses, inspectors, and the whole obnoxious brood.

St. Luke, who of the apostles presents the most particular account of the nativity of Christ, commences his second chapter saying: "And it came to pass in those days that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."

Nearly 2,000 years have gone by since those days, and in all lands under all circumstances the Cæsar Augustus, who ever he may be, has been issuing his decree that all the world shall be taxed.—*"The Retriever," St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A.*

**Our Natural Storehouse, the Land, is Locked.**

### Vested Rights in Public Wrongs.

The discussion on the Land Question still goes on in the *Hastings Times*. The Single Taxers are James Macrae and "Xatelgnis." Arthur Clayden is the "practical politician," who goes in for the people buying back their own property. We give the following extracts:—

J. Macrae writes:—

The evil of land monopoly, says Mr. Clayden, has grown up under the aegis of our country's laws. He actually makes the poor, landless, voteless victims responsible for their country's iniquitous land system! He might as well make slaves responsible for their slavery, or "the bird for being in the vacuum of the air pump!" Our land and taxation laws were made by landlords, and have been maintained by landlords, in their own exclusive interests; and to appeal now to these laws as barring the people from a practical and common sense land reform is simply a refinement of cruelty. Even if the landless were equally responsible with the landlords, the bottom question is, not what the State sanctions, but what it may rightfully sanction. And if the State has done wrong, must it continue to do wrong? Must it perpetuate the wrong under another form, as compensation to landlords necessarily implies? And if there is to be compensation on account of a change in these laws, surely, in common decency, the compensation should be from those who have benefited by the injustice to those who have suffered, not *vice versa*!

The piling up of stamp duties on land transfers is just a piece with the other costly formalities and precautions with which those crafty, landed law-makers hedged about their divine rights, and kept the people out of the privileged preserve. Besides, the affixing of stamps to a transfer of land does not guarantee the buyer against the risks that attach to the possession of land—one of which risks is that the land legislation which culminated in the infamy of 1660 may be reversed.

If A purchases from B a legal claim to a part of C's earnings without consulting C in the matter, and without making any return of services to him whatever (and this is just what an ordinary "investment in land" means), then A has invested his money in a fraud. That the transaction is complete as between A and B, I have always admitted; but how can this contract, even when duly stamped and taxed, bind the third party, C? If the State sanctions the transaction, that only shows how basely it has betrayed C's interests. And the crowning beauty of it is that, in this matter, the "State" is none other than A and B! First they make the confiscation legal, and then they say it can't be stopped, because it is legal!

And now, when at last C is waking up to the true inwardness of this little game, and sees that he is being "robbed, plundered, and bamboozled," comes Mr. Clayden and preaches Morality. And to whom? Does he admonish A that he must stop taking C's earnings while giving him no return—that he must cease committing "legislative murder," as Cobden called it? Not a bit of it! He denounces C as dishonest, and his ideas as crudities, frauds, and fallacies, revolutionary and unthinkable, because he refuses to bribe A to leave off the blackmailing! "Do as you would be done unto," says Mr. Clayden. "If you were A, how would you like your supplies to be cut off? Wouldn't you knock down the man who proposed such a thing?" And all this in the name of Morality and the Golden Rule!

This is how the Land Question comes home to us in Hastings. We are practically paying our rates and taxes twice over—first (say) £200,000 to the rate and tax collectors to pay for all kinds of institutions and improvements, every one of which gives value to the land; and a second £200,000 to the ground landlords (ultimate and intermediate) because we have made "their" land valuable—just as if the Almighty had created these 2,194 acres in order that a handful of the population might make a living by charging other people for the use of them! And the pressing problem is—How are we to end this intolerable strain of double taxation? Mr. Clayden says: Buy out all those who profit by the present system, seeing they have legal rights, though no moral justification. Pay down to the landlords who have got hold of your land values the capitalised value of all they would ever be able to squeeze out of you—that is some £5,000,000—and then you will only have to pay your rates and taxes once.

Single Taxers, on the other hand, say: Transfer by degrees the rates and taxes to where they ought to be and used to be, that is, the shoulders of those who enjoy the land values, and begin with a transfer of 1s. in the £.

It is true that the State has the power to expropriate one landowner in order to place another in possession, but that only shows that the real landowner is the people, who possess what is called the right of "eminent domain," which never lapses. This is just the right which was exercised by so many kings from William I. to Henry VIII.; they "resumed for the good of the realm" those estates whose holders had neglected the duties of their charters. Now, since these covenanted duties have been fraudulently evaded ever since 1660, is there not a good legal case for "resumption?"

When the State purchases land for public improvements, it of course pays full market value. To do otherwise, would be to make an unfair discrimination between individual landowners. Here there is no question of landlordism as a system, or of its abolition.

The fact is, the Single Tax position is impregnable, viz., that land values, being created by the community, belong solely and exclusively to the community; and that as soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer makes land values a basis of taxation, these will gradually

become public property according to law, just as they are public property now by "every canon of moral rectitude."

#### A LOOK IN AT THE NEWCASTLE PROGRAMME.

"Xatelgnis" says:—

To blame the Fabians or the Independent Labour Party, or anybody else but "the practical politicians" in the Liberal Party for the defeat of that party in 1895, is sheer nonsense. In the Newcastle programme the Liberal Party is pledged to the hilt to the Taxation of Land Values, to the abolition of the breakfast-table duties, and to the payment of members and election expenses. Each and all of these measures could have been included in the Budget, and the House of Landlords could not have rejected them. But no; three years passed, three Budgets were brought down by Sir William Harcourt, and no mention of these reforms. There is now supposed to be a tax of 4s. in the pound on Land Values, but it is levied on the values of 1692, and brings in less than £1,000,000 a year. If levied on present values it would bring in £32,000,000 to £40,000,000 a year, and would not only allow of the other Budget reforms I have mentioned, but would run to an old age pension of, say, 10s. a week to every person over 65, or 5s. a week to every person over 55. Such a Budget, I venture to say, even if thrown out, would, if the Liberal Party in the House had shown itself to be in earnest about it, have enabled the party to win "hands down" at the last General Election. And if they would only put such a Budget in the forefront of their programme now, and show that they mean business, it would, I am, convinced, secure their triumphant return to power at the next General Election.

For one who so freely and glibly accuses others of robbery and fraud, and with smug self-righteousness proclaims "I have no faith in doing evil that good may come," Mr. Clayden's views on morals appear to be, to say the least, somewhat peculiar. "When the great question is ripe for settlement," says he, "every legal right must be respected, irrespective of its moral justification." Surely Mr. Clayden lacks "the saving sense of humour," as well as the logical faculty, for he begins the next paragraph but one with the familiar saw, "Honesty is ever the best policy!" In the name of the prophet, figs! what sort of "honesty" is that which holds that "legal right" must prevail over moral right; that man-made law is superior to God-made law?

Really, after this, the recommendation to adopt "as the basis of our political action the 'Golden Rule,' 'Do as you would be done unto!'" comes well from our "practical politician." In my humble opinion it would be much more to the point to address that admonition to the landlords.

Our opponent says, "We agree in regarding the condition of the landless as one of slavery." But instead of turning to the 180,000 landlords who "own" ten-elevenths of the United Kingdom, and by so doing enslave from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 of their fellow countrymen—instead of turning to them and saying, "The masses are your brethren; God gave the land for all men, not for the few; Do unto these your brethren as you would be done unto; set them free; recognise their right to the full product of their labour; recognise the right of the State to the land values created by, and therefore belonging to, the public, and live henceforth on the fruits of your own labour, as every honest, independent man should;" instead of doing this he turns round on those who would have the slaves assert their rights and demand their freedom, and denouncing their proposals as "simply fraud based on a fallacy," admonishes the slaves that "legal right must be respected, irrespective of its moral justification," and tells them that they have been bought and paid for with good, hard-earned cash, and that if they set themselves free without first compensating their "owners," they will be guilty of gross robbery and confiscation.

But, it may be said, the slaveowners in the West Indies did receive compensation—£20,000,000 of it. I reply that in that case there was a third party, the British taxpayer, who stepped forward and took the burden—the £600,000 which the slaveowners got out of their slaves yearly—on his own shoulders. And the British taxpayer (the poor Irishman most of all!) has been bearing this burden ever since—that is, for two generations, and is likely to have to bear it for several generations longer. Whereas, in the case of compensation to landholders, there are only two parties in presence—the landed and the landless. There is no third party to step in and pay down 30 years' purchase. If there is to be compensation, the landlords will simply be receiving interest out of the same pockets from which they are now receiving rent. That would just be equivalent to changing the label on the taxpayers' burden—calling it "tax" instead of "rent." And that is what Mr. Clayden calls "practical politics," "a common-sense view, in harmony with the best traditions of British Liberalism!" I venture to say that British Liberalism, with its plank of "The Taxation of Land Values" rapidly coming to the front, thinks quite differently.

### 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.

### Tory Home Rule for Ireland.

Mr. Michael Davitt, who has been interviewed by the *New Age* on the new Local Government for Ireland scheme, as stated by Mr. Balfour the other night in the House of Commons, says "it came like a bolt from the blue." He calls it "the Chamberlain as against the Gladstone method—the petty as against the generous method." The Irish landlords are to get £300,000 per annum from the Irish and British taxpayers, for their consent to this act of justice to the Irish people; "A proposal," Mr. Davitt says, "which resembles the ethics of the bandits of the Middle Ages who allowed people to follow their ordinary avocations on the condition of a cash payment for the privilege;" and he puts the question—"If the Irish landlords consent to a scheme of county government on a cash basis of £300,000, how much by way of bribe would the taxpayers be required to furnish to purchase the landlords' adherence to real Home Rule?"

General agreement will be found with Mr. Davitt's opinion, "that a bill of this kind if brought forward by the Liberals would have been as fiercely assailed by the Tories, and particularly by the Irish landlords, as it is now welcomed by them, because it is introduced by their own party."

Mr. Davitt has sanguine expectations of the measure, and is of opinion that "this extension of local government will be the means of converting many in Great Britain who have hitherto opposed Home Rule on the ground that the Irish people were not capable of managing their own affairs."

It would be interesting to have Mr. Gladstone's views on this new Tory departure. He has already stated his conviction that the Tory party were in a position to settle this question, and invited them to do so. Meantime we hope the Liberal party will drive home this lesson in politics, that after years of struggle and sacrifice on their part, Ireland's claim to freedom from "Crown Colony" government has been conceded by the strongest Tory Government of modern times with the usual bribe to their friends, the landlords.

### Thy Kingdom Come.

No one can think of the kingdom for which the prayer asks without feeling that it must be a kingdom of justice and equality—not necessarily of equality in condition, but of equality in opportunity. And no one can think of it without seeing that a very kingdom of God might be brought on this earth if men would but seek to do justice—if men would but acknowledge the essential principle of Christianity, that of doing to others as we would have others do to us, and of recognising that we are all here equally the children of the one Father, equally entitled to share his bounty, equally entitled to live our lives and develop our faculties, and to apply our labour to the raw material that He has provided, Aye! and when a man sees that, then there arises that hope of the coming of the kingdom that carried the Gospel through the streets of Rome, that carried it into Pagan lands, that made it, against the most ferocious persecution, the dominant religion of the world. Early Christianity did not mean, in its prayer for the coming of Christ's kingdom, a kingdom in heaven, but a kingdom on earth. If Christ had simply preached of the other world, the high priests and the Pharisees would not have persecuted Him, the Roman soldiery would not have nailed His hands to the cross.

#### WHY WAS CHRISTIANITY PERSECUTED?

Why were its first professors thrown to wild beasts, burned to light a tyrant's gardens, hounded, tortured, put to death by all the cruel devices that a devilish ingenuity could suggest? Not that it was a new religion, referring only to the future. Rome was tolerant of all religions. It was the boast of Rome that all her gods were sheltered in the Pantheon; it was the boast of Rome that she made no interference with the religions of people she conquered. What was persecuted was a great movement for social reform—the Gospel of Justice—heard by common fishermen with gladness, carried by labourers and slaves into the Imperial City. The Christian, revelation was the doctrine of human equality

**The Single Tax is the Key to Open it.**

of the fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of man. It struck at the very basis of that monstrous tyranny that then oppressed the civilised world; it struck at the fetters of the captive, at the bonds of the slave, at that monstrous injustice which allowed a class to revel on the proceeds of labour, while those who did the labour fared scantily. That is the reason why early Christianity was persecuted. And when they could no longer hold it down, then the privileged classes adopted and perverted the new faith, and it became, in its very triumph, not the pure Christianity of the early days, but a Christianity that, to a very great extent, was the servitor of the privileged classes. And, instead of preaching the essential fatherhood of God, the essential brotherhood of man, its high priests engrafted on the pure truths of the Gospel the blasphemous doctrine that the All-Father is a respecter of persons, and that by His will and on His mandate is founded that monstrous injustice which condemns the great mass of humanity to unrequited hard toil. There has been no failure of Christianity. The failure has been in the sort of Christianity that has been preached.—*Henry George.*

#### Portsmouth Trades' Council and the Housing of the Working Classes.

At a meeting of the Portsmouth Trades' Council, held on 6th May, Mr. J. H. M'Guigan moved in accordance with notice:—

That we appreciate the efforts of the Social Reform Committee and the editor and staff of the *Evening News*, in drawing public attention to the wretched condition of the houses in which some of the poorer paid workers are compelled to live. That we consider it is evident that the levying of rates on the building and improvements of houses while idle land escapes, tends to discourage building, and to prevent improvements. Hence we desire to reverse this policy by abolishing all rates and taxes on houses or improvement of any kind, and imposing a tax on the value of land.

In speaking to the motion, Mr. M'Guigan referred to the municipal dwellings of Glasgow:—

They had cost large sums of money, and in consequence had to be rented so highly that the people for whom they were intended could not hire them. The result was that the very poor were driven into other slums, whilst people who had been living in decent houses previously moved into the municipal ones that were erected ostensibly for the slum dwellers. There was a cause for people living in slums, and the resolution indicated this and the remedy. It was utterly absurd to put a tax on houses and yet complain that the houses were not big and good enough. Directly a man built or improved a house, he was taxed for it, while idle land was not taxed.

Mr. Bunnell seconded, and after some discussion the resolution was carried unanimously.

#### A Real Jubilee.

The June number of the *Progressive Review*, in its first editorial, says:—

A true Jubilee would require for its due observance: (1) An eight hour day; (2) Increased educational facilities; (3) The abolition of land monopoly and the assertion of the equal right to the use of the earth, by the taking of economic rent for the common use.

This is very good, and marks progress on the part of the *Progressive Review*. When our contemporary looks into the problem a little deeper it will discover that when land monopoly is abolished "by the taking of economic rent for the common use," that their first observance will be quite unnecessary, and the second follow as a matter of course.

To demand an eight hour day is but to demand powers to compel people to do what they want to do—take more leisure. When land monopoly is no more, the people will have all they work for, and if there be those who will sweat themselves on these conditions, why, if it pleases them, it will harm no one else.

The cry for this restriction of the hours of labour arises from the fact that men and women are compelled under the present conditions of land monopoly to submit to long hours of labour, and to that other almost exploded fallacy that a reduction of the hours of labour would take in the unemployed. But those who fully realise the boundless opportunities to employment behind the barriers of land monopoly, insist that this is the bottom restriction that is responsible for the bondage of labour, and that its overthrow is the only way to freedom.

The *Progressive Review* has hit the point of least resistance—take "economic rent" or land values for the "common use."

#### A Minister on the Press.

The Rev. Robert M'Queen, Clydebank, in a Sunday evening lecture last month, reviewed the modern press. It is the rev. gentleman's opinion that "the editor commanded a larger congregation than all the churches, and with his pen could arrest his tens of thousands;" and that "the average newspaper of our time was a slave to public opinion, and took courage as well as inspiration too often from its advertising columns." There is a great deal of truth in these remarks, but people who live in glass houses should not indulge in stone throwing. It is notorious that ministers are silent on social grievances and questions affecting the very lives of the people, through fear of offending the rich supporters of the church. If the editor writes to please this class, the minister preaches not to offend them. He talks pleasantly of the Heavenly reward hereafter for the good, but is generally found silent on the laws and institutions that are responsible for starvation wages, and the hell of the one room hovel so common to tens of thousands of our fellow creatures.

"Many of the editors," says Mr. M'Queen, "instead of taking advice from God, are in the habit of giving Him advice." We have no desire to apologise for such sinners, and we don't envy them their task, but what is the attitude of the church on the question of emancipating the poor from the clutches of the "dogs in the manger," whom Nehemiah denounced in his day with such vigour?

The Moderator of the Free Church Assembly at Edinburgh, the other day, referred to the depopulation of the country and the slums of the city. The money changers and land speculators, who are responsible for this, are not generally found in editorial chairs. Most of them are in the front seats of the Christian church. If they "inspire the editors," according to Mr. M'Queen, "six days in the week," the silence of the pulpits on this Land Question proclaims how they control the minister on the seventh. How true are Carlyle's words—"We have dethroned the Spirit God, and put that brute god mammon in his place." This is the god that the editors advise, and to whom the churches bow down.

#### Why Poverty.

We will all acknowledge that if a continent were to arise in the ocean to-night as rich in resources as America, within accessible distance, the question of the unemployed and of poverty would vanish like the morning dew.

Is it, then, that our country is too densely populated? Yet there are but eight persons to each square mile of the United States. The single State of Texas could accommodate and support the entire population of the United States, yet be less densely inhabited than Germany. With no more fertile or arable land, France supports a population of 40,000,000, while California, with less than a million and a half, presents the spectacle of able-bodied, willing workers begging bread in her two great cities. What a flattering tribute to our intelligence this is!

There may be those of you who expect a visionary, intricate dream of Utopia; yet my remedy does not so seem to me. I would simply annul the unnatural divorce, and marry man again to the land. I would write in our statute books these laws:—

This earth, being God's common gift to mankind, shall not be monopolised by men.

No man shall be permitted to hold a foot of unused land while another man desires to use it.

Each man shall pay, for the privilege of the use of this land, and for the benefits and requirements of the community, such amount as shall be his rightful due, according to the benefits he enjoys from the community, and such tax, or dues, or rent, shall be paid to the power which creates these benefits, to the people, as represented by their chosen government.

No man shall be punished, by tax or fine, for being a benefit to the community and to his fellow-men.

They that will not labour shall not eat.

Is there anything intricate or impossible or unfair in these laws? Would we not be serving ourselves and the world by their enactment? Yes, And more, they will, they must be enacted. And, oh, my friends! eye hath not seen nor can tongue tell of the change, instant and perpetual, that will follow. And I am of good heart that we will not have to wait an age, or a generation, or a decade, to see its fulfilment.

No; every day, every week, I hope and pray that some commonwealth—God grant it be California—under divine inspiration, will obliterate the relics of ignorance and barbarism, and place in their stead these simple truths. Then will a light burst forth and a song arise that will glow and swell until all the world sees and all its voices join in the acclaim, until mankind can walk in the sunlight of life erect, and this world become a fitting ante-chamber to the higher life which I trust awaits us all.—*Conclusion by M. M'Glyn before the Los Angelous Council of Labour, at Music Hall, March 9, 1897.*

#### English Liberals Active.

The General Committee of the National Liberal Federation, at a special meeting held at Derby last month to consider resolutions on the subjects of registration and electoral reform, resolved:—

That the period of qualification shall be reduced to three months, the conditions of registration simplified, and, further, that the principle shall obtain of one man one vote, that all elections shall be held on one and the same day, and that all public houses shall be closed on the polling day; that the official expenses of elections shall be made a public charge, and the principle of payment of members be recognised, in order that the electors may be free and unfettered in choosing who shall represent them in the House of Commons; that temporary parochial relief shall not disqualify its recipient for the franchise; extension of polling hours, and to permit all electors inside the polling booth to vote; that the executive be instructed to obtain and circulate among the affiliated associations as quickly as possible the best information on the precise working and effects of the second ballot. Further, this committee reiterate the opinion expressed by the Council of the Federation at the Norwich meetings on the 18th March last:—That the House of Commons should no longer be subjected to the veto of a hereditary, unrepresentative, and irresponsible House of Peers.

It was also resolved:—

That the executive be instructed to circulate this resolution amongst the affiliated associations to ascertain their opinions thereon, and to report the result to another meeting of this committee, at which the whole subject shall be further discussed, such meeting to be summoned as early in the autumn as possible.

A motion for the "extension of the parliamentary franchise to women who now vote at municipal and parochial elections," after some discussion, was adjourned, the chairman, Dr. R. Spence Watson, pledging that the question would be brought before every one of the federated associations.

#### From Japan.

BY CHARLES E. GARST.

Within the past three months there has been a very remarkable movement in Tokyo in the way of the formation of societies for the study of social problems. There never has been a movement similar to it in Japan. A number of such clubs have grown up in ignorance of each other, and now that they are becoming acquainted with each other's existence, there is much rejoicing.

They all seem to recognise that there is much wrong, that the wrong is economic, that it is founded on law, i.e., it is legalised wrong.

"Peace" is inscribed on their banners, their desire being to bring about changes by peaceful agitation and the education of the public conscience. The present membership of these societies is less than five hundred.

The Single Tax and proportional representation have a free field in three of the societies at least, and likely in all.

Single Tax articles are to appear regularly from April in a monthly magazine. This effort has a promise of strong support, and will be the beginning of a strong Single Tax movement in Japan. There is much here to encourage the lover of progress.

Tokyo, Japan, April 1.

**NOTICE.**—"*Single Tax*" readers are respectfully recommended to patronise the advertisers. Mention the paper, where possible, when making purchases.

#### LONDON AGENT—

W. REEVE, 185 Fleet St., London, E.C.

Published for the Proprietors by JOHN PAUL, 56 George Square, Glasgow, and printed by MURRAY & DONNELLY, 74 Argyle Street, Glasgow, JUNE, 1897.