

the city and in the country drives men to the unproductive mountain and desert lands or into the labor markets of industrial centers to compete for starvation wages. Tenantry in industry and in agriculture increases yearly. Thus a dispossessed class are growing more numerous in town and country, giving rise to a blind discontent that does not recognize individual rights in its demands.

Under the Single Tax the natural advantages of individualism may be preserved by adopting that only form of collectivism which a just civilization should secure: collectivism in the appropriation by taxation of the rental value of land.

Those who would preserve the virility of American individualism *must choose between collectivism in natural opportunities and collectivism in everything.*

The history of civilization serves notice that the participants in landlordism must yield their special privilege of extortion or yield all.

This is the choice of Georgeism or Communism.

## Philip Snowden's Great Budget Speech

HERE is the speech of Philip Snowden on the passage of the Finance Bill, July 3, by a vote of 274 to 222. The Chancellor defined the Bill as a "Money Bill" and therefore it passes into law without modification by the House of Lords:

The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Neville Chamberlain), in his concluding remarks, called the attention of the House to the fact that upon the Order Paper today something like 200 names are attached to a Motion for the rejection of this Bill, and that, he said, was an indication of the views of the Opposition upon these proposals. It came as no surprise to see that. I should have had grave suspicions about the efficacy and justice and purpose of these proposals if they had received the support of that party, whose purpose was described by one of their own Members a few days ago as looking after vested interests. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman and his associates that when that day comes and we have to take the verdict of the country upon our proposals to deal with the land monopoly, we shall not shirk the issue.

Before I go further, I should like—and I have a special obligation to do this—to associate myself with the just tribute that has been paid from many quarters of the House to the invaluable assistance that I have received in the conduct of this Bill. I am grateful to my hon. Friend the Financial Secretary and to the President of the Board of Trade; and I am sure that it will not be regarded as invidious if I say that I am grateful beyond measure for the assistance that I have received from the Solicitor-General. His legal knowledge, his ability, his powers of debate have justly earned for him a high place in Parliamentary history; and his courtesy, his tact and his tolera-

tion are so admirable that even I could hardly do better. (*Loud laughter.*)

The land clauses in this Bill have emerged in a somewhat different form. I have never expected that I should be able to carry them without making some concession, but I was determined to maintain intact and unimpaired the essential principles of the Bill—and the Bill, as it will pass in the next quarter of an hour, does maintain those principles. It maintains the principle which was defined by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Carnarvon Boroughs (Mr. Lloyd George), of a tax upon all site values, and it maintains wholly intact the principle and practice of a valuation for arriving at the real value of all the sites which will be subject to taxation, excluding, of course, those which are exempted under the Bill. A first Measure dealing with a great and complicated subject like this is bound to show imperfections. I never expected that I should be able, as a first Measure, to produce a perfectly watertight Measure. Any Measure is bound to inflict what may appear to be injustices in certain individual cases. What we have to do is to try to confer the largest measure of good by what we do, and at the same time to try to reduce the injustices or hardships that it may entail.

We have heard a great deal about the alleged injustice of imposing a tax upon land value which the owner of land has already paid. But the House of Commons ought to realize that this land tax proposal is for the future, and that in the future those alleged injustices will not operate; because it has been repeatedly stated, and it was repeated by the right hon. Member for Hillhead (Sir R. Horne) this afternoon, that the effect of these taxation proposals will be to reduce the capital value of land by at least one-twelfth. Indeed, it may be anticipated that the reduction will be more, because, when the tax is imposed, it will be the object of the owner to sell the land, land will be thrown into the market, and competition in the sale of land will have the inevitable result of reducing its capital value.

There has been a great deal of talk about double taxation. But, if this tax raises revenue—about which the right hon. Gentleman appeared to have some doubts—something can be done with that revenue. It will be used for the purpose of reducing taxation in other directions and, therefore, there will be a reduction of taxation exactly corresponding with any increase of taxation that may have been imposed by the operation of this Measure. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member of Carnarvon Boroughs (the Budget of 1909) was complicated, as I think he will agree, by trying to deal with too many aspects of the question at the same time. Ours is a much simpler way and, in that respect, it is the first real attack upon the land monopoly of the country.

I hope more courageous Parliaments will in the future deal with this problem more drastically than we have done. The land monopoly is the greatest burden on industry. It imposes a tax of hundreds of millions a year upon the productive enterprise of the country, and, instead of this



tax being an additional burden upon industry, it is designed for and will have the effect of lightening the burden upon industry. The right hon. Gentleman raised the question that this tax is going to be imposed whether a profit is being made by the business that is on the site of it or not. Is not rent paid? Is not the rent of agricultural land being paid in these times of depression?

The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Spen Valley (Sir J. Simon) explained what he conceives to be my views upon this question, my purpose and my principles. I take no exception to what he said, but I may remind the House that they are views of which he himself was such an ardent supporter up to a few weeks ago. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said that the Liberal party had never been identified with the principles of Henry George. The English Land Taxation League exists for the purpose of propagating the principles of Henry George, and up to a month ago, when his name was removed from the list, the right hon. Gentleman was a Vice-President.

The principle underlying this Bill is to assert the right of the community to the ownership of the land. I have never made any question about that, nor that that right should be expressed in the form of a rent paid by the occupier or rather the owner of the land to the community. As I said just now, this is only the first step in the reform of our land system. The effect of that system has been to place a burden on industry of hundreds of millions a year. It has crowded our people into pestilential slums, and it has driven hundreds of thousands of people from the land into the towns to compete with the town workers, with the result that wages have been depressed and unemployment has been increased.

I commend the Bill to the House of Commons, not only upon its financial proposals but also upon its land proposals. I think that when they come into operation their social and economic effect will be seen, but it is only the first step.

\* The party for which I speak have always put the question of land reform in the forefront of their programme. Although I may not live to see the step that we have taken this afternoon advance still further, at any rate I submit this Bill to the House of Commons with the satisfaction that I believe that we have begun a far-reaching reform which some day will liberate the land for the people and abolish once and for all the tyranny under which the people in this country have suffered.

[Editorial Note.—This address is reprinted from *Land and Liberty*, of London, Eng., and the usual English capitalization is retained.]

**R**USSIANS of today may not regret the revolution of 1917 but those of a century hence may have to endure an organization to be known as "Daughters of the Soviet Revolution." That will surely subject the reverence to Lenin's memory to a severe strain.

## Gold Miners' Philosophy In Early California

**G**OLD, gold, the lure of gold, made early California the land of romance, tragedy and economic phenomena. Henry George, in his great book, "Progress and Poverty," which he wrote in San Francisco in 1879, after twenty-one years' residence in California, shows that land value—always absorbs most of the value created by labor and capital. My story of the free, gold-mining land in California indicates that his book is a development of the economic history of California. You are now offered a copy of that book free.

The early California miners were orderly men, standing for the square deal, and opposed to monopoly. When a new gold discovery was made, the creek, gulch, flat or river was soon crowded with men. Immediately a meeting would be called, a chairman and secretary elected, and after discussion, laws and regulations adopted for the new mining district.

The first miners' laws in California are said to be those of Wood's Dry Diggings, a mile and a half long (now Auburn), where \$8,000,000 in gold was taken out of the surface dirt. There a claimant had to get on his knees and strike out with his right hand to mark one corner of his claim; then, pivoting on his right knee, he marked the other three corners. When absent, he had to leave his pick, shovel and pan on his claim, or it would be "jumpable." There being no water, the dirt had to be sifted through the fingers. A former Mayor of Virginia City told that he so located and worked his claim at Auburn in 1848. He got nothing, but a man near by found \$10,000 in gold.

The first laws allowed one person to own only one claim in a district; later, one claim by location and any number by purchase, the size then being fixed as ten feet by ten feet; but each had to be worked. Ten days' absence was allowed, if recorded. In case of sickness, each miner aided in working the claim of the afflicted one. All disputes about mining claims had to be settled by a jury of miners, even when rowdies robbed a miner of his claim by force. But the justice of the miners was swift and certain.

Miners always spoke of the gold they got from their claims as their wages. For years they prevented taxation of their claims, asserting, as does Henry George, that it is wrong to tax any one's labor. It was not until mines developed an unearned increment value in excess of their labor value that they were taxed in California.

The mining ground was free to any one who wished to work it, without any restriction except the mining district laws and customs, which made working the land the only title or right to possession. Writers of those days assert that this condition made wages higher, interest on money higher, business men more prosperous, and the cost of living lower or less than anywhere else in the world. They