

The SINGLE TAX

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE CAUSE OF TAXING LAND VALUES.

VOL. IV.—No. 42.

GLASGOW, NOVEMBER, 1897.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

DO YOU SEE THE "CAT?"

WE are glad to be able to inform our readers that the number of Boards of Guardians in England and Wales which recently petitioned Parliament for power to assess land values to local rates, is no less than 63. The list includes such important Poor Law Unions as Lambeth, Holborn, West Ham, Poplar, Hackney, St. Pancras, Middlesborough, Hastings, Tynemouth, Gateshead, Merthyr Tydvil, Blackburn, Bromley, Preston, Kettering, South Shields, Sunderland, Huddersfield, Salisbury, Norwich, etc. This brings up the total of petitioning authorities south of the border to 133.



"I just dropped in, Sir, to ask if you believe that God made the Earth, and if so, use the whole Earth, without any appropriation of it to any particular person or class of persons?"

"Then, if one man appropriates the whole Earth, without giving an equivalent value, he would be doing an injustice to his fellow-men?"

"Then, if any number of men appropriate any portion of the common heritage, without giving an equivalent value, the injustice would be the same in character?"

"Of course I so believe, God is no respecter of persons."

"He would, most assuredly."

"True—there's no doubt about that!"



"But, if that equivalent were given, wouldn't the annual value of the land be vindicated, and the end of perfect Justice be met?"

"Unquestionably; but how can you fix that equivalent, as you call it?"

"Nothing simpler—it's and the rental value to be taken in the form of a tax on the land, which, if other taxes, direct or indirect, being abolished, it worth in the shape of a pound of burden now borne, but how about landlord?"

"That rental value could be taken in the form of a tax on the land, which, if other taxes, direct or indirect, being abolished, it worth in the shape of a pound of burden now borne, but how about landlord?"

"I see; that would relieve the landlord?"



"It would only extinguish the land, etc., River, etc., fishing and beautiful situation are furnished by the Creator; advantages of railway communication, good roads, expected additional railway service, adjacent village, post offices, and churches, are the work of the builders in obedience to the needs of the people. Yet all are used to add to the value of the property of the owner so called."

"Young man, there's a Christian, Sir, these are the doctrines of the Anti-Poverty men, and which year the Earth for All, He never new to me. Now, if those Ministerial Association deem that some should live in idleness, on the labor of others, 'Whoso will not work shall not eat,' you know."

"Sir, these are the doctrines of the Anti-Poverty men, and which year the Earth for All, He never new to me. Now, if those Ministerial Association deem that some should live in idleness, on the labor of others, 'Whoso will not work shall not eat,' you know."

WE commend this information to all those who are striving to bring the question of the Taxation of Land Values to the front. Press this home that it is becoming more and more a ratepayer's question, and that it can be given effect to any year in the Budget proposals. The ratepayers are beginning to see that land monopoly is the main cause of high house rents in towns; and that the Taxation of Land Values will overthrow land monopoly. Let this be shewn clearly and the future is ours.

Notes and Comments.

Ex-Ballie Burt's Visit to Halifax.

LETTER FROM MR. C. H. SMITHSON.

Heath Avenue,
Halifax, 10th October, 1897.

Dear Mr. Paul;—We have been congratulated on all sides on our meeting last night. Mr. Burt may feel assured that he has done a great service to the cause here. We are more than satisfied. Many who came to scoff remained to pray; and the resolution was carried unanimously, with great spirit. It was supposed to be non-party, but the result has been to show our local political leaders that it is a question which they must look into, and with energy. Mr. Burt was in good form, and completely carried his audience with him. Personally I can honestly say I never heard the question so ably and conclusively dealt with. Thanking you very much for the help you have given us.—Yours very sincerely,

CHAS. H. SMITHSON, Secy.,
Halifax Branch
Financial Reform Association.

Apply to the Lords of the Land.

"FOR SALE—Lands and Estates of Haddo, Baloon, and Haggis; extends one mile along river, having within its limits some famous fishing pools. The house is beautifully situated on the banks of the Keithney, between the railway stations of Turiff and Huntly, connected by good roads. In contemplation to promote a railway running from the Great North of Scotland Railway Station. The village of Inverkeithney is on the estate; it has two Post Offices, two Established, one Episcopal, and two Free Churches."—*Herald*, 18th October.

The land, etc., River, etc., fishing and beautiful situation are furnished by the Creator; advantages of railway communication, good roads, expected additional railway service, adjacent village, post offices, and churches, are the work of the builders in obedience to the needs of the people. Yet all are used to add to the value of the property of the owner so called.

We Pay the Piper, the Landlord Names the Tune.

Villa, in beautiful situation, looking into Maxwell Park, for Sale.

Tenements, near Elder Park, for Sale.
House, fronting the Camphill entrance of Park, for Sale.

The tune demanded by the landlord is too high-priced for these advantages, and he advertises in the *Herald* (18th October) for a purchaser.

£600 for Liberty to Ascend another Flat.

The following is an extract from the report of the minutes of the Cathcart Cemetery Co., submitted last month:—

FEUING GROUND.—It was found on examination of the titles of that ground that any buildings to be erected thereon must not exceed three storeys in height; and as this restriction materially diminished the value of the ground as a feuing subject, the Directors entered into negotiations with the Superior to have it removed. In this they were successful, and the sum of £600 paid for the concession, was considered well-spent money.

Thus, for ascending another storey into God's atmosphere the Superior claims £600.

The Railways Furnish the Means.

Partick Properties for Sale, near Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Station,

Uddingston.—Villa, convenient to Caledonian and North British Railway Stations.

Dumfriesshire.—Greenbank House, ten minutes from Glasgow and South Western Railway Stations.

Garelochhead.—House, commands magnificent view of the Loch, the Firth, and surrounding country.

Fifeshire.—Villa, uninterrupted sea-view.

Banffshire—Portsoy.—Seaside view—health—beautiful scenery—good bathing—rock and trout fishing, etc.—All for the man who owns the sites.

New South Wales.

IMPORTANT STATEMENT BY THE PREMIER. SUCCESS OF THE LAND VALUE TAX.

[REUTERS TELEGRAM.]

Sydney, 15th October.

The Right Hon. G. H. Reid, Premier and Colonial Treasurer, delivered his Budget statement to the Legislative Assembly yesterday evening. He showed that in the financial year, 1896-97, revenue had exceeded both his former estimates. The expenditure amounted to £9,505,000, and when this sum was deducted from receipts, including the balance brought forward, the sum of £120,000 was left to be brought forward to the current year. The colony under free trade policy had made greater progress in manufactures than protectionist Victoria. In consequence of the change in fiscal policy, the Customs revenue had decreased

OFFICE—56 GEORGE SQUARE, GLASGOW.

by £828,000, and there would be a further decrease in the present year of £64,000. Agricultural prospects had much improved, and the area under wheat was now one million acres. The exports had exceeded the imports by 464,000 bushels during the last nine months. *Two distinct advantages had been achieved by the Land Tax, namely, the establishment of sound prosperity of the colony, and fixing of the price of land at its true value.*

Mr. Reid's speech was received with enthusiasm.

How the People lost the Land.

A few centuries ago, says the *Ayrshire Post*, the land for miles around Ayr was the property of the town—the people, you understand, not an individual. Well, gradually, very gradually, one Council Board after another, to raise the wind and bolster up their bad management, had to resort to the sale of the people's land—just as they did last week. They did not pledge it, but sold it outright. The keen competition for this Nile Court site, of course, can be accounted for by its proximity to us. Why will public bodies, entrusted with the people's rights and privileges, increase the difficulties of land restoration by selling these rights at every opportunity? One would think that they were in dire haste to get quit of valuable ground, and to acquire in its stead unproductive bent and shingle where the people's rights are already established.

The community creates the value of the land—the community likewise create the expenses—the one then should be pitted against the other and the landlord abolished. Had the people's rights been maintained and not frittered away by improvident Councillors, Ayr to-day would have been drawing an income from her land—the land made valuable by the people—sufficient to cover all expenses for improvements, etc., however great, without having any other tax. This land question is THE ALL-IMPORTANT QUESTION on which all other social problems hang, and until it is boldly faced and surmounted the millennium will be delayed.

Henry George's Position.

Discussing the candidature of Henry George for Mayor of Greater New York, the *New York World* says:—

Henry George has never been a candidate for any office in the political sense of the word. His canvass in 1886 was a matter of principle. He knew that the opponents of special privileges were in a minority, but he wanted them to stand up and be counted; to know how strong they were. They stood up. And the result surprised him as much as anyone. If he is chosen as the leader to command in the anti-Tammany Democratic forces in this campaign, there may be even a greater surprise in store. Tammany certainly will not "be able to elect a yellow dog."

To accept such a nomination means a sacrifice by Henry George that few people appreciate. He has nothing to gain in the way of fame or honour.

His health is not so robust as it was ten years ago, and the campaign will make heavy drafts upon it, for he is a fighter of the Grant kind. His great work on political economy has yet to be finished.

The first part is now in the printer's hands, but the concluding chapters have yet to be written. For several years past he has been steadily at work on entirely new lines in economics, and now when all the threads are coming together, to break in upon his study with the excitement of a political campaign in which, like the quest of Prince Geraint, "no honour can be gained," and health and labour must be lost, is such a sacrifice that only the strongest sense of duty will induce him to make it.

Some Men who will probably not support the Taxation of Land Values.

The man who does not think.

The well-fed man who thinks all others are about as comfortable as possible.

The man who tolerates the slums because he is too busy to look into the question.

The man who slaves all day in his shop, pays his rent and taxes regularly, and "thanks God" inwardly and outwardly "that he is not as other men."

The land speculator.

The man who believes in no politics, *i.e.*, no radical politics, at the Town Council.

The man who does "not yet understand the question."

The man who takes the widow and the orphan under his wing.

The man who thinks the Land Question an agricultural question.

The man who is waiting for a "feasible plan" to apply the principle.

The man who fears that the tax collector would be thrown out of employment if the Single Tax were put in force.

The man who doesn't see the philosophy of the question.

The man who sits for a "safe" seat in the Town Council.

The man who would vote for a yellow dog provided it had the proper label.

Some Men who will Support the Taxation of Land Values.

The straight Single Taxer.

The man who wants votes.

The man who means to study the question.

The man who thinks taking "Betterment" and "Future Unearned Increment" is akin to taxing land values.

The man who means to go to the Bradford Conference on the Taxation of Land Values, on the 4th January, 1898.

The man who thinks it a good platform cry, but who dauns it in private life by saying—it is a long way off.

The man who believes it will kill the land speculators who "throttle" the towns.

The man who believes in "Differential Rating."

The man who fails to see why land values should be exempt from local taxation.

The man who thinks everything should be taxed.

The man who believes that people should be rated on the value of the privileges they receive from the community.

The man who believes that men should be rated according to their ability to pay.

Ex-Bailie Burt, J.P., on the Taxation of Land Values.

At the invitation of the Halifax Branch of the Financial Reform Association, ex Bailie Burt, J.P., Glasgow, delivered an address in the Mechanics' Hall of that town, on Tuesday, 12th October—Mr. Alfred Billson, M.P. for the division, presiding.

The following report appeared in the *Halifax Evening Courier*, 13th October:—

INTERESTING LECTURE IN HALIFAX.

Last night a large audience assembled in the Mechanics' Hall to hear a lecture in connection with the Halifax Branch of the Financial Reform Association, by ex-Bailie Burt, J.P., of Glasgow, on "Taxation of Land Values—its effect upon towns." Mr. A. Billson, M.P., presided.

The CHAIRMAN, in his opening remarks, said the subject of taxation was one that commended itself to all parties. All parties felt the burden of excessive taxation, and would be only too glad to find some method by which taxation might be more equally distributed. (hear hear.)

Ex-Bailie BURT at the outset remarked that this was the first time he had had the honour of addressing a public meeting in England. Continuing, he said that the subject of the Taxation of Land Values was one of world-wide importance. As far as their ideas of taxation were concerned at the present time, they believed that taxes were taken from the people for the purpose of being spent in the interests of the people. They had a great many

LANDLORDS IN TOWNS LIKE HALIFAX

and Glasgow who simply stood by and allowed the people to work and produce improvements of which they reaped the benefit. Everyone was aware that public improvements made in a city had one certain result—they increased the value of the land in the neighbourhood of the improvements. But the people who reaped the increased advantage of that public improvement did not do anything towards it. When they started with the idea that taxes were collected for the purpose of being spent for the benefit of the people, then it was right to say that those who got the benefit ought to pay. (hear hear.) It was admitted in practical politics that the individual was entitled to compensation for his improvements. They had an Act of Parliament which now laid down as law that agricultural tenants when leaving a farm were entitled to have unexhausted improvements valued. When

a community improved a landlord's property, however, the landlord paid no compensation whatever. It was argued that

IF THEY PUT A TAX UPON THE LANDLORD

he would put it on the tenant, and the tenant would have to pay just the same. Under existing conditions there was a good deal of truth in that, because at the present moment they only rated the landlord upon the rental he received from the tenant, and the moment he had no tenant he was not taxed. Thus the landlord was enabled to fix his own price for the tenancy. If, however, they taxed the landlord whether he had a tenant for the land or not, then a different phase would be put upon the question. Under these circumstances a landlord would soon reduce the rent of the land to such a figure as would enable land to be occupied, for if he was taxed on the value he put upon it, it would be impossible for him to keep it idle. Some people urge that it would not be fair to tax land from which no rent was being received. If, however, the landlord chose to keep the land idle that was his business, but by keeping it idle he was

DEFAUDING THE COMMUNITY

of revenue which would be received were the land put to use. It had been argued that the Land Question was not of so much importance, and we were asked how it was going to solve

THE UNEMPLOYED PROBLEM.

The speaker urged that everyone was dependent upon the land for a livelihood either directly or indirectly. He pointed out that large plots of land unbuilt upon were to be seen in towns whilst other parts were congested in the extreme. If the owners were taxed upon the value of the land held idle, it would soon be occupied with buildings, people would have room to spread out, and industry would be increased. No matter how the workers strove to progress, as long as they left certain individuals with the raw material with which they must work, these individuals were able to take the largest proportion of what was produced. To destroy the monopoly power they must tax the value of natural opportunities, and this would alter the conditions of society to its very foundations. Instead of workmen seeking employers as at present, the employers would be looking for workmen. The natural opportunity was there, but the landlord said: "There is the raw material, you have skill to apply to that material, but before you have access you must promise me a share of the produce, and until you make that promise you can wait and starve into submission." The taxation of land values would not only find employment for the unemployed, but it would solve the problem of the

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

He always thought there was something ironical in the "housing of the working classes" proposal. He thought they might with more appropriateness discuss the housing of the idle classes. And yet it was a fact that they had to discuss it. If they wanted to find the working classes they always went to the poorest part of a city, and when they looked for the people who did not work they sought in the best part of a city. (laughter.) If they solved the unemployed problem they would solve the question of the housing of the working classes. They heard a great deal about Acts of Parliament to do this and that for the working people, but he felt that working people would do these things for themselves if they were left alone. At present it looked as though the working classes were robbed, and then laws were devised to disguise the robbery. Proceeding, Mr. Burt spoke of rents and rates, and urged his hearers to bear in mind that these were one and the same. He instanced this by saying that if some wealthy man gave sufficient money to a Corporation to relieve the town of taxation, that town would quickly have an increased population, and the landlords would at once raise the rents to the figure which was previously reached by the rate and rent combined. Another point which cropped up in this question of land values was

LAND SPECULATION.

It was urged by some that they must give people this opportunity of speculation for the purpose of inducing them to develop those natural resources. The speaker, however, contended that the speculators never bought land for its

Ask all Candidates for Municipal and Parliamentary Honours this Question—

present value. He speculated in the land, and kept it until it was required by the community or a railway company, and then he could command his own price. Look how railway enterprise had been killed. Instead of making it easy for a railway company to open up and develop a district, landowners made it as difficult as possible. The result was that to pay a fair interest on the capital expended, when the railway did come fares were high, rates of carriage were high, and so the whole thing was strangled by those dogs in the manger who simply did not use the land themselves and would not let anybody else use it. (applause.) Thus they would see how that system of land monopoly went against the interest, progress, and wealth of a community. Some people suggested the nationalisation of land as a remedy, but he felt that to tax the land on the value that the proprietor himself put upon it was

THE BEST METHOD.

A proposal to that effect has been carried in the Glasgow Town Council, and the scheme proposed was to ask landowners when they made out their annual return to state the extent of the land that they owned and the annual value of it. By this means a Corporation would have a list of all the plots of land in a town, and if the land was wanted by the Corporation or a railway company, it would only be necessary to turn to this list and find out the price the owner put upon it. The financial part of this question was important, but the main idea was to get the use of the land. Why was it that in the wake of civilisation should come the march of poverty and destitution? Simply because they had locked the storehouse of Nature and handed the key to the landlord. It was their duty to demand the key from him. They did not want anything he had stolen in the past, but they urged that he should take no more in the future. (applause.) They did not deny the landlord his share, but they thought he had no right to appropriate their share. Some people contended that that state of things existed in the days of Adam and Eve, but it would not act now. But the land was just as new to them when they came into the world as it was to Adam and Eve, and it was unfair to find that the world had monopolised their share when they got here. (applause.)

The lecture, which was attentively listened to throughout, bristled with telling illustrations of the various points enunciated by the speaker.

At the close, Councillor WHITLEY moved, "That this meeting is in favour of the Halifax Town Council applying to Parliament for powers to make land values the main basis of local taxation."

Mr. HOWARD CLAY seconded this, and it was carried.

A resolution of thanks to the speaker concluded the meeting.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., Sept. 17.—James S. Reynolds, one of the best known Single Taxers of California, died in this city on the 14th inst. from the effects of an attack of pneumonia. All the papers of the city had notices of Mr Reynolds' death, ascribing to him the noble qualities that his friends and opponents had for so long recognised.—*Ex.*

A CONFERENCE

ON

The Taxation of Land Values

WILL BE HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE ENGLISH LAND RESTORATION LEAGUE,
THE SCOTTISH LAND RESTORATION UNION,
AND THE
FINANCIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION,
TUESDAY, 4th JANUARY, 1898, at 10.30 a.m.,

AT THE
CENTRAL HALL, Manchester Road,
BRADFORD.

For particulars apply

F. VERINDER, 376 77 Strand, London;
JOHN PAUL, 56 George Square, Glasgow;
J. W. S. CALLIE, 18 Hackins Hey, Liverpool; or,
L. H. BERENS, Wreatley Road, Ilkley.

Glasgow Municipal Election.

SIXTH (SPRINGBURN) WARD.

Ex-Baillie Burt, J.P., President of the Scottish Land Restoration Union, is a candidate for the vacancy in this Ward, caused by the death of the late Councillor Main. Councillor Cochran also retires this year, and the contest is Burt and Cochran *versus* Johnstone and O'Hare. Mr. Cochran is the sitting member for the Ward. He was returned last year for the first time, and his record speaks for itself. Messrs. Johnstone and O'Hare stand for what is known as "Municipalisation, expressed in the workers' municipal programme." It is with Mr. Burt's candidature that we are concerned. He is recognised in all Single Tax circles as an able advocate and gifted exponent of the Taxation of Land Values, and has already shewn his capacity as a legislator on the question at the Glasgow Town Council. But let him speak for himself. In his address he says:

"On questions of municipal reform I stand for progress. On

THE QUESTION OF TAXATION

I feel that the direction of true reform is in the taking for the benefit of the community that value which the community creates. This, I believe, can only be done by imposing a tax on the values of land whether used or kept idle. This principle means that men shall not be taxed upon their industry as at present, but upon the value of the advantages they receive from the community. I am confident that were this reform accomplished, the greatest source of the poverty and misery of the people would be removed. During the seven years I was a member of the Council I kept this question before the Council and the electors as one of primary importance; and on the 5th October, 1896, I moved a resolution which was carried by 33 to 25 votes—"That the Council present a petition to Parliament in favour of making land values the basis of the city's taxation."

THE CLAIMS OF LABOUR.

"I can only repeat what I said in my Election Address of 1895:—'I have always made it my earnest endeavour to further the interests of the wage-earning employees of the Corporation, and have always supported any proposal to increase the workers' wages.' On the 6th September, 1895, I moved—"That the superintendent of the Parks Committee have power to advance the wages of labourers to 21s. per week," which motion, I regret to say, was lost by 18 to 13 votes.

WHILE THIS IS MY POSITION

generally regarding the claims of labour, I am not unmindful of the danger that may arise in creating a privileged and favoured class in the employment of the Corporation, whose activity on their own behalf may ultimately menace the true interests of the community. This possible danger to us is exemplified in the position of American municipal affairs to-day, where the system is so rotten and corrupt that it meets with almost universal reprobation."

These, with his known and expressed sympathy with the cause of temperance reform, are the leading points of Mr. Burt's programme. His opponents, Messrs. Johnstone and O'Hare, have lost their heads and published statements to the effect that he voted against land value taxation, and that he is opposed to the interests of labour. These charges are made up deliberate falsehoods, and wiltful misrepresentations. They have been answered as such, and the answer has awakened a feeling of contempt for the men who made them. They are not worth noticing here, they could only excite our readers' merriment or amazement. We are sure that the electors of the Springburn Ward will answer such low down tactics to injure the reputation of a representative citizen reformer like Mr. Burt by returning him on Tuesday, 2nd November, as their trusted representative.

Ladies or Gentlemen wishing to create a safe and regular Income by the employment of Spare Capital should write for the "INVESTOR'S VADE MECUM," sent Post Free by DAVID BARCLAY & CO., 48 WEST GEORGE STREET, GLASGOW.

Secret of Tranquility.

Chung Yao Tam, a learned Chinaman who is making the circuit of the globe, is a philosopher whom even the Occident need not despise. He explains the security of the Chinese government upon the theory that it lives off the poor. "It is a great truth," he says, "and therefore hard to tell, that as long as a state can live off the poor, it is happy, tranquil, and honoured." Mr. Tam is evidently a wit as well as a philosopher, for with a smile that would bring a blush of self-consciousness to the cheeks of the most hardened saviour of society, he adds: "But let a country show the slightest intention of calling on the rich for a contribution, and there is a riot; it is accused of violating all human rights, of lacking in respect for sacred things, of being destructive to commerce and industry, and good citizens despise it."

"Has experience in your country taught you anything of the sort?" Mr. Tam naively inquires of his interviewer.

Yes, experience has taught us just that. So long as we tax the poor and let the rich escape, so long as we tax the home lot heavily and speculative holdings lightly, so long as we levy indirect taxes so as to burden the poor with high duties while letting the rich off with light ones, so long as we create public debts for the rich to invest in and the poor to pay—so long as we raise our revenues in these ways and the thousands and one other ways which these typify, the country is happy and tranquil, and its honour is secure. But let us attempt to reverse the programme, and the rich begin to threaten. If we urge that direct taxes are better than indirect, we are told that the rich would rebel rather than pay them. If we pass an income tax law, they have it nullified by one judge who changes his mind over night, and when we criticise him they denounce us as anarchists. It is no uncommon thing to hear the rich threaten resistance to constituted authority, if their privileges be assailed; but so long as the government lives off the poor, it is, as Chung Yao Tam says, happy, tranquil, and honoured.—*Cleveland Recorder.*

Glasgow Central Liberal Association and the coming Liberal Conference.

Executive Resolution, 4th October, 1897:—

That whereas the land question lies at the root of the Social Problem; that land monopoly, which is directly caused by the values of land being exempt from taxation, forces labour into involuntary idleness, and thus creates an unemployed class; and, whereas, the values of land are created by the presence, industry, and growth of the people, this Conference is of opinion that the taxation of land values should occupy the foremost place in the programme of the Liberal Party, to be dealt with at the earliest possible moment by—

- 1st.—The abolition of the breakfast table duties: the duties on tea, coffee, cocoa, dried fruits, &c.;
- 2nd.—The substitution of a direct tax on the value of land apart from improvements.
- 3rd.—Reform of the Valuation Acts to provide for the separate scheduling in the valuation returns of the values of land and the values of improvements with a view to separate assessment.

Hutchesontown and Blackfriars passed the following resolution:—

In view of the injurious effects on the trade and industry of this country, caused by our present cumbersome mode of raising public revenue, this meeting is of opinion that the time has come when the Taxation of Land Values, irrespective of improvements, should be given a foremost place in the Liberal programme.

The Three R's Up-to-Date.

(To the Editor of the Single Tax).

SIR,—You say that "the Single Tax movement ought to be re-christened." Allow me to suggest

"RENT REVENUE REFORM."

which slips readily off the tongue, besides being in touch with the Land, the Fiscal system, and Progress, which is certainly more than can be said for "Single Tax." "Rent Revenue Reformers" will probably arouse more enthusiasm than Single Taxers.—Your obedient Servant,
EUSTACE G. EDWARDS.

Wincanton, 14th Oct., 1897.

Major Edwards is mistaken. It was a correspondent who remarked in a note in the *Single Tax* that the movement ought to be re-christened.—Ed. S. T.

A fast line of steamers between Boston, America, and Bristol, England, to make the distance in five days is likely to be established soon. It will be in order to note the speed with which land values and rents will go up in Bristol and Boston should this line materialise.

"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.

NEW PAMPHLET.

THE LAND QUESTION AND THE LIBERAL PARTY

By H. S. MURRAY.

To be had from *Single Tax* Office, One Penny.
3s. per 100 (carriage paid).

Sample Copies Free on Application.

John Morley on Land Values.

At last we have obtained from a leading member of the Liberal Party, and at the same time one of the safest and most advanced statesmen of our country, an open and straight declaration on the Taxation of Land Values. Speaking to his constituents at Forfar on Monday, 4th October, Mr. JOHN MORLEY said:—

"Unless the House of Lords places itself full front in face of some law which is eagerly desired by the bulk of the voters—and in face of such a desire they will think twice or thrice before they resist it—you can't sweep it away by law. You can do it by revolution, but questions will arise which would perhaps test this temper in the House of Lords, the temper of giving way before a decisive majority.

GLASGOW'S PROPOSAL.

"I will give you an instance. I observe the other day that the Town Council of Glasgow which, I suppose, is one of the most important Corporations in the kingdom—representing one of the largest constituencies in the kingdom—I observe that the Town Council of Glasgow passed a motion adopting the heads of a Bill for dealing with what are known as ground values. Well, you know, I am sure what principle is involved in proposals affecting ground values. I cannot doubt that the principle involved in what is called the question of ground values is one which must make quicker and quicker way into the minds and opinions of the people of this island, both in this part of it and south of the Tweed. *It will be thought an intolerable thing that men shall derive enormous increments of income from the growth of towns to which they have contributed nothing, that they shall be able to sweep into their coffers what they have not produced, that they shall be able to go on throttling towns as they are well known to do in some cases—it is impossible to suppose that the system will not be vigorously, powerfully, persistently, and successfully attacked.*" (Loud cheers.)

THE LORDS CANNOT INTERFERE.

"Now, that is the kind of question which will no doubt try the House of Lords very hard, and when that question arises we shall see whether they will evade these proposals for sweeping them away by wisely bowing to the wish of the people. But let us go on with this discussion of the House of Lords. First of all, *the House of Lords cannot touch a tax bill or a money bill*, and second, it is absolutely unable to affect in any way the choice of an Executive Government. Therefore, in those two important particulars of Parliamentary power—first of all, *control of the taxpayers' money*, and second, in choosing to shape the Executive Government and from what party they shall be taken—the House of Commons is absolute and uncontrolled."

Such a pronouncement coming from one so universally respected as a gifted and cautious statesman, is very gratifying. As we noted in our last issue, close upon 140 assessing bodies in England, and 63 in Scotland, have recently sought powers from Parliament to tax land values for local purposes; and now Mr. Morley publicly commends the action of the Glasgow Town Council in preparing a bill to submit to Parliament on the subject. He also takes occasion to show that this is the kind of question which would try the House of Lords very hard; and one which can be dealt with independent of their consideration.

It has often been stated that the Lords would interfere with the Taxation of Land Values, and it is true they could prevent or mutilate the passing of an Act giving powers to local bodies

to rate land values. But they cannot interfere, says Mr. Morley, with a tax bill or a money bill. That is to say, in plain language, the Chancellor of the Exchequer could arrange in the Budget to tax land values, the Lords having no control of the Government as to how it will raise the revenue to pay the way of the nation. This is an important point, and we are more than pleased that Mr. Morley has made it so clear. Its importance lies in the fact that whether Home Rule, Disestablishment, Temperance Reform, Employer's Liability, Registration Reform, One Man One Vote, or any other measure of domestic legislation comes first in the policy of the Liberal Party, *a Budget Bill must be brought in every year.*

None of these other reforms need stand in the way of the Taxation of Land Values—it can be adopted and given effect to in the first Liberal Budget. This should destroy the opposition of those Liberals who stand for a first place for the various other planks in the Liberal programme. Liberals may contend for any of the numerous and pressing reforms for which the party stands, but in doing so they need no longer strive with those who claim precedence for the Taxation of Land Values, nor need we strive with them. A Budget is necessary every year and this "New Tax" can be dealt with whenever the Government desire. The Lords may, and probably will, oppose the other Liberal measures, but in the matter of Taxation of Land Values they are helpless; the Budget is solely the concern of the House of Commons.

We, who are organised to advocate the Taxation of Land Values, must bring this home to the people and to the Liberal Party. If we want the leaders to move on the question, we must create a sentiment in its favour among the rank and file. During the month the Glasgow Central Liberal Association unanimously passed a resolution to the effect "that the time had arrived when the Land Question must be faced in earnest; that land monopoly was caused through the values of land being exempt from taxation; and, further, declaring that the Taxation of Land Values should occupy the foremost place in the programme of the Liberal Party." Other Liberal Associations are also demanding that attention be given to the question. Let this work continue and we are bound to win.

We are continually being asked to defend the sincerity of the Liberal leaders on a question like the Taxation of Land Values, which strikes at the root of aristocratic privilege. Well, we do not feel called upon to reply. The attitude of the Liberal leaders for the time being counts for very little. Leaders come and go, but thought is always progressing; and when the people are resolved on the settlement of any question, the leaders will compete with each other in their haste to give effect to it.

The essence of Liberalism is the abolition of privilege. But too many of the leaders of the party, to-day, have forsaken this creed. They have left the straight path towards equal freedom, and are seeking salvation at the Socialistic shrine of restriction. The land speculator, "throttling the towns," and defrauding the people of their

natural source of revenue—the values of land—does not seem to be in their way. And in reply to the demand for industrial freedom they send factory inspectors to see that the "hands" get the regulation number of holidays, and that the workshops have been whitewashed for the year. This is not Liberalism; it is weak paternalism, or an apology for Socialism. It is merely arranging for the "comfort" of the working classes after they have been robbed, and driven into corners by the men who "throttle" the towns. Such pusillanimous action on the part of the Liberal leaders can only bring the Liberal cause into the valley of humiliation, and sooner or later (and the sooner the better) these false methods will be found wanting and condemned.

Glasgow Town Council and the Reform of Local Taxation.

WHERE ARE THEY?

The Special Committee of the Glasgow Corporation on Reform of Local Taxation reported recently, "That the present system of local taxation is imperfect and unsatisfactory, and is capable of improvement. It is of paramount importance," the report goes on, "that the assessments should be placed on all sections of the community and especially so as regards their ability to pay." The committee recommend:—

"That the rates be levied one-half on owner and one-half on occupier."

"Houses rented under £10 should only be charged half rate of all assessments levied by the Corporation."

"The Committee further recommend consideration whether the rate of differential rating should not be extended to rentals of £12."

"That the Taxation of Land Values is the most equitable method of removing the present inequalities of local taxation."

Such are the recommendations which in the name of the Glasgow Corporation are to be presented to the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. At a special meeting of the Corporation held on Thursday, 21st October, this report of the sub-committee was adopted by 30 to 25 votes. The 30 who voted for its adoption were:—Baillies Chisholm, M'Cutcheon, Fife, Hunter, M'Phun, Battersby, and W. F. Anderson; Councillors Bilsland, Brechin, Boyd S. Brown, Richard Brown, Calderwood, Carswell, Cochran, Dallas, Dick, Ferguson, Finlay, Garey, Gray, Hamilton, George Mitchell, Morrin, Maclay, Paterson, Robertson, Sandilands, Stewart, Walker, and James Willock.

The daily papers would even admit that the present system of taxation is capable of improvement, but we must frankly state that the task seems beyond the capacity of the men who support such a mixed and contradictory statement. The report winds up by saying:—

"It is our earnest desire that the Commission should impress upon the Government the necessity of this question being not further delayed, whereby we may have at no distant date a scheme placed before the country that shall be fair and equitable, instead of the present unjust methods."

When we consider this report we are almost persuaded that this peroration is wrote sarcastic. A more confused pronouncement on the incidence of local taxation it would be difficult to imagine. The report states in the first place that the basis of taxation should be "*ability to pay*," and winds up by declaring for the "*Taxation of Land Values*"—the basis of which is that men shall be rated not on their ability to pay, but on the value of the advantages they receive from the community. It is about time the supporters of land value taxation in the Council were recognising this difference.

To tax a man on his ability to pay, is to fine the industrious man, and fine him according to the amount he produces. We are told by our teachers on morals that men should be thrifty and industrious, but the so called land value taxation members of the Town Council are of opinion that this is only so much bunkum, and that Parliament ought to give them powers to put impositions on those who

SERVE THE CAUSE BY HANDING THE PAPER TO A FRIEND.

dare to practise the virtue of industry. The advantages anyone receives from the community find expression in the value of land, apart from improvements. The taxation of this value is therefore the reverse policy of taxation according to ability to pay, and one that encourages the industrious citizen. It is putting a period also to the confiscation enforced at present by both the Government and the landowner, and in a way that destroys the power of the land speculator; as John Morley puts it, to "throttle towns."

To impose the rates "one-half on owner and one-half on occupier," and differential rating, are mere subterfuges. Rent and rates are one and the same thing, and the more the occupiers pay in rates the less they will pay in rent. To continue to talk of such methods as desirable changes is to throw so much dust in the eyes of the people, and to trifle with the cause of reform.

Where, it might be asked at this point, is the Corporation on local taxation? On the 17th June, 1895, it was resolved to petition Parliament in favour of taxing the values of land for local purposes, and other 1,100 assessing bodies in Scotland were written to, seeking their co-operation in applying to Parliament for the necessary powers to give effect to this principle. There was no word in the circular sent to these bodies about "taxation according to ability to pay," nor of "differential rating." Sixty-two of these bodies responded favourably, and on the 5th October, 1896, the Council resolved, by 33 to 25 votes, on the motion of Bailie Burt, seconded by Bailie Chisholm, "that a petition be presented to Parliament in favour of having powers to make land values the basis of the city's taxation." What impression can the Town Council with such a record make on the Royal Commission, except to make confusion worse confounded.

There is only one way out of the wood. There is only one way to rescue the suffering poor from unjust taxation, and from their wretched social condition, and God help them so long as their cause is advocated at our Council board by men who, while publicly professing to be in favour of reform of taxation, shew such lamentable ignorance on the very A B C of it. The people owe the supporters of this report nothing, except that they have confused the issue.

In respect of rating, the pronouncement of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, twelve years ago, was clear and definite, and to the point. It was simply to Tax the Value of Land to reduce rates and destroy land monopoly. *This was twelve years ago.* Truly, "after many days" comes the Glasgow Town Council with a report on the subject which must alternately excite our merriment and indignation. When we witness such denseness and vacillation on the part of our "elected persons," on a question upon which so much has been said and written, we can only blush for the patience of the electors.

John Morley on the Land Question.

"Here I find myself in the midst of a group of small towns. There are five burghs (the Montrose Burghs) that constitute this constituency, and the other towns round about. It seems to me an admirable type of manufacturing and industrial work. This by the way, but I suppose that both about the large towns and the small towns in Scotland—certainly it is the case in England—the land around these populous centres is rated not in regard to its prospective value which, as you all know, is derived entirely from the proximity of places where enterprise and activity are, while the owners of the surrounding land were asleep in their beds—adding every day, every hour to their value."

The Squire—"Do you know your trespassing, my man?"

Tramp—"Is this your land?"

The Squire—"That it is. It's been in my family for a couple of hundred years, though there have been times when we've had to fight for it."

Tramp—"All right, gov'nor; will you fight for it now? I'm on!" *Pearsons Weekly.*

Here and There.

Ex-Bailie Burt told his Halifax audience that Acts of Parliament to improve the condition of the working classes were just as absurd as if some philanthropic movement were started to frame special laws to keep a hive of bees through the winter after someone had stolen the honey.

It seems to him ironical in the extreme that we always went to the poorest part of a town to find the working classes, and to the best part of a town where they sought the people who did not work.

At the close the following resolution was passed:—"That this meeting is in favour of the Halifax Town Council applying to Parliament for powers to make land values the main basis of local taxation."

"I entertain little doubt that if Scotland could be polled to-morrow there would be a decisive majority for making short work of the House of Lords as it now stands. The danger of the moment is that people should be attracted by some reform of the House of Lords. A reformed House of Lords is a strengthened House of Lords, and a stronger House of Lords would not be content with those merely suspensory powers which it at present possesses. It would be more ready to meddle, and we should have to look out for an era of dead locks between Lords and Commons, which are the great nuisance of the two-chamber system all over the world."—*John Morley.*

Did not God create the earth for the Markis of Ailsa, the Markis of Bute, the Dook of Argyll, Lord Stair, and a few others? 'Course He did! Common people made of clay and such like material are only allowed (sometimes) to live on it and utilise it by favour of these few. We common clayey folks have not only to pay them for this privilege, but we have to keep these Markises and Dooks lolling in the lap of luxury, idleness, and profusion.

Ayrshire Post.

Mr. Alex. Veitch, De Soto, Mo., U.S.A., writes:—

We have much to thank you for here in your matchless fight for Single Tax. We are all watching Glasgow more than any city I know of. God speed your good work.

The Right Hon. G. H. Reid, Premier and Treasurer of New South Wales, told the Parliament there, on 15th October, that the tax on land values has brought great prosperity to the Colony, and that no community in the world was less troubled by the tax gatherer.

Mr. Wells Drury, of the *San Francisco Call*, in sending a new subscriber says:—

We consider the *Single Tax* one of the leading journals of the Single Tax philosophy—not second to any. If good wishes can be of service to you, ours will flood you with prosperity. My copy comes regularly and is enjoyed by me because of the clear understanding of the true doctrine which it is evident the editors possess.

Councillor Graham (Glasgow) says the Taxation of Land Values is a question for Parliament and that the Town Council should confine itself to administrative work. Mr. Graham now represents a "safe" seat in the Exchange Ward.

TO LAND REFORMERS AND RADICALS!

We have reprinted Mr. H. S. Murray's Address on "The Land Question," in pamphlet form.

May be had from "SINGLE TAX" OFFICE, at 2/6 per 100, carriage paid. *Sample copies free on application.*

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?



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

Glasgow Municipal Election.

POLLING DAY—TUESDAY, 2ND NOVEMBER.

The wards to be contested for and against Land Value Taxation, and the candidates, are as follows:—

FIRST WARD.—Bailie M'PHUN, J. JEFFREY HUNTER, W. G. HUNTER. Bailie M'Phun is the sitting member. He supports the Taxation of Land Values.

SECOND WARD.—Councillor BOYD S. BROWN and RODERICK SCOTT. Both are in favour of taxing land values.

FOURTH WARD.—A. C. HOLMS and HUGH MURPHY. Both are in favour of taxing land values.

SIXTH WARD.—Councillor W. COCHRAN, ex-Bailie BURT, PATRICK O'HARE, WILLIAM JOHNSTONE. All stand for the Taxation of Land Values. There are two vacancies. Mr. Burt is running with Mr. Cochran.

EIGHTH WARD.—Councillor D. MORRIN and WM FORSYTH. Both in favour of taxing land values. Councillor Morrin is the sitting member. He supports the Taxation of Land Values.

SIXTEENTH WARD.—Councillor Dr. CARSWELL and R. CHISHOLM ROBERTSON. Dr. Carswell supports the Taxation of Land Values.

TWENTY-FIFTH WARD.—Councillor A. KERR and Dr. ERSKINE. Councillor Kerr is against and Dr. Erskine is in favour of taxing land values.

Conference on Taxation of Land Values.

The circular invitations to the Conference on the Taxation of Land Values to be held on 4th January, 1898, at Bradford, will be issued this month. We should like to know as early as possible all those who intend being present. Those going from Scotland are invited to accompany the Glasgow contingent who will leave Glasgow on Monday, 3rd January. We would point out that if a sufficient number journey together, arrangements can be made for going at a cheap rate. It will also be necessary to make arrangements for hotel accommodation for one night in Bradford. It is essential, therefore, that we be informed as soon as possible how many are going.

The expenses of the Conference and public meeting must of course be met, and we have pleasure in acknowledging the first subscription sent to this account, from Mr. James Watts, Manchester. In a cordial letter of approval, Mr. Watts sends £2 2s. We shall be glad to acknowledge further subscriptions.

Lords and Dependents.

Sixteen out of every hundred own land, eighty-four own none; the eighty-four are therefore legally dependent on the sixteen for the opportunity to earn a living.

Must men ever pray for the rocks to get harder, the mineral deeper, and the soil less fertile, to the end that they may find labour enough to earn their daily bread? Must millions of labourers continue to tramp the highways in hunger and want because no one will employ them? Must we always have dogs in the manger to monopolise what God intended for the annual benefit of all his children?—*J. R. Sovereign.*

Land and Law.

The Caledonian Railway Company bought, in its last half-year, land for which it paid, with compensation, £10,068. The law and conveyancing charges were just about £8,365. Land is just a little dearer than law.—*Edinburgh Evening News.*

We would simply take for the community what belongs to the community—the value that attaches to the land by the growth of the community; leave sacred to the individual all that belongs to the individual.—*Henry George.*

Workman—Mr. Brown, I should like to ask you for a small rise in my wages. I have just been married.

Employer—Very sorry, my dear man, but I can't help you. For accidents which happen to our workmen outside the factory the company is not responsible.—*Answers.*

READ THE APPEAL TO LAND REFORMERS.

STRIKES AND THE GREAT BATTLE OF LABOUR,

BY HENRY GEORGE.

LABOUR'S REAL ENEMY.



Do You See the Cat?

We have been favoured with an advance copy of a remarkable article contributed by Henry George to the *New York Journal*. Mr. George says:—

I have neglected no opportunity of telling working men that what they have to fight in order to accomplish anything real and lasting, is not their immediate employers, but the false and wrongful system which, by depriving the masses of men of natural opportunities for employment of their labour, compels them to struggle with one another for a chance to work. I have constantly endeavoured in every way I could to induce men to revert to first principles, and to think of these questions in a large way; to convince them that the evils which they feel are not due to the greed or wickedness of individuals, but are the result of social mal-adjustments, for which the whole community is responsible, and which can only be righted by general action.

UTILITY OF STRIKES.

Yet I realise that it is folly to tell working men, as they frequently are told, that they ought not to strike, because strikes will injure them. Not only are there many working men who have nothing to lose, but it is a matter of fact that strikes and fear of strikes have secured to large bodies of them considerable increase of wages, considerable reduction in working hours, much mitigation of the petty tyrannies that can be practised with impunity where one man holds in his hands control of the livelihood of another, and have largely promoted the growth of fraternal feeling in the various trades. The greater number of strikes fail, but even the strike that fails, though its immediate object is lost, generally leaves the employer indisposed for another such contest, and makes him more cautious of provoking fresh difficulties.

THE SYMPATHETIC STRIKE.

Nor is it so strange, as some pretend, that one body of workmen, without any special grievance of their own, should strike to help another. The immediate purpose of a strike is to inflict damage upon opposing employers, and there are many places in which employers who could defy their own workmen can be seriously hurt by pressure exerted upon them through the medium of other employers with whom they have business relations. To be sure, third parties, with no direct interest in the quarrel, do suffer, and frequently the greatest sufferers are the men who thus go out to help their fellows. But if the strike be thus more costly, its results, in causing employers to hesitate before engaging in another such contest, are likely to be more decisive and more effective. And men may strike, as men fight, in a quarrel not originally their own, either as a matter of sentiment, or from the more selfish consideration that they thus make alliances that will render

them stronger in any quarrels of their own; or, as is generally the case, from the mingling of both motives.

And when men are willing to stop work and submit to loss and suffering in the effort to aid their fellows, does it not show heroism of the same kind as that which prompts men to risk their lives in battle for men weaker than themselves? Those who would condemn a strike of railroad men in aid of coal miners must, if they be logical and assume the standpoint of working men, condemn the aid which the French gave to the struggling American Republic.

COERCION IN STRIKES.

A favourite platitude, now finding wide expression in the American press, is that although men have an unquestioned right to stop work themselves, they have no right to coerce others into stopping work, and the disposition of working men to do this when they are on strike is denounced as not merely wicked in the highest degree, but as un-American.

This is nonsense. When our forefathers struck against England, they not merely struck for themselves, but compelled everyone else they could to join them, first by "moral suasion," which amounted to ostracism, and then by tarring and feathering, harrying and shooting, and when they boycotted the East India Company's tea they were not content with simply refusing to drink it themselves, but threw it into the sea so that nobody else could drink it. A strike can only amount to anything in so far as it is coercive, and whatever working men may say they must of necessity feel that it is only by exerting some form of pressure upon those disposed to go to work that they can succeed in a strike.

TENDENCY TO VIOLENCE.

For the most part, so far, this pressure has been a moral one, and the penalty of contempt as "scabs" had been sufficient to induce men to undergo actual suffering rather than assert what the denouncers of strikes declare to be the inalienable right of every American citizen. But admonitions are not wanting that in these industrial wars—for they are nothing else—there is a growing disposition to resort to more violent measures. And whether right or wrong, the growth of this disposition is natural.

The labour associations which have least necessity of resorting to the coarser and more obvious methods of inflicting or threatening injury or loss as a means of coercing employers, are those in trades where special skill is required, and which carefully restrict the number permitted to learn the trade. Beginning at this primary point to interfere with the freedom of the employer and of their own members to teach a trade, and with the freedom of boys to learn it, they are able to so limit the number of those who can take their places, that

they can, by their own mere refusal to work, inflict such injury and loss upon employers as will exert a sufficiently coercive power to maintain their wages and enforce their rules. But just in proportion as the organisation of labour proceeds beyond the trades to the learning of which artificial difficulties have been imposed, or which from their nature are not easily learned, do the practicable methods for the exertion of the coercive power necessary to win with employers, become coarser and more obvious.

COERCION THE ONLY COURSE.

The mere cessation of work on the part of a strict trades union of glassblowers may inflict such damage and loss upon employers as to compel them to accede to terms. But a strike of unskilled labourers, when there are thousands of unemployed men eagerly pressing for employment, must be backed either by some sort of coercion to prevent others taking their places, or by some means of inflicting such injury and loss upon employers as will make them afraid to employ men outside of the association.

Now, it is the tendency of constantly increasing labour-saving invention to dispense with special skill on the part of the mass of workmen, and to reduce skilled labour to the status of unskilled; and the extension of labour organisations, which has been so rapid of late years, has been in the direction of the less skilled occupations. This is the reason of the growing tendency of strikes to violence, and the necessity more and more felt of calling upon men in other occupations for help, by stopping work or by boycotting, to inflict injury or loss upon the employers with whom a struggle is being carried on. If the labour movement is to go on in this direction, every man who looks ahead must see that it will at last come to violence.

WHERE THE BLAME LIES.

But for that, not the working man, but the "saviours of society" are to blame. Those who really hold that "whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek" thou shouldst "turn to him thy other also," and "if any man will take away thy coat" thou shouldst "let him have thy cloak also;" they who hold that the command, "Thou shalt not kill," applies as well to the man in uniform as to the man in plain clothes, might with some consistency condemn violence in strikes. But they alone. If there are any such people, however, they are not often found in the editorial rooms of our great dailies or the pulpits of our national churches. On the contrary, the loudest denouncers of strikes—those who declare that they ought to be put down by force if necessary—are to be found among the class who have grown rich through extortion backed by force. The very men who are now calling so loudly for the maintenance, by the bayonet if necessary, of the liberty to work, are the most strenuous supporters of a system which denies the liberty to work.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR COERCION.

How is it that a land like ours, abounding in unusual natural resources, is filled with unemployed men? Is it not because of the power which our laws give to some men to prevent others from going to work?

Let striking labourers in a city like New York accept the dictum that no man has a right to prevent another from going to work. Let them turn from attempts to compel their former employers to employ them, and where shall they go to employ themselves? Where, indeed, will they go that they will not find someone, backed by law and force, who forbids them to work? There is plenty of unused land in every city. Let them go upon this land and attempt to employ their labour in building houses. How long will it be before they are warned off? Let them cross the East River, the North River, or the Harlem. They will find everywhere unused fields, on which, without interference with any man, they might employ their labour in making a living for themselves and all depending on them. But they will not find a field, though they tramp a thousand miles, on which someone has not the legal right to prevent their going to work. What is left them to do but to beg for the wages of some employer? So if, to prevent being crushed by competition of others like themselves, they strive, even by force, to keep others from going to work, is theirs the blame?

Our Natural Storehouse, the Land, is Locked.

THE PRIMARY COERCION.

The very worst the strikers do or think of doing is to prevent others from going to work, in order that they themselves may work—may earn a scant living by hard toil.

But what are the dogs in the manger doing who are holding unused city lots, farm lands, mines, and forests—the natural opportunities, in short, that nature offers to labour? They are preventing other people from working, not that they may work themselves, but that they may live in idleness on what those who want to work are compelled to pay them for the privilege of going to work. If labourers were to form societies which should by force prevent anyone from going to work without their permission; were to charge the highest price for the privilege of going to work, which the necessities of others would compel them to pay, and were then to sit down and live in idleness on this blackmail, they would only be doing to others what organised society permits others to do to them.

While it is perfectly true, as an abstract proposition, that no one ought to be permitted to interfere with the legitimate business of another, or by going out of his own right to inflict or threaten injury or loss as a means of coercion, yet it is also true that, under existing conditions, it is only by combining together to interfere with the legitimate business of others, and to coerce others by the fear of injury or loss, that workmen are at all able to resist the tendency to crowd wages down to the point of bare existence. The great fact that is ignored by those who talk so flippantly about the wickedness of coercion in strikes is that all this coercion is in reality coercion against coercion, the attempt to use force in resistance to force. What labour unions are attempting to do is to secure for themselves a monopoly in supplying labour, and the real cause and only justification of this effort is the existence of monopolies in the things vitally necessary to the use of labour.

AN ILLUSTRATIVE STORY.

Before the Cadi of an Eastern city there came from the desert two torn and bruised travellers.

"There were five of us," they said, "on our way hither with merchandise. A day's journey hence we halted and made our camp, when following us there came a crowd of ill-conditioned fellows, who demanded entrance to our camp, and who, on our refusing it, used to us violent and threatening words, and, when we answered not their threats, set upon us with force. Three of us were slain, and we two barely escaped with our lives to ask for justice."

"Justice you shall have," answered the Cadi. "If what you say be true, they who assaulted you when you had not assaulted them shall die. If what you say be not true, your own lives shall pay the penalty of falsehood."

When the assailants of the merchants arrived they were brought at once before the Cadi.

"Is the merchants' story true?" he asked.

"It is, but—"

"I will hear no more!" cried the Cadi. "You admit having reviled men who had not reproached you, and having assaulted men who had not assaulted you. In this you have deserved death."

But as they were being carried off to execution the prisoners still tried to explain.

"Hear them, Cadi," said the old man, "lest you commit injustice."

"But they have admitted the merchants' words are true."

"Yes, but they may not be all truth."

So the Cadi heard them, and they said that when they came up to the merchants' halting place they found that the merchants had pitched their camp around the only well in that part of the desert, and refused to let them enter and drink. They first remonstrated, then threatened, and then, rather than die of thirst, rushed upon the merchants' camp, and in the mêlée three of the merchants were slain.

"Is this also true?" asked the Cadi of the merchants.

The merchants were forced to admit that it was.

"Then," said the Cadi, "you told me truth that, being only part of the truth, was really a falsehood. You were the aggressors by taking to yourselves alone the only well from which these men could drink. Now the death I have decreed is for you."

WEAKNESS OF THE STRIKE.

In the attempt to meet coercion by coercion, working men, under the present conditions, are at fearful disadvantage. It is not merely that the capitalists and corporations against whom they fight have control of the organs of public opinion and of the courts, but that they can combine, can coerce, can inflict injury and loss in a much more quiet and effective way than can working men. They can evade or take advantage of the law, while working men, to do things of essentially the same kind, must defy the law. Labour, surrounded by law-made and law-supported monopolies of all kinds, is virtually told by the law that the only coercive force it can apply to fight off the coercion to which it is subjected is to stop work and starve.

Conscious of the coercion those who have only labour to sell are subjected to, though without fully realising its cause, there are active men in the labour organisations who have dreamed of so fully organising all kinds of labour in mutually supporting combinations as to make labour, by the stopping of all work, master of the situation. But this dream is hardly capable of realisation. For, putting aside all the difficulties of inducing so many diverse trades to act in concert with any persistence, and putting aside the surety that there must remain outside of any possible combination a body of labourers pressed by the direst necessity to take work on any terms, the great fact is that labourers as a class live from hand to mouth. They, therefore, are of all classes the least able to maintain a contest of endurance, and would quickest and most severely suffer from any general stoppage of the machinery by which the community is fed and its necessary wants are from day to day supplied.

THE POOR SUFFER FIRST.

A partial strike is now maintained for any length of time only by contributions from workmen who remain at work. In the check put upon the supply of coal to New York during the great strike, they who suffered quickest and suffered most were they who buy coal by the bucket, not those who could lay in a season's supply. If the thirsty men in the desert had attempted to compel the merchants to let them in to drink by forming a cordon around the camp and refusing the rights of labour by a general refusal to labour, the merchants could have remained quiet for a long time. How long could the travellers have gone without water?

Suppose, however, that to such a plan were brought the strength of the law-making power. Suppose that by properly using their votes labouring men were to succeed in giving the labour associations just such a legal monopoly of supplying labour as is now given by our laws to monopolists of things necessary to the exertion of labour. The trades union ideal would then be realised. No one could then go to work without permission of a trades union, just as now no mere labourer can go to work without the permission of a landowner or capitalist.

But, if this were practicable, would not the placing of such power in the hands of managers and trade unions lead to tyranny and abuse of the kind which, as experience has shown, always attend the concentration of power? And outside of the trade unions or labour associations, would there not remain or grow up a class deprived by one set of monopolists of access to the natural means of employing labour, and deprived by another set of monopolists of the power to sell their labour to those who could give them opportunity to use it?

THE ONLY REMEDY.

The true line to follow for the emancipation of labour is not the emancipation of restrictions, but the sweeping away of restrictions—not the creation of new monopolies, but the abolition of all monopolies. And the fundamental and most important of all monopolies is that legalised monopoly of the earth itself, which deprives the labourer of all right to the use of the natural means and material for the employment of labour, and which, by thus making him helpless to employ himself, and forcing him to buy some other human creature's permission to even live, compels him to compete with others disinherited like himself for permission to sell his labour.

Out of the multiplying and menacing labour difficulties of our time there is but one way to escape, and that is by the restoration to all men of their natural and inalienable rights to the use upon equal terms of the element on which and from which all men must live—the land. If there were a brisk demand for labour, there would be no surplus of labourers anxious for work upon any terms upon which employers could draw. That there is not such a demand for labour is due simply to the fact that labourers are prevented by the monopoly of natural opportunities from employing themselves. Here is the point on which the efforts of labour should be concentrated. The restoration of these opportunities can easily be obtained by the ballot. In the ballot, working men have in their hands the power of so adjusting taxes as to make the dogs in the manger let go their hold. When this is done there will be no necessity for strikes, and competition, instead of crushing the labourer, will secure to him the full reward of his toil.

Patriotism.

Is patriotism decaying? Can a national sentiment live to day? Patriotism, we believe, of the old-fashioned sort, is played out, and national sentiment, which used to be so largely mere tribal instinct, cannot, or at least, ought not to be revived. If there is to be patriotism and national sentiment, they must be of the kind that permit us to love other nations as we love ourselves. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" is as much a law of life and health for States as for individuals. Real patriotism is the love of one's country, not because it is my country, but because its institutions are the embodiments of wisdom and justice, and because it is to its inhabitants a home round which their affections can twine, as do a child's round the spot hallowed by the names of father and mother, and associated with material comfort, spiritual discipline, and all that makes a home. To create real patriotism and national sentiment, therefore, it is not enough to increase the army and navy, or wave aloft the flag of ancient times, to point to the glories of the past, or go into hysterics over the diamond jubilee of a great reign. Give the people wise and just laws. Eradicate poverty.

MAKE OUR COUNTRY GREAT,

not by driving other countries out of the fields of trade and commerce, but by being a great example to all the nations of good government, fraternal co-operation, equitable conditions of life to men and women in all classes—let it be said that our country is one where men and women are protected from the animal struggle for existence, where literature, and art, and science are fostered, and placed within reach of all, and the Church is the friend of man, and the servant of all that is beautiful and good—then it would be possible for us all to love our country with a great love—to look upon it as a real home, and to be justly proud of it. But what patriotism is possible, except of the jingo kind, in a land where thousands are starving or move on the borders of poverty, where every business man and employer, as well as every employé, is endeavouring to exploit his neighbour, and get at him in ways legal or illegal?

There can be no national sentiment such as any good man could wish to see, so long as the ideal of society and a nation remains what it is. Why should a poor man love Melbourne, for instance? It is no home for the people, but a battlefield and a shop. We are all trying to get out of each other as much as we can, and friendship, brotherliness, the humanities of life, are looked upon as luxuries. If we buy coffee we have to watch that it is genuine; if we buy a horse, that it is sound; if we buy milk we must see to it that it is not watered; if we buy mining shares, we must see to it there is not some roguery; if we go to witness sports we are suspicious of some foul play; if we want a coat we must look out for shoddy; if we buy a hat we must look that the stamp is genuine. From top to bottom our social life is riddled with this sort of thing, and even our Churches are becoming shops. How can patriotism or national sentiment exist under such conditions? It is mockery to talk of it.—From the *Australian Herald*.

The Single Tax is the Key to Open it.

Because They were Asses.

BOLTON HALL.

The Monkeys, being lazy, learned to ride the Donkeys. A big Monkey would ride in front of the herd, this he called "being the leader." Although, since the Donkeys were obstinate, he had in the end to go the way the Donkeys wished.

Sometimes the Donkeys kicked. Then the Monkeys called them "Anarchists."

The Monkeys got so fat and heavy that the Asses had no strength left to get their own food.

They began to complain and to seek for causes and cures. A sweet girl Donkey said, "I will take them some flowers to allay their discontent—we will establish a Flower Mission." The Monkeys subscribed quite liberally.

A dear little Donkey added, "I will hold a Charity Fair, which will raise enough from the Benevolent Apes to send some of the young Asses' Colts to the fields for a week." The Monkeys called that "enlightened Charity." A long-eared Donkey cried, "No, preach temperance; these Beasts of Asses drink so much that they have no time to eat and nothing to eat in the time if they had it." The Monkeys restricted the sale of Drink—to Asses.

A big Ass said, "What we need is a high wall round so as to keep our pauper hay—then our Masters will give us employment cultivating hay fields, and pay us with some of the hay." The Monkeys made a wall so close that the Asses could not see through it. Said a small Donkey, "We need cheaper money so that we can buy some leisure time from the Monkey that makes the money." The Monkeys did not like this—they were only Monkeys.

"Now," said an Ecclesiastical Ass, "Sin is at the bottom of all this. These Monkeys are on top of you because your hearts are corrupt." So he preached to the Monkeys.

"I have discovered that it is because lower class animals are lazy—too lazy to graze," said a Mule, "that all this want and suffering exists." (The Monkeys made that Mule a Professor.)

Still the Asses kicked.

"Have we not done all we could for you?" said the Monkeys. "What you really need is a strong Government, to provide formidable Arms for us, and to ensure the stability of the Social Order." And the Asses voted additional appropriations for all these things.

The Monkeys spent the Money.

MORAL.—This fable teaches that if you put a Monkey on Horseback he will ride—

You must be either a Monkey or a Donkey.

What are just social conditions? Why, plainly, such as secure to every man and woman equal opportunity. It is perfectly idle to suppose that by any human contrivance men and women can be made equal, but it does not pass the art of man to establish equality of opportunity for all men and women of whom any given community is composed. Such equality may be established in regard to the use of land, by Taxing Land Values.—*The New Age*.

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.

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.

Reply—34,926.

I should also advise "T. H." to read the report of the Illinois Bureau of Labour statistics on this question. After an exhaustive inquiry, the Bureau comes to the conclusion that the main causes of labour troubles are land monopoly and our present penal taxation of trade and industry, and that the remedy is the Taxation of Land Values—the Single Tax. In Canada and British Columbia Acts empowering local bodies to Tax Land Values, and to exempt improvements wholly or in part from taxation, have been largely adopted. In all the Colonies but Western Australia, the first steps towards the Single Tax would already have been taken but for the opposition of the Second Chamber—there, as here, "Houses of Landlords." In South Australia a tax of 1/2d. in the £ on the capital value (10d. on the annual value) has been in force for some 11 or 12 years. Attempts to increase it have been balked by the "Upper House," and a strong agitation for a Single Tax Local Option Bill is afoot. In Queensland a tax of 2d. in the £, capital value, has, since 1893, sufficed for all local purposes. In New Zealand a land tax of 1d. in the £, capital value,

HEAVILY GRADUATED AGAINST BIG ESTATES, was passed in 1892, and last year the Rating on Unimproved Land Values Bill (the Single Tax Local Option Bill), thrice rejected by "the Lords," became law. By last mail I heard that Palmerston North (a prosperous go-ahead township) had adopted the Act by 102 votes to 12, so that local bodies are sure to follow suit. When the farmer at one side of a district boundary finds that he is paying 12s. in rates, whereas his neighbour on the other side is paying, on a similar property, only 2s., and that the difference is made up by the City speculators and the absentees, who now practically pay nothing, it will not take him long to appreciate the benefits of a Single Tax principle as applied to local rating. New South Wales has followed New Zealand's example as regards the land tax of 1d. in the £. The Victorian House of Representatives passed a similar measure in 1894, but it was rejected by the Lords; in Tasmania that year a Bill, taxing land up to £500 in value at 1/2d. in the £, and above that value at 1d. in the £, met with the same fate. The Premier, however, is pledged to introduce it.—*Xatelnis in the "London Echo."*

With natural opportunities thus free to labour; with capital and improvements exempt from tax, and exchange released from restrictions, the spectacle of willing men unable to turn their labour into the things they are suffering for, would become impossible; the recurring paroxysms which paralyse industry would cease; every wheel of production would be set in motion; demand would keep pace with supply, and supply with demand; trade would increase in every direction, and wealth augment on every hand. The monopoly of the land gone, there need be no fear of large fortunes. For then the riches of any individual must consist of wealth, properly so called—of wealth, which is the product of labour, and which constantly tends to dissipation, for national debts, I imagine, would not long survive the abolition of the system from which they spring. All fear of great fortunes might be dismissed, for when every one gets what he fairly earns, no one can get more than he fairly earns. How many men are there who fairly earn a million dollars?—*Progress and Poverty*.

Single Taxer—"What is the use of confusing the thinking capacity of the beginner by talking about rent, wages, interest, and profits. If, as you say, there are only three factors in production—land, labour, and capital—there can only be three returns—rent, wages, and interest."

Socialist—"Profit is made and realised, therefore, it is a factor."

Single Taxer—"Then there are four factors in distribution, and only three in production?"

Socialist—"Yes; you ought to read—"

Listening Beginner—"What about the house factor, and the benefactor, and the malefactor?"

What has labour-saving machinery done that it should be taxed? Prohibit it altogether or set it free and Tax Land Values.

The Bugs and the Bees.

As the farmer went round 'mid his plants and trees,
He saw the bugs and he saw the bees.
"Oh, the pesky bugs, they'll ruin my crop,
With poisonous dose their work I must stop;
But the bees I'll shelter and keep alive,
With best of food and best of hive"

With poison his trees and plants he sprayed,
And thus the pesky bugs he slayed.
Each swallowed his draught and said, "Here goes,"
Then rolled on his back and turned up his toes.
The farmer laughed in boisterous glee,
"Requiescat in pace, O bugs," said he.

The farmer toiled from day to day,
He garnered his oats, his wheat and his hay,
With busiest might he toiled each hour
To catch the shine or to catch the shower.
In the human hive I'm a busy bee,
But a pesky bug, well, that's not me.

His neighbour he saw, who dwelt near by,
Raise never a crop, nor goods supply;
But only a sign did tell this tale
To everyone, "Here are Lots for Sale."
And the farmer said, as his ground he dug,
"My neighbour's no bee, he's only a bug."

In the human hive there are bugs and bees,
For some must toil, while others may squeeze;
While some are raising the wheat and rice,
Others are raising naught but a price;
While some like bees enrich with their toil,
Others like bugs live only to spoil.

Then the taxer came with the "Sessor's" roll,
"I'm coming to each to gather my toll,
The man who makes improvements great,
Must pay the most to support the State.
But when improvements there are none,
We'll place the taxes lightly on."

The farmer stamped, the farmer swore,
Said he, "I'll have this tax no more."
This taxer ain't worth bread or cheese,
He don't know which is bugs or bees.
If he had a farm, the stupid plug,
"He'd poison the bees and feed the bug."

W. A. Douglas, B.A.

For the man who, seeing the want and misery, the ignorance and brutishness caused by unjust social conditions, sets himself, in so far as he has strength, to right them, there is bitterness and disappointment. So it has been of old time. So it is even now. . . . To-day Russian prisons are full, and in long processions men and women, who but for high minded patriotism might have lived in ease and luxury, move in chains toward the death in life in Siberia. And in penury and want, in neglect and contempt, destitute even of the sympathy that would have been so sweet, how many in every country have closed their eyes.—*Progress and Poverty*.

An experimental scheme of compulsory popular education is on the tapis for the whole of European Russia. If it goes through, "land values" will increase and the "owners" will get the benefit.

Surely you know someone in sympathy with Taxation of Land Values not yet a subscriber to the *Single Tax*—1s. 6d. per annum.

If you are opposed to the Taxation of Land Values you should subscribe to the *Single Tax* for you will never know your own case well till you know the case for the other side.

If houses are good things to have, why tax them?

If Land Values are created by the community, why exempt them from taxation?

WILSON, Tailor and Clothier, 15 TRONGATE,

Has always on hand a full range of OVERCOATINGS and SUITINGS at the most moderate prices. All garments are made on the premises by experienced workmen. Fit and style guaranteed. A trial solicited.

NOTE THE ADDRESS—
WM. WILSON, 15 TRONGATE (One Stair up).

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., Lonon, E.C.

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