

Land Values

JOURNAL OF THE MOVEMENT FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

Seventeenth Year—No. 193.

JUNE, 1910.

rd.; Post, 1/6 per annum.

Telephone No.: WESTMINSTER 5774.
Telegrams: "EULAV, LONDON."

CONTENTS.

NOTES OF THE MONTH:—	PAGE
Landlordism at Bournemouth	1
Land Value in the New Forest	2
Rating of Mansions in Yorkshire	2
Land Settlement and Depopulation in U.S. ..	3
The Land Union	3
Demand for Land in Cheshire	3
LEADING ARTICLE:—	
King Edward's Great Work	4
SPECIAL ARTICLES:—	
Unemployment	5
The Effect of the Budget and Valuation ..	6
Good-Night to the Budget (verse)	6
Abe Clegg's Talks—Hasty Legislation ..	7
Land Titles—A Dialogue and a Rifle ..	7
HERE AND THERE	8
POLITICAL SPEECHES AND WRITINGS:—	
Mr. Hemmerde on Valuation	9
Mr. Devlin on the Budget	10
Mr. F. E. Smith on Land Values	10
Land Values Resolution in Commons	10
Mr. Devlin at Armagh	13
Keep it Before the People (verse)	13
Death of Sir Edmund Verney	13
PRIVILEGE AT WORK:—	
Cottage Rents Raised in Somerset	14
NEWS OF THE MOVEMENT:—	
Manchester, Huddersfield, Portsmouth ..	14-15
Women's Liberal Federation, Scottish Notes ..	15
What the English League is doing	15-16
COLONIAL AND FOREIGN:—	
Australia, Canada, South Africa	16-17
United States, Argentine, Denmark and Java ..	17-20
Mining Royalties (verse)	20
BOOK REVIEW:—	
Land and Labour in Belgium	20
LEAFLETS	21-22

NOTES OF THE MONTH.

Political Respite.

Owing to the death of King Edward the meeting of Parliament has been postponed until June 8th. This sad event, for many reasons, is one of overshadowing importance to the country. It seems to have closed an epoch in politics. Whatever policy the Government may now adopt, it is unlikely that any great question will be brought to an issue this year. The new Budget is overdue, and after the exacting session of last year it would be unfair and unwise to ask members of Parliament to devote themselves to a controversy which would mean a prolonged session. The electors are also tired, and would welcome a respite from the keen political feuds in which they have taken part.

The Economic Disturbance.

The Duke of Northumberland, presiding at the annual conference of the National Deposit Friendly Societies at Manchester on May 7th, warned the members to watch the signs of the times. It was clear, he said, that the questions which were being urged forward were economic questions which pointed to economic disturbances. He did not care whether it was Free Trade or Tariff Reform,

the nationalisation of the land or of mines, or the reform of the Poor Law, it implied disturbance. It might be desirable disturbance or it might be undesirable disturbance, but it behoved them to be extremely prudent in managing their affairs. Whatever views they might take of these questions, it was quite possible that an economic change might be a good one for the country at large and yet act injuriously upon certain interests in which they were involved. It was not a question of politics but of prudence that they should be careful in regard to their investments.

The passing of the Budget has given the Duke adequate ground for his apprehensions. The Valuation is the first step, but on top of the Valuation there will speedily come certain changes which will shake up landlordism and all the crushing weight with which it lies on industry. We cannot see that members of friendly societies or even dukes will be harmed by disturbances which force them to consider industry. Some measure which would stir them out of their sluggish, complacent, and obstructive attitude to business has been urgently required for generations.

Land Values in a Small Area.

Another illustration of almost fabulous land values is this week forthcoming from New York, revealed by the death of Count Waldemar Oriola, of Berlin, who has left estate valued at £3,600,000. He was the owner of tens of thousands of acres of the richest agricultural land in Germany and the noble castle of Budesheim, but the bulk of his wealth lay, not in these, but in a small freehold plot in Wall Street, upon which there stands a thirty-storey skyscraper, land which came into his possession by his marriage thirty years ago with the American heiress, Miss Mortimer.

This is a story from the ESTATES GAZETTE of May 7th. The Count took a prominent part in German politics recently. We are sometimes inclined to wonder where all the wealth comes from, the evidences of which are seen in such cities as London and Berlin. This story partly explains it. We are sometimes asked to admire the excess of exports from some countries over their imports, but we fail to see the advantage to Americans of having to send to Berlin substantial wealth to the amount represented by the land values created by their industry in New York.

Not quite Ruined.

During the last month one or two of those whose opposition to the proposed taxation (of the Budget) was characterised by more zeal than discretion have been buyers of building sites, and have competed for ground rents.

THE TIMES of April 30th had this comment on the Estate Market. Subsequent reports coming from all parts of the country indicate that there is a large demand for all kinds of land, and that the occupations of the auctioneer and builder have not been entirely abolished by the Budget. Indeed, the whole field of industry and trade is prosperous enough to falsify all the predictions that have been made by the opponents of the Government, and to destroy that superstition, so commonly held, that business prosperity can only be assured by a Tory Government, devoted to Imperialism and privilege.

Landlordism at Bournemouth.

THE ESTATES GAZETTE of May 7th tells of Bournemouth Town Council's experience in an endeavour to construct an overcliff drive from Boscombe to Pokesdown. The distance is over a mile. At the meeting of the Council on May 3rd, letters from Lord Abinger and Lord Portman were read. Lord Abinger said that "should he contemplate the development of his estate they might rest assured that he would always be ready to consider the views of the Corporation upon the important question of the sea front." Lord Portman wrote that "an overcliff drive would entirely destroy the privacy and pleasure of Wentworth Lodge, and that any such scheme would have his uncompromising opposition. He had no intention of parting with any of his property at Wentworth Lodge."

The Bournemouth people have a tough problem with these two landlords. One is for depriving them entirely of a new cliff drive, and the other intimates that if his estate is to be developed he will give them permission to develop it—for a consideration, as old Trapbois says in the "Fortunes of Nigel."

A Strange Uncertainty.

Not long ago, when the County Education Committee wanted an acre of land to build a new school at Brockenhurst, the owner asked them £1,000 an acre. They had, however, been able to get over the difficulty in another way, and they would not have to pay that price, but he only mentioned it to show the value put by owners of land upon land in the New Forest, which was certainly not situate near any large town. He thought the whole of this showed what was to his mind one of the greatest defects of the Budget, and that was the enormous uncertainty which must exist as to the taxes which anybody had to pay.

This statement was made by Lord Northbrook, presiding at a meeting of the Winchester and District Agricultural Association held at Winchester on April 30th. There seems to be little reason for uncertainty with regard to what the owner should pay for this acre. Lord Northbrook was discussing the difficulty of defining what was undeveloped building land. We wonder what clearer indications he would seek. A growing village requires land for a school, and comes abruptly against a demand for £1,000 per acre. It has to turn and go round another way. Everything in the case is as clear as a stone wall. The only defect in the Budget is that a ½d. in the £ is too light an instrument with which to strike an obstructive landowner.

A Doubtful Step.

A special meeting of the Executive of the North Argyll Liberal Association was held in Oban on May 10th. The business was to consider the intimation by the Rev. Malcolm MacCallum of Muckairn, that he had finally made up his mind to sever his connection with the Liberal Party. Mr. MacCallum, who was present, said their member had broken his pledges to the electors of Argyll, and the Government had broken faith with Scotland, both on the land and the House of Lords' questions. For all practical purposes the Government had abandoned the Small Holdings Bill. After several members had appealed in vain to Mr. MacCallum to reconsider his decision, it was agreed to dissolve the Association and re-organise it as a Land Law Reform Association. We sympathise with the Highland people in their eagerness to obtain land. Reports indicate that there may be repetitions of the Vatersay raid in other parts, but we are convinced that this means no settlement of the land question. In spite of the fact that the Small Holdings Bill has been dropped in the meantime, the Government in the Budget has done more than kept faith with Scotland in this matter. There is only one thing which the Government can do for the landless people of this country—they

can break the power of landlordism, and they are doing that through the Budget.

Nature's Antidote for the Slum Evil.

Britons have gradually come to see that the havoc wrought by overcrowded slums cannot longer be tolerated with impunity, for slums contaminate all who come in contact with them. Kindly Nature has ensured that nearly every poison provides its own antidote. The enhanced rents demanded in towns for factory space and tenement houses have become so burdensome that many large manufacturing concerns have for some years been transferring their works to the country, where lower rates and rents are possible, expansion is unrestricted, and where the workers can settle amid a health-giving environment. This is the beginning of a new national development which promises to become more pronounced as the century advances.

Thus writes a TIMES correspondent on May 23rd. We agree with the sentiments expressed, with the qualification that although nature may provide the antidote to the poison, the antidote must be administered by the actions of men. Nature provides land with healthful environments in abundance, and it is the restriction of nature's provision that is responsible for slums. Unless this restriction is removed slums will spring up where these manufacturing concerns have migrated. Remove the restriction, by the taxation of land values, and not only will these new developments be encouraged and made slum-proof, but existing slums will disappear.

A Logical and Practical Proposition.

On May 4th the DAILY EXPRESS contained an article, with a title about bribery, stating that it had information from sources "wholly reliable" that the Government intended to repeal the Breakfast Table duties in the next Budget. It stated that although "logically sound," the proposal is "practically, wholly unsound, for where is the money to come from to meet national obligations?"

Without extending the argument that what is logically sound is practically sound, we can answer that despairing question: "Where is the money to come from?" It will not come from a 2s. tax on corn, or from a tax on those well-worn foreign doors. There will be no necessity to establish an army of Customs officers to search for manufactured goods, nor to establish a court to define, raw material. The campaign fought on the land clauses of the Budget revealed the source from which the money is to come. The land values of the country are a never-failing source that will not only last as long as required, but will increase according to the demands of the country.

This Conservative organ is suffering from a bad attack of nerves, and had the Liberal Party adopted the motto, "*Vaudace, Vaudace, toujours Vaudace*," and come out with a straight tax on land values, Tariff "Reform" would have been pretty well dead by this time.

Unequal Rating of Mansions.

At the meeting of the York Board of Guardians, on May 19th, Mr. Shipley moved a resolution that the time had arrived when the mansions in the Union should be reassessed.

He said that though the city had been revalued and the assessment raised from £258,000 to £410,903, and though the railway property had also been revalued, nothing had been done in the matter of the mansions, which were under-assessed. The late chairman of the Assessment Committee had given as a reason that the owners would appeal to Quarter Sessions, where the appeals would be heard by their own class, and thus the Guardians would not be able to get any re-adjustment.

He said that Morby Hall only paid rates on £602, Eserick

Park on £300, Heslington Hall (Lord Deramore's seat) on £250, and Bishopthorpe Palace on £440 gross. Many members talked about the poor ratepayers, but it was evident that the rich ratepayers were fairly well looked after on the Assessment Committee. He thought the poor ratepayers ought to receive more consideration by the rich ratepayers being made to pay their fair proportion.

Colonel Wilkinson deprecated this attempt to set class against class. He said the Assessment Committee had considered the matter, and had been guided by their late chairman, who had laid down the sound principle that the rateable value was the only true basis of assessment. None of the properties mentioned would let for more than the sums at which they were rated.

On being put to the vote the motion was defeated by 15 votes to 10.

These inequalities in rating appear frequently enough to justify the conclusion that they are as universal as the system itself. There can be no remedy, of course, until the basis and machinery of rating are entirely altered. Meanwhile such cases accumulate as arguments for a sweeping change in the near future.

A "Passing Liberalism."

Mr. James Bryce, our Ambassador in America, has published a new work entitled "Hindrances to Good Citizenship." He says "Freedom has done much for the European and American continents, yet far less than was expected. . . . Everywhere there is the same contrast between that which the theory of democracy requires and that which the practice of democracy reveals. . . . To contrive plans by which the interest of the citizen in public affairs shall be aroused and sustained is far easier than to induce the citizen to use and to go on using, year in and year out, the contrivances and opportunities provided for his benefit. Yet it is from the heart and will of the citizen that all real and lasting improvements must proceed."

When or where was democracy ever practised in this world? Why should we impugn and belittle freedom by attributing to it the fruits of its opposite? The words, freedom and democracy, as Mr. Bryce uses them, stand for systems that represent servitude and tyranny. In no country have we the substance of freedom and democracy. Landlordism is the negation of both, and landlordism is strong and rampant everywhere and in no place more than in America. It is difficult and impossible to arouse the interest of citizens, when the matter on which their interest has to feed itself is the policy of privileged classes and timid legislators who withhold all the substance of freedom and democracy from the people, and then invite their attention to empty speeches and writings about these subjects in the abstract. Let the people understand that through politics they can secure their material interest, and they will become politicians, that through morals they can secure their material interest, and they will become philosophers. It is an encouragement, at least, that they are becoming less inclined to accept the apologies of legislators for vicious legislation.

Attracting Population.

THE TABLET of May 21st says that Dr. Michael Walsh, of Brooklyn, has received the following letter from Bishop McGoldrick, of Duluth, Mich.:—"I am in the midst of a great work to keep me going for a few years. One hundred and seventy thousand acres of good Minnesota land have been entrusted to me for colonisation. I sent a priest to Holland to get good dairy farmers, and he got them—all Catholics. I sent a priest to Belgium for good market-gardeners, and they are the next group. I am trying to get the Irish (our own good people) to leave the towns, and I hope to succeed. The company will give me the land, and build church, school, and pastoral residence. It is a great opportunity thrown in my way, and I have seized

it with pleasure." We hope this will be a good opportunity for the dairy farmers, market-gardeners and the Irish, and not good only for the company. It is a strange game this of luring men to land in new countries.

Driving off Population.

Mr. Herbert Quick, writing from Madison, Wis., on May 10th, says:—"Iowa is a great farm. The drift of population is from farm to city. Iowa has not advanced in population since 1900, though Iowa is the richest piece of land on the globe. . . . There are three reasons for this tendency which shows up in the Iowa returns, because Iowa is one vast farm with but few cities.

"These reasons are, first, landlordism; second, improved agricultural machinery; and third, the existence of new and cheaper lands in the West and South and Canada, and cheaper lands in the East. Iowa herself stands as an American proof that landlordism is the same thing here as in Britain, where every rod of ground once maintained its man, but where sheep walks and deer parks have come with the lessening population as developments of landlordism.

"This census has given us a warning that we will be blind, indeed, to fail to see and understand.

"It asks us plainly, 'Where will your children and your children's children get their bread?'"

The Land Union.

The inaugural meeting of the Land Union on May 5th was not exactly a complete success, and the London correspondent of the GLASGOW HERALD gives an entertaining account in the May 6th issue. He says:—

As a demonstration against the injustice of the new land taxes it did not, to write quite frankly, impress me. When I entered the hall an obliging official handed me a bill, from which I gathered that the Land Union was "the spontaneous rally of a host of determined men suddenly attacked and placed in imminent peril." The appearance of the hall scarcely bore out that bold assertion. A half-filled arena, a single straggling row of occupants in the first gallery, and an empty second gallery were not surely a true reflection of what the organisers described as a "spontaneous rally of determined men." . . . The icy reserve of the audience was difficult to break through, and the infrequency of audible approval of the points made by the speakers conveyed an impression of indifference which was no doubt entirely alien to their feelings. On the whole, for a body of determined men smarting under a sense of injustice, their restraint was wonderful. Mr. Cox was introduced to the meeting as "an honest Liberal."

Demand for Land.

On May 2nd, according to the TIMES, there took place at Crewe one of the most important sales of agricultural land held for many years in Cheshire, when part of the estate of Sir Delves Broughton, tenth baronet of Broughton, which comprised a tract of valuable dairy farming country in a prosperous part of the county, was sold.

Only one of the 18 lots was withdrawn, the remainder realising £33,815 for a total acreage of 585, with farm buildings. The largest purchasers were the Cheshire County Council Small Holdings Committee, and this was taken as an indication that the small holdings movement, which has been successfully established owing to the Council's policy, is to be extended. They purchased Batherton Hall Farm, 216 acres, for £9,200, Batherton dairy farm, 196 acres, for £10,800, two pasture fields for £50, and a small holding for £150. Pasture land was selling remarkably well and averaged £60 an acre. Mr. E. Reginald Bellyse purchased 46 acres for £3,270, and Mr. J. Christy-Miller 35 acres for £2,855. An 18 acres dairy farm realised £1,110.

"OUR POLICY."

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

KING EDWARD'S GREAT WORK.

A period of unusual political activity has come to an end. The Budget of 1909 received the Royal Assent on April 29th. One week later, on May 6th, King Edward VII. died. Without a suggestion of party vindictiveness or boasting, most of our readers will feel that the King was happy and blessed in this his last legislative act. Who of us would wish to finish our life's work in a better way? Much has been spoken and written about the late King in the brief interval since his death. It has been one of those times whose duration measured by the calendar seems disproportionately short compared with their duration measured by the amount of activity which takes place in them.

Something, however, has been left for us to say about the King. His last act will almost certainly be regarded in the future as the most notable and splendid of his reign—a reign marked by many liberal and magnanimous acts. But it is twenty-five years since King Edward, as Prince of Wales, signed the Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes. This Report contains the famous passage in favour of rating vacant land written by Lord Stanley of Alderley. It is the first of those official recommendations which have played so great a part in advancing our cause. His actions as King were all consistent with this early action. Every part of his policy favoured the advancement of this cause. He has been hailed from every side as the peacemaker of the world, and his work in this respect has helped to prevent any serious interference with devotion to the reform of industrial and social conditions at home. It is generally known that he warmly approved of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's generous policy in South Africa, and the personal friendship which he showed towards the late Prime Minister may justify the inference that he did not view the strong land policy of that Minister with disfavour. In saying this we are far from implying that King Edward was a Liberal in the common acceptance of that word. The King cannot be this. There is another kind of Liberal. Political orators of all parties often indulge in perorations in which they appeal to the great tradition and spirit of liberty and justice which belong to this country. Too

few of them have done much to perpetuate these. But if we conceive of this tradition and spirit being represented or embodied in a living person, we should say they were so in the person of King Edward. He did not speak about the glorious liberty of Britons, but he represented it. He brought it out of the past or the abstract, where it is generally kept by rulers and legislators, and made it an active, beneficent agency in the present. His influence favoured its existence and growth. Progress was made possible and easy so far as he was concerned. We may not say that he favoured any particular measure, but judging by what he did throughout his reign, we may assume that he offered no opposition to any measure that was likely to improve the conditions under which the vast majority of our people live. We believe that his assent to the Budget would be, unlike that of the Lords, willing and cordial. In these times when trade and progress of every kind are knitting nations more closely together, the king who loves and works for peace is a great king. He performs a great service to the world. King Edward did this in his great and influential office.

His work here can never be undone or its fruits lost. We have every reason to believe that George V. shares his father's spirit. Even if his disposition is different and his experience less, his father's policy has been too successful, too convincing and irresistible in its influence, to be reversed. The efforts to stir up hostility abroad, and carry reaction at home always had to fight against King Edward's influence. This influence did much to defeat them. It will be a difficult task to fill this office as it has been filled for the last nine years, but we are sure that the sympathy of the country will support the new King in his endeavour to continue the tradition and spirit of his father. We may be entering upon a long period of political controversy, and we are fortunate in having this large and generous spirit associated with an office which has still great weight in the decision of these matters.

What direction the political struggle will now take is uncertain. The lines were already marked out in the Resolutions passed by the House of Commons in April, and in the Bill introduced to give these Resolutions legal and statutory form. The death of the King, however, has interrupted progress along these or any other lines. Ordinary and extraordinary business, chiefly of a financial nature, will fully occupy Parliament during a session of the usual length. There is, therefore, every probability that the

Veto issue will be postponed, and that any new move on the Government's part will be connected with the Budget for this year. There have been rumours to the effect that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would repeal the Breakfast Table Duties. If this step were possible, no policy would be more acceptable, but we should not be impatient if we have to wait until the valuation is complete for such a welcome relief.

In our view the Government has achieved so much and done so well in passing the Budget that further legislation of any kind may be postponed without loss. Outside of Parliament the valuation of land will engage the attention of the country, and there is no more interesting or profitable subject to which it could devote itself. In addition to this there is the education of the people on the Taxation of Land Values and other democratic questions, and it would be a pity if an empty political controversy in Parliament diverted the minds of the people from a serious consideration of such questions. We do not say that the ground of conflict has changed from Parliament to the country. It was always there, but with the comparative cessation from party hostility at Westminster, more attention can be given to the practical subject of Land Valuation, and to the discussion of the principles that will properly press for fuller legislative recognition in a few years. Here again we are full of hope. Just as the success of the late King's policy is a guide and inspiration besetting his successor, so the success of the Government's Budget policy will largely make for its continuance in the future. The political situation is satisfactory enough from the Liberal point of view to be appreciated by everyone. Nor is the cause of this satisfaction obscure. The advancement of the Budget and all that it represents to their natural place in the Government's programme has changed the whole face of affairs and brought order out of chaos. Their retention in that place will preserve and extend that order.

J. O.

"There is a method by which you can tax the last rag from the back and the last bite from the mouth without causing a murmur against high taxes, and that is to tax a great many articles of daily use and necessity so indirectly that the people will pay it and not know it. Their grumbling will be of hard times, but they will not know that the hard times are caused by taxation."—WILLIAM PITT.

On the average, the rent of agricultural land in Belgium is 36s. 3d. an acre, against 20s. in England, a difference which amounts to about £19 a year, or 7s. 3d. a week on a holding of 25 acres. When it is remembered that the total net income of a small owner is very limited, it will be seen that the sum of 7s. 3d. a week is enough to make, the difference between straitened and easy circumstances.—B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE, in "Land and Labour."

UNEMPLOYMENT.

ITS CAUSE AND ITS CURE.

Look around and you will see on all sides evidences of unemployment. Have you ever thought out what causes unemployment—what is the real reason why so many men cannot get the opportunity of exchanging their labour for wages? Has it ever occurred to you that there is a kind of systematic holding back of these opportunities which men want?

Let us inquire into this view of the matter. Have you ever thought, when sitting in a room—as you may be now—to look around and see if you can find anything in the room, in the house, outside the house, in the town, in the country or in the world, which has not a common origin in land? The chair you sit on is made from wood from trees grown on land; the linen curtains from flax grown on land; the hearth rug from wool, which comes from sheep, which are bred on grass grown on land. The fire-irons are made of steel which comes from iron ore which comes out of the land; the gas which lights the room comes from coal which comes out of the land. The house itself is built of bricks and stone which come from land. Ransack your mind for any substance or combination of substances which you can think of and you will find nothing which does not come from land. Land is the source of everything.

And how do these things assume the forms in which you see them? The answer is simple—by labour, by men employing themselves. And what is it that assists men to labour? The tools they use, and further, the credit which enables distribution and exchanges to be made—that is, capital, capital simply being stored labour or the credit of being "good" for the products of labour.

It is very simple you think. There is plenty of land in the world, there is plenty of labour, and there is plenty of capital. Put the three together, and there will be plenty of good things produced for everybody.

But there is something in the way which throws this machine out of gear, and that is a system which permits certain people to own land, to hold back what we clearly see is the source of all production, from labour and capital employing themselves. This system of land ownership is the real cause of unemployment, of poverty and all the misery that poverty brings.

We know a case in point—a very typical case—which will show what we mean very clearly, a pretty village in Berkshire where City men in particular would like to dwell because of the good railway service and because of the beautiful and healthy surroundings. All the land is owned by two landowners. There are some beautiful sites for houses suitable for men of moderate means and in certain positions the owners of the soil have put up boards, "This valuable building land to be sold or let on building lease." For fifteen years these boards have been up and there have been hundreds of applications for sites, but rarely has a deal been done; for the treatment applicants receive stops business. This is what happened four months ago:—A certain city man wrote to one of the landowner's agents asking the price of three acres upon which he had set his heart as a site to build a house on. It was a corner of a bare ploughed field of about 50 acres. After about six weeks' delay an answer came that the price was £1,500 or £500 an acre—and it was stipulated that a house of not less than £1,500 cost should be erected by the purchaser. The man who was enquiring, knowing something of the rental value of houses, pictured in his mind the sort of house that could be put up for £1,500 and found that the average kind of tenant for that kind of house standing on three acres of ground could not afford to pay more than £100 a year rent. He figured that this £100 a year rent, the income which would come from his investment, should he ever want to let the house, would not, as a marketable investment, fetch more than £2,000, so that he was really being asked to pay £3,000 for what was only worth £2,000. This meant that the price asked for the land, £1,500, was £1,000 more than its market value. He thought it over carefully and came to the conclusion, that being a wealthy man, he would not mind being bled to the extent of £500, and so he made an offer of £1,000 for the land. Two months have gone by up to the time of writing, and he has had no reply.

Please think what is happening. A man is willing to give employment to a builder to erect a house. The builder is then willing to give employment to bricklayers, to stonemasons, to carpenters, to joiners, to plumbers, to gas fitters and various other workmen, who in their turn would handle things produced

by brickmakers, by quarrymen, by wood merchants, by hardware makers, by pipe drawers, by metal merchants, by glass makers and all kinds of tool makers who again in their turn would employ labour. A golden chain of wages would immediately be set up. Employment for wages which would arise simply from the bringing of a small piece of land in Berkshire into proper use. But the chain would not stop here. For there would be tradesmen in the locality regularly employed, dairymen, butchers, grocers, bakers, and the like, all because a small piece of land is brought into use. But the landowner forbids it. It costs him nothing to keep the land out of use; for he knows that the tendency of the population is to grow and that the greater the pressure the more wealth men will surrender to get land. He wastes time only, so far as he himself is concerned, so far as other people are concerned he is causing them to starve.

This little case in point has doubtless brought to your mind a similar sort of case on the opposite side of your own street, round the corner, or maybe in the next street. Certainly within a stone's throw almost of where you are sitting something of the kind is happening. If a million people should chance to read this they will each of them be able to find with very little exercise of memory a parallel example and there in a nutshell is the actual and glaring cause of unemployment. Opportunity is kept away from willing workers in order that the owners of land may profit. Men, women and children are made to starve for want of the food which they could produce with their own hands, by producing either the food itself, or the wages which they could exchange for food. There could not be a more heedlessly cruel system.

The value of land is created by the labour and expenditure of the whole population, by the roads which the people provide, by the railways which the people cause to be made, by the exchanges, by the markets, by the water supply, by the gas, by the electric light, by the tramways, and by all public utilities made by population for the use of the population. All these things increase the value of land which the private owner of land enjoys without lifting a hand. And not only because he enjoys these unearned profits, but because he has the power to check production, to stop an investment of capital, and to stop wages coming to labour, poverty exists and men are out of work.

The remedy is at hand. Tax Land Values and make it unprofitable for owners of land to keep land away from labour and capital.

THE EFFECT OF THE BUDGET AND VALUATION.

The Budget, more especially the Valuation Clauses thereof, is having a marked effect on the Conservative Press in England and Scotland. The more sober section are in a state of wonder and conjecture, and, although discussing the subject and prophesying evil, do so in a tentative manner, betraying a confused state of mind. The *GLASGOW HERALD*, the *SCOTSMAN*, and the *MORNING POST* are all wrestling with various phases of the problem. The *GLASGOW HERALD* of May 11th, printed a very gloomy article entitled, "Scottish Feuing and Increment Duty" by Robert Guy. Various evils were prophesied as a result of the new Budget taxes, chief among them, the old story of injury to the building trade and increased rents. Bearing out our contention that the valuation leaves them at sixes and sevens, we found no mention of this, the part of the Budget having the most far reaching effect and most important bearing on the land question. However, the *HERALD* is evidently anxious to get to the bottom of the problem, and on May 13th published an article, dealing with the points raised in the May 11th article, by Alexander Mackendrick, the President of the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values. The *HERALD* should now see the light a little less confusedly, for Mr. Mackendrick effectively disposed of the contentions put forward by Mr. Guy. He showed that it is the old system which has produced exactly the results which are foretold in Mr. Guy's article as a result of the Budget taxes. As Mr. Mackendrick says, the slums, backlands and congested areas in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee and other cities, condemn the Scottish feuing system, "as the worst among those available for comparison to the moderately travelled man." Mr. Mackendrick, like a loyal Scotsman sticks to his own side of the border, but the slums, backlands and congested areas—the result of the at least equally bad land system in England—are to be found, equally with Scotland, throughout the length and breadth of the land.

In the *SCOTSMAN* of 17th May, appeared a contributed article under the heading, "Duties on Land Values." The writer gave a technical explanation of the Finance Act as it affects life-renters, entail proprietors and bond-holders, making out

dark ruin to this class of the community. He concludes with the following rather pregnant statement:—

"Looking at it from a slightly different point, trustees, investors generally, solicitors and valuers have a totally new element to consider, which will become more serious and more complicated as time goes on, and which, put shortly, is—How much of the value of an estate belongs to the 'owner' and how much to the Chancellor of the Exchequer?"

Here again the kernel of the nut, valuation, is skilfully circumnavigated, the writer showing a painful shyness and indecision.

The *MORNING POST* on the 30th April, the day after the Budget passed into law, published, "Practical Points for Taxpayers," by Alfred Fellows. This dealt mainly with the valuation, and the manner of treatment reminded one of taking nasty medicine. The author seemed somewhat staggered to find that a true valuation was the best for the landowner, inasmuch as he would be "boomeranged" by either a too high or too low valuation. The justice of valuation has created bewilderment at least, in this quarter, and there is a plaintive note prevailing in the paragraph dealing with the difficulty of evasion.

The same writer has another article in the *Post* of 18th May, dealing with "The Finance Act and the Duty of Trustees." Here again there is a note of regret and confusion, because a too high or too low valuation will not benefit. The writer seems unable to reconcile himself to the justice of a true valuation, apparently desiring that the valuation should be entirely in the hands of landowners to raise or lower to suit their own ends.

One other indication of the unrest created in the reactionary forces by the progress of the taxation of Land Values is to be found in the fact that Captain Pretymann, for want of better argument, attacked Mr. Fels in the House of Commons and in the Press, because he is "a foreigner." It is a good testimony to the efficacy of our propaganda when opponents are reduced to these tactics.

The *AGRICULTURAL GAZETTE* on May 16th was nothing if not frank in making the amazing suggestion that:—

The assessment of gross value of land should be a secret between the commissioners and the owner, just as assessment for income tax is. . . . It might prevent authorities who have power to purchase land compulsorily from knowing what the new valuation is.

The *OUTLOOK* is also conscious of the changed situation and on May 7th published an article entitled, "Unionists and Land Policy." Although this particular contribution is written in a very tentative manner and may be regarded as kite flying or groping in the dark, yet it is intensely interesting to see these signs of the times in the Conservative Press.

Time was when the word valuation was taboo in this rarefied atmosphere, but the Valuation Clauses of the Budget have been the means of showing the Tory Party that there is a real Land Problem in this country.

GOOD-NIGHT TO THE BUDGET.

Good-night to the Budget!—the lobbies,
Their changes, and rumours of change,
Which startled the rustic Sir Bobbies
And made all the Tories look strange;
The breaches, and battles, and blunders
Performed by the Commons and Peers;
The Marquis's eloquent thunders,
The Baronet's eloquent ears;
Denunciations of Redmond and treasons,
Of German invasion and oats;
Misrepresentations of reasons,
And misunderstandings of notes.

Good-night to the Budget!—Another
Will come with its tellers and bores,
And hurry away, like its brother,
In closure, and tramping, and roars.
Will it come with a rose or a briar?
Will it come with a blessing or curse?
Will its taxes be lower or higher?
Will its schedules be better or worse?
Will it find me grown thinner or fatter,
Or fonder of wrong or of right,
Or married—or buried?—No matter;
Good-night to the Budget—good-night.

W. M. P. (redivivus), In *SATURDAY REVIEW*, April 30th.

ABE CLEGG'S TALKS.

HASTY LEGISLATION.

FROM YORKSHIRE DAILY OBSERVER, April 5th.

"There's a deal o' things belongs to things," said Abe, sententiously, "an' nowt's as simple as it lewks. Aw think misen 'at Balfour wor rey't abaht t'Hahse o' Lords. Tha'll mind what he said t'last wick? 'Ye Lib'rals,' he sez, 'is t'only chaps 'at iver duz owt. Ye're t'Progressive party,' he sez, 'an' us Toaries is t'Wecary Willies. An' then, begow!' he sez, 'ye grummle 'cos t'Hahse o' Lords passes ahr bills an' wean't pass yahrs. Aw can't for t'lfe o' me see what all t'fuss is abaht,' he sez. 'We niver send 'em na bills 'at meean's owt—they're summat an' nowt, a soart o' blawin' t'steeam off as ye may say. It's ye 'at gets t'wheels runnin', an' then ye're capt 'cos t'Lords claps t'brakes on.' Ther's a deal o' t'rewth i' that ther argyment, lad. An' if aw wor nobbut sewer 'at they'd clap t'brakes on when t'train started runnin' back'ards way——"

"On to the Tariff siding," I suggested.

"Aye. If aw wor sewer o' that, aw sud think twice abaht sackin' 'em. Tha knaws, ther's na sense i' tawkin' abaht fairaition wi' a Second Cham'er. It isn't what they're for. T'Second Cham'er is to keep t'speed dahn. Lib'rals wants to get forrad, Toaries wants to stick wheer we are, an' tha'r't capt 'cosd t'Second Cham'er is o' t'Toary side. Aw doan't see hah it could be owt else. 'It's too to one,' tha sez, 'an' ther's noa fairaition i' that.' Fairaition's nowt ta dew wi' t'case, lad. Duzta tawk abaht fairaition when tha sees two bobbies luggin' a druffen raffleoppin dahn to t'hoil? Duzta tell one on 'em ta leaave hod, an' g'e t'chap a fair chance to get off an' smash a toathri shop windas? Not if tha hez onny windas o' thy awn, tha duzn't. Aw doan't, chewsehah. Aw want him locked up wol he comes rahnd, if it taks twenty bobbies. T'Second Cham'er, lad, is t'extra bobby. It isn't fairaition, it's plate-glass insewerance.

"An' tha knaws, lad, this here hasty legislation's dahndreht dangerous. If we hed noa Second Cham'er, we sud be gettin' summat done afore we knew wheear we wor. What wi' t'closure, an' t' terranny o' t'party system, an' that, ther's nowt as ceasy as gettin' bills throo t'Hahse o' Commons at this day. Some madlin, we'll say, starts a crazy idee for t'taxation o' land vallys, or summat o' that, an' but for t'Hahse o' Lords it 'ud be t'lav o' t'land i' noa time. He goas stumpin' up an' dahn t'country-side, an' he starts a paper, an' as like as not afore he's turned o' sixty—if he nobbut starts young enough—ther'll be monny a thahsand fowk 'at he's deledwed well they're ommost as crazy as hissen. Then, if he hez a bit o' brass, he gets into Parlyment—an' if he hezn't, he can happen noblebly sumb'dy 'at hez. An' for t'next twenty or thirty yeeat ther's a resylewtion moved i' t'Hahse o' Commons reglar ivery session. T'first on, ther's noab'dy taks na noatis on him. He's nobbut young. But it's noan so long afore he gets a toathri voats, 'cos tha can get sumb'dy tu voat for ommost owt if tha sticks at it a bit. An' ther's t'paper comin' aht ivery wick, that knaws, an' a fayoo ardent sperrits lectrin' up an' dahn, an' fowk's gotten agate o' tawkin' abaht it. By t'time t'chap's eighty-five or theerabahts yon resylewtion gets passed, an' t'chap's that flustered wi' t'gooid news 'at he hez vi'lent palpitation finishin' up wi' awsefix-ye, an' pops off.

"Well, t'mantle falls o' one o' t'ardent sperrits, an' that ther resylewtion goas on yeeat after yeeat wol at last ther's a toathri Toaries voats for it, an' t'Lib'rals is ommost solid. T'ardent sperrit brings in a bill. Nowt comes o' that, 'cos he duzn't get a place i' t'ballot, but he goas on tryin', an' i' another twenty or thirty yeeat he leets lucky. T'bill's read a first time an' referred tul a Committee. Wol t'Committee's agate wi' t'peramble t'Government's turned aht on a voat o' censer, awin' to t'inefficient state o' t'coast defences o' t'Isle o' Man, an' ther's a general election.

"Dewrin' this brief probeyctionary period, with which we've been deecin' up to nah, t'Socialists hes been feytin' agean this land vallys idee tootth an' nail. They've said 'at it wor nobbut a red herrin', an' warned t'democracy not to be led astray wi' Lib'ral an' Toary Willy-wi'-t'-Wisps, 'cos none wor jennywin unless it bore t'red flag stamped on ivery packet. T'consequence o' that 'is at men o' t'stamp o' Lord Noasgay, 'at sees i' Socialism t'end of a gooid deal, he been led to think 'at ther wor happen summat i' this land vallys idee, an' they'd lewk intul it when they'd nowt else on. One or two young bloods ameng t'Toaries puts it i' ther election addresses. They're i' favour of a jewdicious scheeam on them ther lines, tha knaws, baht committin' thesen ta support onny particular propoasal. A Toary Government

follass, an' for ten or twelve yeeat at after ther's nowt but t'annywal resylewtion, allus meetin' wi' vigorous opposition throo Sir Frederick Banbury, an' supported by varry near iverybody else.

"T'next time t'Lib'rals comes inta pah'r, they put it i' t'King's Speech, an' i' t'fowert session o' that theer Parlyment ther's a Government Bill browt in. Sir Frederick bein' dahn wi' t'inflywenzy at t'time, noab'dy sez nowt agean it but Balfour, an' he confines hissen to pointin' aht 'at ther's a deal 'at he duzn't agree wi', an' 'at i' all his Parlymentary experience he niver seed a bill 'at wor drafted i' sich a disgraceful style, an' he taks leaave to daht if t'minister responsible for t'measure knaws what it meean's hissen. All t'same he agrees wi' t'principle if ther is one, an' he hoaps they'll be able to patch it up i' Committee. Owin' to t'presser o' bizness, t'bill niver gets that far. They're bahn to bring it in agean t'next session, but one o' t'members asses t'Prime Minister if he's aware 'at t'German waiters 'at's i' t'employ o' t'Kitchen Department o' t'Hahse is all reservists i' t'Imperial army, an' if soa, what he's bahn ta dew abaht it. T'Prime Minister, i' reply, sez summat 'at can nobbut be interpreted to meean summat 'at noa honourable gentleman owt ta say tul another baht a deal o' provocation. Ther's a moation for adjournment, an' t'Government's defeated.

"Just afore this happens, one o' t'members o' t'I.L.P. maks a speych. He sez 'at t'land taxes is nowt ta meean owt, an' wodn't dew a hawporth o' gooid ta noab'dy; but, speyk'n' for hissen, he's i' favour on 'em, 'cos it 'ud be t'thin end o' t'wedge. That ther frank declaration is quoted all ower t'world. Sir Frederick sez, 'What did aw tell ye?' All t'Toary papers tawks abaht t'thinly-veiled Socialist policy o' t'Liberals. Lord Noasgay sez it's t'end of all, an' a change o' Government, follad by a little war, turns fowk's attention elsewheer. Happen tha thinks tha's hecard t'last o' them land taxes? Tha'r't mista'en. I' another seven or eight yeeat ther's a Lib'ral Government agean. They bring in a bill i' t'first session, an' forces it through wi' t'gillytine at breeak-neck speed, nobbut allahin' seventy-three days an' a hawf for discussion. Ther's a toathri triflin' amendments 'at redewees it to abaht hawf t'strength, an' then it goas up to t'Lords. And if we hedn't a Second Cham'er, that ther bill 'ud be t'lav o' t'land afore onnybody'd hed a chance o' makkin' thesen acquainted wi' its provisions.

"Aye, lad. Doan't tell me ther's no need o' Second Cham'ers. But for t'Hahse o' Lords, or summat sim'lar to tak t'place on't, a revylewionary Government, carried inta pah'r by one o' them theer unaceahntable waves o' poppylar feelin' to which democracies is subject, an' which constitewts ther chief danger throo t'standpoint o' t'stability o' t'Constitewtion, t'maintenance o' law an' order, an' respect for t'reyts o' property—sich a Government, actin' baht a mandate, 'ud be able to wreck t'ship o' State, an' i' a whirlwind o' destructive fewry, consewm t'last remnants o' wer ancient glories i' t'lewrid fires o' Socialism. It's enough to flay a boggart."

The kitchen had become rather warm. I said good-night, and left Abe mopping his brow.

F. J. N.

LAND TITLES—A DIALOGUE AND A RIFLE.

When the Michigander bought 400 acres of land in Tennessee at a bargain, he understood that it was wild land, and he didn't learn to the contrary until he visited the property. Then he found six families of squatters, each in possession of about twenty acres. Someone told him that old Bill Thompson was the boss of the community, and that whatever he said the others would stick to. The Michigander therefore visited the old man's shanty, and opened business by saying:

"Mr. Thompson, I own all this land about here, and want to arrange matters with you."

"Own all the land?" queried the old man, as he looked his visitor over.

"Yes. There are six families of you on my land. Do you want to pay me ground rent?"

"I skassly think we do, stranger—I skassly think so."

"Then would you like to buy?"

"I can't say as we would—I can't say so. Can't be no mistake bein' yo'r land, eh?"

"Oh, no, I have the deeds here in my pocket. If you don't want to rent or buy, then I suppose you will vacate?"

"Does that mean git off—move away?"

"Yes."

"Then I wouldn't skassly say that we will vacate—I skassly wouldn't. Yo' can show them deeds, kin yo'?"

"Certainly; will you kindly tell me what you will do in this case?"

"Yaas, I think I will. There's my deed to this yere claim on the hooks up there, and yo'll find all the others hev the same. Yo' kin see it, I reckon?"

"I see a rifle hanging up there," replied the Michigander.

"Wall, that's the deed I've had for the last 20 years, and nobody hain't said it wasn't a good one."

"Then you propose to hang on?"

"That's my idea, stranger, and when I once get an idea into my head I'm apt to be set."

"Then to come into possession of my own, I must resort to law?" asked the rightful owner.

"Skassly that, stranger. In the fust place the Lawd made Tennessee fur Tennesseans, and not for Michiganders. In the second place there hain't no law around yere to appeal to. In the third place the other five men are ambushed along the trail, and if yo' continue to think yo' own this land I don't think yo'll git outter the woods alive."

"You'd assassinate me for claiming my own, would you?" demanded the frightened but irate Wolverine.

"Skassly fur claiming yo' own, stranger, but fur claimin' ours. Did they tell yo' in town how many owners of this land had showed up in the last 20 years?"

"No."

"Wall, I've got 'em notched on the stock of that ar rifle. Ten notches, I reckon; and that ain't counting two sheriffs and a constable. Stranger, d'ye want to leave yer address up in Michigan, so's I kin answer any inquiries from yer wife?"

"I—I don't think so."

"Just as yo' feel about it. Hev yo' changed yer mind about the land?"

"I think I have. I own it, but I won't take possession."

"That's k'rect. Might sell it to someone else?"

"Yes, I'll do that."

"And let him come down here to run us off and make number 'leven on that rifle stock? That's yo'r best way. And now I'll send a boy on ahead of yo' to say to our fellows that yo' are in love with Michigan, and don't kear a durn fur Tennessee, and I reckon yo'll git back home all right. 'Day to yo', sah, and if yo' feel like smokin', them yere deeds will be a good thing to light yer pipe with.'—NEW YORK HERALD.

HERE AND THERE.

"What is the baby crying for, my child?"

"I dunno; 'e's alw'ys crying. I never came acrawst anyone wot looks upon the dark side of things as 'e does.'—PUNCH.

Old Scotsman (to his son, who has just returned from a business trip to London): "Weel, laddie, and what dae ye think o' the English noo?"

Son: "Oh, I didn't have much of a chance to study them. You see, I only had to do with the heads of departments!"—PUNCH.

Mr. Joseph Edwards, Editor of the LAND REFORMERS' HANDBOOK, has removed from Palace Square, Norwood. His new address is 88, Anerley Park, London, S.E.

On June 24th, six farms with several small holdings and 37 cottages belonging to Lord Lansdowne will be sold. They are the Foxham estates and extend to about 1,040 acres, in the neighbourhood of Chippenham and Calne, Wiltshire.

The "People's Budget," the Workmen's Compensation Act, and the Port of London Bill have not only combined to throw our poor people out of employment, but have caused our supporters to drop their subscriptions towards God's work in this waterside parish. We are in dire straits as to how we are to carry on our many works and to relieve the sick and poor, and I earnestly beseech all who can to come to our aid. Donations in money or articles for our jumble sales will be gratefully received.—The Rev. Herbert Williams, The Clergy House, Tower Bridge, S.E.—Agony Column, MORNING POST.

The ESTATES GAZETTE of May 7th tells us that:—

The City of London owns Irish freehold estates in Derry, Coleraine and Culmore, consisting mostly of town land. The rent for the past year was £14,928. Other amounts brought the revenue up to £15,752. £9,253 was spent in Ireland and the difference taken to London.

The GLASGOW HERALD of May 10th stated that Mr. J. M. Barrie entered yesterday upon his fiftieth year. As a journalist in Nottingham his favourite political subjects are said to have been Mr. Chamberlain, then in his Radical phase, and Henry George. When Barrie went to London in 1885 his mother warned him to be careful to walk in the middle of the street, never to venture out after sunset, and always to lock up everything before leaving his rooms.

Canada.—£10 to £20 buys plot of land, size 33 by 132 feet, in "Rosslyn Townsite" near Fort-William, the coming Commercial and Industrial City of Canada.

The largest grain elevators in the world are here distributing to Europe 90 per cent. of the grain grown in the Canadian North-West.

"The Canadian Pacific," "The Grand Trunk Pacific," and "The Canadian Northern Railways," all make this city a central terminus.

This is an excellent opportunity for the small investor. For plans and pamphlet apply to the Secretary, The Strathcona Coal and Exploration Syndicate, Ltd., 90, Mitchell Street, Glasgow.—GLASGOW HERALD, Advt.

Mr. Owen Seaman, Editor of PUNCH, was entertained to dinner at the Authors' Club on April 25th. In responding to the toast of his health he said there was a story whose hallowed antiquity ought to protect it against further exploitation, but he was tempted to repeat it, because it offered certain analogies to the present situation. There were three characters in the story, a blue-bottle and two Scotsmen. (Laughter.) The story at once struck a note of probability by showing the Scotsmen drinking whisky. (Laughter.) The blue-bottle buzzed on the pane, otherwise profound silence reigned. This was broken by one of the Scotsmen trying to locate the blue-bottle with zoological exactitude. Said this Scotsman: "Sandy, I am thinking if yon fly is a birdie or a beastie." The other replied: "Man, don't spoil good whisky with religious conversation." (Laughter.) He was tempted to ask himself and then why it was that they should spoil the after effects of an excellent dinner by an academic discussion on British humour.

The Land Clauses of the Budget appear to have given dissatisfaction, and according to our correspondent farmers anticipate less generosity than formerly from their landlords in improvements upon their homesteads, the draining of land, and similar matters.—TIMES, May 23.

Felixstowe Urban Council has let 229 beach tent sites on the sea front by auction for £790.

UNDERGROUND TO MANCHESTER.—The distance between England's capital and the great centre of Free Trade and the cotton industry having now been covered by coach, train, and motor-car, on foot, bicycle, and wheel-barrow, by water and by air—in every way, in fact, but one—it has been left to THE DAILY NEWS, the only other paper besides THE DAILY MAIL which publishes a Manchester as well as a London edition, to offer a handsome guerdon to the first aboriginal or naturalised Englishman who can traverse the route by burrowing.

The conditions of the competition are as follows: The start must take place within a four-mile radius of THE DAILY NEWS offices in Bouverie Street, and the finish must occur opposite the Manchester Town Hall in Albert Square. The time occupied must not be more than twenty-four weeks, and competitors must not come up oftener than six times to blow. The sole implement that may be used besides the hands and feet is an ordinary spade, adjudged and declared to be such by, jointly, the editor of THE DAILY NEWS and the Minister of Agriculture. The objects aimed at in this enterprise will be:—

- (1) The advancement of the "Back to the Land" movement.
- (2) The survey of ungotten minerals.

(3) The promotion of an interior and local enthusiasm as opposed to the spirit of Imperial pride. ("What do they know of England who only know her on the top?")

It is anticipated that the generous reward offered (£105. in spade guineas) will stimulate a large number of intrepid talpiators (or mole-men) to make the hazardous attempt, and incidentally to re-create history.

LATER.—Mr. G. K. Chesterton has started. He left the cellars of the "Cheshire Cheese" at 8 p.m. last night, with no provisions but a slab of chocolate and two bottles of barley wine. He is burrowing hard.

LATE SPECIAL.—Mr. L. G. Chiozza-Money is following in Mr. Chesterton's wake. He started from Praed Street Underground, and expects to crop up at Blisworth Junction by the subway in about four weeks' time. The greatest excitement prevails above the probable line of route.—PUNCH.

POLITICAL SPEECHES AND WRITINGS.

MR. HEMMERDE ON VALUATION.

Speaking in the third reading debate of the Budget on April 27th, Mr. Hemmerde said:—

I am going to deal with that very question. As a member of the Land Group in this House, the members of which are popularly supposed to have had some influence in inducing the Government to take up this great experiment in taxation, I am very glad to have the opportunity of saying a few words upon this question on the eve of the departure of the Budget to another place, where it is likely to meet with a more friendly reception than before, although we are always told that it is passed only by a minority of this House. We are told that, but nobody believes it, otherwise the Lords would promptly throw the Budget out again. It is merely another piece of electioneering or journalistic clap-trap. I wish to say something about the extraordinary misconceptions as to the principles of this Land Group. The hon. and learned member for North Louth, during these debates, has told us that many English members, who are what he calls single-taxers, think that agricultural land should bear the burden of the rest of the land, and a noble viscount opposite has informed us that he imagines that, with the exception of a few single-taxers below the Gangway on this side, the view generally taken in this House is that agriculture is far too heavily burdened. Both these gentlemen, and many of their colleagues, are labouring under an entire misconception as to the objects and principles of this Land Group, which numbers probably over 100 members in the present House of Commons. Far from believing that agriculture could bear new burdens, our whole case is, and always has been, that it is already over-burdened. Where we differ from right hon. and hon. gentlemen opposite is not in our view as to the heavy burdens upon agriculture; but whereas they engage in perpetual moanings as to those burdens without making a single suggestion as to how they can be diminished, we have definite proposals as to their alleviation, and we intend to give an enthusiastic support to the Government proposals, because we see in them the completion of the first step by which alone our proposals can approach fulfilment. If the Opposition are right in their estimate of the views and principles of the Land Group in this House, when the Government proposed to leave out the agriculturists from the purview of the Budget taxes, you would have expected indignant remonstrances from those benches. As a matter of fact we had nothing of the sort. What we have always felt was the great value of the Government proposals: was that by them we were to get a complete valuation. If the Government had for a moment wavered—*as* some of the Government Press wavered, and as some members upon these benches wavered—in their desire for a complete valuation, the Government would soon have been able to estimate exactly the strength of the Land Group. They never wavered on them, and therefore we have all through given them a cordial and enthusiastic support. The proposals of the Government, as a matter of fact, have always struck us as being open to grave tactical objections, in that the burden which they impose is a cumulative burden, rather than a substitutive burden. My friends and I were, and are, in favour of the Taxation of Land Values which would cover all land, agricultural and urban, but—and this is the point which is never really understood, or is ignored, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and if it is understood is always

ignored by some hon. members on this side of the House, such as the hon. gentleman for the Spen Valley Division of Yorkshire, whose denunciation of the principles which we hold is often, perhaps fortunately for himself, more outspoken in this House than in his own constituency—although we wish the tax to cover all land, agricultural as well as urban, we would not make the effect of the tax cumulative, but in substitution for the rates, which now fall with most unfair incidence upon agricultural enterprise. We realise that the burdens upon agricultural land are too heavy—because the burdens upon unoccupied building land and undeveloped land and under-developed land are too light.

Year after year the chambers of agriculture in this country protest against the unfair way in which agricultural land is burdened by taxes—by the education rate, the Poor Law relief rate, and the main roads rate. Day after day, week after week, year after year, hon. gentlemen opposite identify themselves in general terms with these complaints. When in office they adopt the clumsy expedient of the Agricultural Rates Act, to which we object, not because we begrudge the relief to agriculture, but because the relief often goes into the wrong hands. Under present conditions the burden of the rates is easily shifted, and the benefit intended for the ratepayer is easily and often absorbed by the landlords. How can agriculture be relieved of these unfair burdens? Someone must pay rates and taxes, and someone in our own country; because at present we are a long way off the Utopia in which every foreigner pays the taxes of his neighbours, who, in turn in some mysterious way, lives tax free, while they pay his. Can these burdens be relieved by Tariff Reform, because Tariff Reformers are very quick to appreciate these burdens, especially when they are addressing chambers of agriculture? Considering that no Tariff Reformer has ever yet suggested how under a system of tariffs we can meet the present Imperial obligations, it is quite obvious that Tariff Reform could not possibly meet the transference of these very heavy local burdens to the Imperial Exchequer. If Tariff Reform cannot meet the transference, agriculture must go on paying these burdens, or must find some other way to meet them. The only hope I can see for a successful and adequate readjustment of local burdens lies in the Valuation Clauses of the Budget. I would like to point out, especially to some of my friends on the Irish benches, that valuation has two aspects. It is necessary for the relief of present burdens, as well as for the imposition of new ones. As a means of securing a perfect system of valuation there is much to be said for the Budget taxes, and a great deal has been said for them. Although we think, as I have stated, that the Government plan is unnecessarily clumsy and tactically a source of no little difficulty, it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of what we get by this present Budget. Tactically, I think, the Government plan is open to this grave objection: No one is obviously relieved by the plan. The fact that taxes are additional instead of substitutive deprives us of that large measure of the support which a substitutive scheme certainly would bring us. For in a substitutive scheme there would be thousands of people who would be obviously and manifestly relieved by a reduction in their rates, and would therefore give us their enthusiastic support. Under the Government scheme this gain, though in a measure real—because they do get some relief of rates—is, as a matter of fact, a good deal smaller. . . . You find practically every one who has ever studied the housing question in this country has come to the conclusion that the system by which we rate improvements in this country is not only absolutely unfair to industry, and particularly to the poor, but it is the very system that makes for overcrowding in this country. If hon. members do not accept that I would like to give an instance. I can take one from a Lancashire town which is probably known to many hon. members. A few years ago that prosperous Lancashire town, with a great cotton industry, was practically land-locked. It could not develop in any direction. After a few years of this, one of the leading landowners died. His executors were rather more progressive. Certain land came into the market. What was the result? Prior to that land coming into the market all the evils of overcrowding were in that growing town. Directly after the land came into the market the town developed with a rush, and within ten years there were 10,000 looms added to that Lancashire town, employing 3,000 people directly, and indirectly 10,000 more people. Yet people tell us that the tax upon Land Values will do nothing to prevent overcrowding; will do nothing to cause employment! I can give an instance in my own constituency in answer to the hon. gentleman who spoke last. No land hunger! What about the village of Chirk

in Denbighshire? There you have 1,000 men employed at a couple of collieries. Another member of this House and myself tried to get land for these men who were living under horrible and beastly conditions. The three landowners stuck out for prices varying from £800 to £1,100 per acre for land which is rated at £1 per acre. Those facts are known to other members of this House. I have challenged them on the platform, and they are not denied because they cannot be denied. There in that village, are living, in sight of the most beautiful land in this country, some of the finest men and women of the country, and living under conditions not fit for beasts, and all because people hold up the land. These proposals will do something for them, for we shall be able to say to these landowners: "On what basis do you value your land, £1,000 per acre? Very well, pay on that basis." They will soon get tired of paying upon that basis. It is for that reason that these people—and many like them—realising that in the Valuation Clauses lies the whole salvation of rural England, get up and say: "The thing is impossible; you cannot value land apart from improvements." It has been in existence in America for years, and in Australasia for years and years. It can be done, and it is going to be done, and it is going to be of greater advantage to rural England than anything that could possibly be done in this country. I hope that Irish members, when they realise the importance of this question to England, will shortly realise the importance of this question to Ireland also, and to the small holders in Ireland.

MR. DEVLIN ON THE BUDGET.

In the same debate, Mr. Joseph Devlin, M.P. for West Belfast, said:—

Last January the hon. Member for Cork City (Mr. O'Brien) submitted the question of this Budget, I understand, as the vital question on which he forced a candidate of his own against me in West Belfast. As one who has remained silent through all these controversies in this House, and as one who has listened with amazement from time to time to the remarks from the Tory Benches that the Irish Parliamentary party are opposed to the Budget, I rise as a representative of Ireland to give the Budget my unqualified support. This Budget next to Home Rule was the great issue on which I fought my contest in West Belfast. The hon. Member for Cork City sent down his candidate in order to draw Nationalist votes from me with the money of Lord Dunraven and the Tories. He now challenges us to go to the country. May I point out that it is we who are forcing the election, it is we who want him to go to the country, and I am confident if he does he will receive the same answer in Cork that I gave him in Belfast when I beat the combination of converted Nationalists and Tories, and raised my majority from 16 to 600. One would imagine to hear the speeches of some of these gentlemen that the only people in Ireland were the landlords and distillers. They talk about the farmers—these gentlemen who added £17,000,000 to the cost of Irish land. The gentlemen who talk here about this Budget throwing an additional burden of £430,000 upon Ireland are the gentlemen who raised Irish land from seventeen years' purchase to twenty-eight.

They are here not in the interests of the farmers, but in the interests of the plutocrats, the reactionaries, and the landlords. . . .

The Budget which has been introduced is, in my opinion, something more than a financial measure; it is a great democratic instrument. They have not told Ireland that you propose, and that this Budget is to be the instrument by which you will carry your proposal out, to deal with afforestation, with drainage, with the general development of the country, and with all those great rural grievances, which are deeply felt in every branch of rural life in Ireland. There is to me a bigger question even than that. There is not one of the social curses that apply to the great cities of Great Britain which we do not feel in Belfast, and all the Dunraven meetings to be held from now to Doomsday would not do half as much to bring into communion and into a harmonious relationship Protestants and Catholics than one speech on the Taxation of Land Values from the right hon. gentleman the Lord Advocate (Mr. Ure). In the city of Belfast there are sweated women and sweated children; there are unemployed men who feel the curse and the character of the whole social system as deeply as you do in your country; and I want to know, am I, as a representative of these people, to sit here and listen to all these fiscal fables told from these benches

in the supposed interests of the distillers and landlords whilst my constituents and the people are to be robbed of all these beneficial advantages which we hope to secure through the agency and operation of this Budget? There are children in Belfast with wizened faces, old before they ever know what it is to be young, who go to work at six o'clock in the morning and work till six o'clock at night for three shillings a week. They work and toil and work and toil, and it is recorded that on an average they die at thirty-nine. They are not to count. You must take away the money from old age pensioners who now have earned their pensions by arriving at the age of seventy in order that the margin may be given in extra years' purchase to the landlords. Have they not got enough? Why do not some of these ex-democrats who exhibit all this passion for the distillers and the landlords think of their better and higher and nobler days when they fought for the people? There is a generation rising up in Ireland who are tired of all this humbug; there is a generation rising up in Ireland who will never be satisfied with the hysterical shriekings of played-out politicians, and who are not going to be led by lords or noodles. The Irish democracy, like the English democracy, are enlightened and educated; they know what they want, and they are determined to have it. I believe that this Budget proposes to give them some of the things they want, and, when the judgment of the people is taken on this Budget, it will be unequivocally in favour of it.

MR. F. E. SMITH ON LAND VALUES.

Speaking at a meeting of the United Club in the Waldorf Hotel on April 29th, Mr. F. E. Smith, Unionist M.P. for the Walton Division of Liverpool, said:—

I could not help thinking that the greatest illumination was to be derived from the history of their opponents since the introduction of the Budget. Before then there was hardly a seat in England that was safe for the Government. Then the Budget was introduced. It was useless for them as a party to pretend or argue that there was not in fact a fundamental distinction between land and other subjects of ownership. The essential physical consideration that land was, after all, limited in extent in a sense which was not true of any other commodity did make a difference—not in the fundamental article of their policy that if the State took anything for a public purpose it should pay for it at commercial rates—but in the degree of control which might be asserted by the community over land on purely public grounds (hear, hear).

So far as he knew, no Conservative had ever approved of the land proposals in the Budget. It was flagrantly and demonstrably unjust, for the purposes of taxation, to impose burdens upon men who had invested their money in land which were not to be imposed on men who had invested it in any other commodity. But that was a totally different proposition from saying that, for purposes of municipal rating, you might entitle the municipalities to readjust the basis on which their system of oppidan rating depended.

LAND VALUES DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On April 27th, 1910, Mr. Verney moved:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the present system of taxation, rating, and tenure of land tends to restrict the best use of the land and the application to it of capital and labour, thereby hindering the production of wealth and causing unemployment."

Mr. Walsh in seconding said:—Although land is indeed valuable in the agricultural districts it is infinitely more valuable for the elementary necessities of life in the urban districts, and we find that whatever discovery is made, whatever works are erected, if you sink a coal-mine, if you start a factory, if you develop a railway, whatever may be the useful purpose to which you set yourself, you are treated not as a benefactor, but very largely as a malefactor, and the enemy of the human race.

I can give as a case in point the council on which I sat as a member shortly after the year 1894. A railway runs through that little township about six miles in length. That railway was rated to the general district rates of the town at nearly £15,000, or at the rate of £2,500 per mile. The improvements brought about by this railway were very great, but the landowners in that particular area received all the benefit, while the railway, which had really been a great boon to the district

and a still greater boon to the landowners, was burdened with taxation and assessed at the rate of £15,000 a year. A little later on coal mining property was developed very largely.

Before the town had possessed a rural character, but after that it became a very hive of industry. Land which at the highest agricultural value had not been worth more than £2 an acre began to yield rentals of £50 per acre, and the persons who were in receipt of this profit did not contribute one half-penny to local taxation, the whole burden falling entirely upon the workers and those who may be euphemistically described as "captains of industry." At least we can say to the credit of the mine owners that they did take some risk—and they were prepared to invest their money in the hope that they were engaging in a profitable enterprise. They did take the risk and they paid all the local rates. Tramways were constructed, new schemes of lighting and new streets were made, and large aggregations of men came together, and all the elements and needs of civilised society had to be met, and the whole cost of these new conditions fell not upon the men who were reaping the immense values to create which they had not lifted hand or foot, but upon those who developed the enterprise either by brains or capital, as in the case of the colliery owners and the railway company, or else upon the working men who were risking life and limb every day in these enterprises. Surely that is a condition of things which nobody can contend is equitable.

I noticed an Amendment on the paper in the name of the hon. member for Cockermouth (Sir John Randles) which proposes to call attention to unemployment and to insert in this motion after the word "land" the words "when coupled with the free importation of competing foreign products not subjected to similar burdens." I am not going to enlarge upon that special amendment, but I would like to ask the hon. member's attention to the question whether it is not a fact that in every nation in the world where they have a similar system of land holding to that which exists in the British Isles, and where they have a similar system of rating and taxation you do not have exactly the same evils complained of in the shape of widespread unemployment, continual recurring depression, and dislocation of industry as you have in the British Isles. That is beyond all dispute, whatever may be the nature of your fiscal system. This is a quack remedy which is suggested by the hon. member, and that is the last word I am going to say about it. Instead of treating the people who initiate and develop industry as being folks deserving of credit and deserving to have their enterprise assisted and encouraged, our present system of rating does everything to discourage and to throttle their efforts. Let me give a case in point. We have very near the division I represent, a great colliery company. It sank a great amount of capital, lost thousands of pounds upon the enterprise, paid away in royalty rents alone £10,000, and was met by the royalty owner half-way through the term of the lease by a request for a greater royalty. So great had been the local burden of taxation, that it was utterly impossible for the colliery company to pay. They said: "We really cannot go on." The royalty owner insisted upon his demand, and the colliery had to be closed. The royalty owner took over the shafts and the cottage property. In the meantime he had escaped all local taxation, and he paid very little indeed to Imperial taxation. Therefore, whatever enterprise the community engages in, is constantly bringing grist to the mill of the private landowner, and the burdens piled upon the general community make it more and more difficult for the community to meet its increasing needs.

During the last ten years the town of Wigan has increased in rateable value by 30 per cent. The chances are that on an average £25,000 a year has been added to the rateable value during that period. That really means that to the owners of the ground rents there has been given this very large sum. It simply tends to check and to thwart the development and the industries of the place, and because of the high rates to-day we find that town, like many other towns, unable to make that advance in general improvements which it really ought to make. The one person or the one body of persons who sit like "the Old Man of the Sea" upon the shoulders of every real improvement, checking the improvement, holding it back, and in many cases making enterprise impossible, are the people who escape local taxation, and who are paying as the days go on an ever lessening share of Imperial taxation, namely, the land-owners of the country.

Every necessity of health, every amenity, and every social reform send up the value of the land. Hon. members on the

other side say, "Tax luxuries." There may be a good deal to be said for that, but our present system of rating and of taxation taxes necessities. There is no greater necessity than to have freedom to breathe and decent housing conditions whereby our people can live a decent Christian life. Is that possible in the great cities of to-day? I hope, as indeed everyone must hope, that it is becoming at least a little more possible because of the trend of general legislation and because of the awakening responsibility of the nation; but, if ever there was a city that suffered from congestion, it is the city that I am proud to own as my native place—the City of Liverpool.

Very many years ago Liverpool endeavoured to provide for the needs of its people, and they constructed at great expense a fine park—Sefton Park. They paid to the man who was good enough to let them have the land £250,000 for the land alone, and they spent in generally improving the site another £150,000. The landowner, the Earl of Sefton, retained the whole of the building frontage. They spent on that park, in order to enable that great community to breathe more freely, £400,000, and the whole of that immense burden fell upon the rates. The immensely increased value of the land, of course, sent up the rent-roll of my Lord of Sefton. He sat on velvet all the time. Then we wonder, when these conditions can be multiplied by the tens of thousands all the country over, why the rates are high and why every dividend-paying company every half-year sends out piteous appeals to its shareholders to try and get hold of the local governing councils in order to keep down the rates.

Liverpool, which, as everyone of course knows, is a great commercial city, had need not very long ago, for a new post office. The Government built a new post office. Land, of course, was again required, and my Lord of Derby was kind enough to provide the land. The land for which not a single halfpenny had ever been paid in the history of the whole of his family became worth to my Lord of Derby £100,000. The nation spent another £150,000 upon the erection of a building, and in that instance alone £250,000 were saddled upon Imperial taxation. The landowner gains £250,000, and pays, I suppose, something like 9d. in the £ income tax and believes he is very badly hit at that. A little later, when we try to improve things a bit he believes himself to be cruelly wronged, suggests the nation should be consulted, and hangs up the Budget in the meantime. That is the kind of treatment we are receiving.

Sir John Randles moved as an amendment, after the word "land" ["rating and tenure of land"] to insert the words, "when coupled with the free importation of competing foreign products not subject to similar burdens."

... I am going to touch on the point raised by the seconder. He expressed his dissatisfaction with the rating and taxation of land, and I might have some sympathy with him, but I notice that he rejects my remedy as a quack remedy. Still there is a good deal to be said for it, and while I agree that the system of rating and taxation is not a happy one as far as the remedy of the hon. member was concerned, it seemed to me to be this, put more rates and taxes on the land.

Mr. Carlile in seconding the amendment said:—

We on this side of the House believe in the magic of ownership. Some of us perhaps own a piece of land, and know from our own personal experience that even if the land produces very little or nothing for us, yet the sense of ownership makes us concentrate our energies and attention upon it, and we are willing to make sacrifices for it. How much more would that be the case with occupiers if, instead of having the prospect all his life of making these eternal payments to the County Council, with no prospect of ever coming any nearer the ownership of his holding, he had the prospect upon which the party with which I am associated has already concentrated its mind, that every yearly contribution which he makes towards the purchase of the property was bringing him nearer to the day when he would become absolute owner of the soil.

Mr. Raffan: The hon. member for Cockermouth (Sir J. Randles), in an eloquent peroration, asked why our people are required to go to lands where their labour is protected to make openings for themselves. I should like to ask where are those countries? Do our workmen seek openings for themselves in the protected countries of Italy, Spain or Russia? The hon. member talked about Germany. I am not afraid to deal with Germany. But Germany does not cover the whole map of Europe. There are all the other protected countries in Europe. From which of those countries is there not a larger emigration than from this country? But our people do not even go to

Germany. The vast majority of the 200,000 of whom the hon. member spoke go to our own Colonies. It is surprising to hear those who uphold so strongly the desirability of cementing our Empire bemoaning the fact that men are going out to Canada and Australia for the purpose of building up the Empire by acting as colonists. It may be said that some of them go to the United States. That is true. But what is happening in the United States at the present moment? Under the scientific tariff in America, which appears to be working so admirably in the eyes of those who framed it, there is widespread indignation, as is shown by the recent election. Not only are the people voting against it, but they are crossing in tens of thousands over the border into Canada. Is that because of the tariff? Is the tariff in Canada higher than the tariff in the United States? Does the tariff in Canada protect better than the tariff in the United States? No. The reason is that in Canada they have still free land, and wherever men can get free access to the land the problem of unemployment does not arise. Men are going into Canada because lecturers are going up and down the country stating that 160 acres await any man who goes out to Canada and settles there. There a man can be sure, if he toils hard, erects a steading, and reclaims the land, that in his old age he will be able to enjoy the fruits of his labour, that no rack-renting landlord will be able to evict him as he can be evicted here, and that there will be no screw from the squire and the parson such as exists in English villages. That is why they are going to Canada. It is quite true that they are going also from Scotland. The men who are going from the North of Scotland are not men driven from the commercial centres because of Free Trade, but men driven from the soil because of the operation of unjust laws. The hon. member opposite (Mr. Carlile) spoke with bated breath of a noble duke. If I might, without bated breath, refer to a noble duke, I would say that, if there is a real desire to remedy unemployment there is one noble duke in this country who has the opportunity to make a great experiment. I refer to the noble duke who is president of the Tariff Reform League. I do not know if it is suggested that the Duke of Sutherland has accepted the presidency of the Tariff Reform League merely because he has a burning desire to deal with this question of unemployment. But if that be so, I suggest to him—and I suggest to those who think with him—that, after all, if you are going to change the fiscal system of this country you are going to make a tremendous experiment! I stand here as the representative of a Lancashire constituency. The men in my constituency, cotton operatives and cotton manufacturers, are unanimously agreed that if this Tariff Reform system comes into effect a death-blow will be struck at their industry. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that at the last election a manifesto was signed by everybody entitled to speak on behalf of the cotton industry repudiating Tariff Reform as a remedy. With regard to a good many other trades that is also true. It may be possible by Tariff Reform, at the expense of others, to build up certain industries which may give some employment. But the evil which you will create will be much greater than the evil which you will cure. You will throw out of employment a thousand men for every hundred to whom you give employment. That is the danger of the system to which the Duke of Sutherland is committed. He will be compelled, if he adopts that system, in the words of the Marquis of Salisbury, "to force food taxes upon a reluctant nation."

There is an alternative which he may adopt. In the Highlands of Scotland there are 3,200,000 acres of land given over entirely to deer forests. The largest holder of this 3,200,000 acres is the president of the Tariff Reform League. What I suggest to him is that, instead of attending the next meeting of the Tariff Reform League, he should call together his fellow land-owners who own these deer forests, which are rated on an average at less than 1s. per acre. That is the value which the Duke of Sutherland and his fellow proprietors put upon them. I suggest that they should agree to sacrifice their sport upon the altar of the solution of this problem of unemployment. I suggest that they should offer 160 acres in the Highlands of Scotland to any settler who cares to have them. (An hon. member: "He could not live on it.") An hon. member says he could not live upon it. Very well; let it be tried! In the old days it was tried. I know it has been tried. I have gone over the ground, I have seen the ruined steadings from which men have been evicted. I have seen the wild deer wandering where the child loved to play. I know that the noblest race of men have been evicted to make room for sport. But give the people the opportunity. Give them, not 160 acres for nothing as they can secure in Canada, but give the land to them at the value put upon

it by the owners, at a rental of 1s. per acre, or £8 a year, and no rates charged upon improvements—because that is a fundamental thing in the solution of the land question. Then, I say, you will be able to settle in the Highlands of Scotland alone 200,000 heads of families who will be able, with their wives and families, to deal with a population of 1,000,000. That is something better than Tariff Reform as a solution of the unemployed problem. Try it. Set up again the old life which existed in the Highlands. Not until then will you be dealing with the question of unemployment. Only settle these men on the soil and you will have collateral advantages. You will be able to regain a healthy population such as lived in the Highlands in days gone by.

He says these men could not live upon such land. Does he forget the time when you reared your soldiers that fought at Alma, Inkerman, and Balaklava, and does he forget that the best of these soldiers came from the Highlands of Scotland? When you want men to fight the German invasion that hon. members opposite talk so much about, how many of them will you get from the gillies and from the millionaire landlords of Scotland? The real remedy for unemployment is to so use the land of the country which God has given us so that we may be able to make the best use of it for the benefit of the people. I have no doubt if the question is argued upon the platform, when the people understand what this quack remedy of Tariff Reform is, and that its object is merely to put money in the pockets of the few, and when they compare that remedy with the remedy which will be provided by the settlement of the people upon the land that God gave them, there will be no hesitation as to what the verdict of the people will be.

Sir William Robson: Both the mover and seconder of the amendment have said that the Tories have got an agrarian policy, and it is a policy which consists in the encouragement of land purchase instead of land hiring for the people of small holdings. They both used language, perhaps inadvertently, which implied that, as we had encouraged the hiring of land for small holdings, so we had discouraged the purchase of land for small holdings. I am sure that hon. members, who talk of our not having encouraged the acquisition of the freehold for that purpose, could not have looked at the Act. Why it gives distinct and direct encouragement to the purchase of freeholds as well as the hiring of land. By Section 19 the County Councils are actually empowered to advance four-fifths of the purchase money, yet hon. members say that the policy of land purchase is their policy. It is not. We made numerous proposals to facilitate land purchase. Hon. members opposite said they were in favour of land purchase, but the test was, how far they were willing to promote cheap valuation for the purpose. Whenever we made any suggestion of any kind—and we did again and again—to facilitate land purchase by an economic valuation we were met with the most bitter opposition. Their idea was that the peasant or labourer who wanted an acre of land for a potato patch was to get it not by some economical valuation of an expert official, but by the application of the Lands Clauses Act through the most costly and elaborate machinery.

We introduced the principle of taxing that which is due, not to the energy and industry of the particular taxpayer, but to the industry and energy of other taxpayers. A start has been made, and though I do not desire to see taxes extended, no one can deny that the Government has done a very great work and a very great national service in bringing within the area of contribution unearned increment arising out of landed value apart from that which is created by the landlords themselves. That has been introduced in no spirit of confiscation. It is simply that we have brought within the range of contribution that which is equitably just, as much the subject of public burden as any similar matter. It has been argued whether all taxes should not be raised out of land. If time allowed, I should be willing to deal with that question, but in the five minutes at my disposal I would advance one objection to that which has not been carefully considered by those who advance that suggestion. Are site values equal to the immense burden which would be laid upon them if they were made the sole subject-matter of rating? Take, for instance, property in London worth £50 a year. The site value of that property is equal, on a fair average, to something like £10 a year, and the rates will be equal to something like £18 a year, so that you could not possibly levy the whole of your rates upon the site value if you made it the only subject-matter of taxation. The rate would be 20s. or 30s. in the £, a result which would mean that the building, which you desire wholly to exempt from taxation, would nevertheless be subject to taxation. The only proposal made by those who are land-taxers which it is impossible for us

to assent to or to treat as other than controversial, is the proposal that site values should be made the sole subject of taxation. That would be going beyond contribution. It would amount to confiscation and appropriation. We have stopped far short of that. Short of that the whole of our policy with regard to the removal of restrictions upon land, and in regard to tenure and to taxation is in the spirit in which this resolution has been moved and seconded. There has been a good deal of discussion as to what is the best system of taxation, whether it should be direct or indirect, whether it should be on land or on labour. There is a better method than any system of taxation, and that is to cultivate in this House and the country the sentiment of thrift. It is better to have less taxation, but if there is to be taxation I challenge anyone to suggest a better subject matter of taxation than those which the Government have adopted.

The Amendment was rejected by 179 votes to 136, giving the Resolution a majority of 43.

MR. DEVLIN AT ARMAGH.

Speaking at Armagh on May 15th, Joseph Devlin, M.P., said:—

He desired to make just one passing reference to the incident that took place recently in the British House of Commons. He had been charged with supporting the Budget recently passed in the English Parliament. He said there that day, not in the English Parliament, but face to face with the greatest Ulster meeting ever held, that he never was prouder of any action in his life. (Cheers.) And he told them there that day and told his constituents that if his seat in Parliament and every seat that it was possible for him to be returned by were involved in a similar Budget to-morrow, consistent with his pledge to his Party, he would lose the seat rather than recall one single word uttered in the British House of Commons. (Cheers.) Why did he support the Budget? He supported it first of all because he believed that the passage of that measure was essential to a genuine and unmistakable unity of democratic forces against the House of Lords. He supported it because he saw an opportunity for progressive democratic elements in these countries joining in a mighty battle against the arch-enemy of Irish freedom and human advance and progress. (Cheers.) But he (Mr. Devlin) supported the Budget on its merits, and on its merits it was a great instrument for the uplifting of the democracy of this country as well as of England. (Cheers.) Not a single poor man in Ireland would be hit by that Budget. (A Voice—"Not one," and cheers.) Not a single acre of land was taxed by that Budget. (A Voice—"That is so," and cheers.) Not a labourer or artisan would have to bear one farthing of additional burthen by that Budget. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. Devlin) was not only an Irish Nationalist fighting for the freedom of their country, but he was a representative of the toilers, and the artisans and the labourers, and he wanted to see, pending the passage of a Home Rule Bill, money raised somehow or in any way by which not only would pensions be given to men and women of seventy, but to men and women of sixty-five. (Cheers.) He wanted to see pensions given to disabled workers, as pensions were given to disabled soldiers. He wanted to see the men and women injured in the onward march along the great path of industrial progress rendered happier, at all events more secure, when they are unable to labour and to work in the ordinary avocations of their lives. He desired to see removed the curse and blight of unemployment that palls upon the life of their cities and crushed the heart of humanity in their great industrial centres. (Cheers.) He wanted to see that problem solved, and if they solved the problem of unemployment they would build up a mighty medium of human happiness. How was that to be done? He hoped that by Ireland paying on whiskey and tobacco £450,000 additional taxes they would be able to get double and treble that amount out of taxation raised on the ground landlords of London and Manchester. (Cheers.) There was never a fouler or grosser misrepresentation than the charge that this Budget was an unfair Budget for Ireland by those of their Irish allies who sucked out of the lifeblood of Ireland millions of money within the last ten years to strike down the gallant Boer Republic, and destroy and crush the liberties of these brave peoples. (Cheers.) No, whether it was popular or unpopular, he (Mr. Devlin) stood by the Budget, and defended the Budget. (Cheers.) He stood by the people and defended them from ignorant writers and malignant critics and sneers, and there that day he believed that that mass meeting of Ulster Nationalists, not only patriots but thoughtful politicians, had approved of their action in Parliament, and they believed that in what the Irish Party had done

they were guided in the first instance by the highest sense of public duty to motherland. (Cheers.) But he would have voted against the Budget if he had believed that by that vote they could have forced to a closer issue the great question of the Veto of the House of Lords. He said he was a democrat, but he was first of all an Irish Nationalist. He believed that the government of Ireland by the Irish people was first and primary, and greatest of all the beliefs that inspired their lives. Therefore, he would have subordinated every interest if he believed that by voting against the Budget he could have advanced the cause associated with the attack on the Veto of the House of Lords, because until that Veto was plucked out of the constitution of Great Britain they would never get Home Rule, and he told them that day pluck it out they would—(cheers)—when they, Irish democrats and English democrats, would join in their day and generation in enabling John Redmond to do what Daniel O'Connell tried to do 70 years ago." (Cheers.)

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE.

Keep it before the people—

That the earth was made for man!
That flowers were strewn,
And fruits were grown
To bless and never to ban;
That sun and rain,
And corn and grain,
Are yours and mine, my brother!
Free gifts from heaven,
And freely given
To one as well as another!

Keep it before the people—

That man is the image of God!
His limbs or soul
We may not control
With fetter or shame or rod!
We may not be sold
For silver or gold:
Neither you nor I, my brother!
For Freedom was given
By God from heaven,
To one as well as another!

Keep it before the people—

That famine and crime and woe
For ever abide,
Still side by side,
With luxury's dazzling show!
That Lazarus crawls
From Dives' halls,
And starves at his gate, my brother!
Yet life was given
By God from heaven
To one as well as another!

Keep it before the people—

That the labourer claims his meed;
The right of the soil,
And the right to toil,
From spur and bridle freed;
The right to bear
And the right to share
With you and me, my brother!
Whatever is given
By God from heaven
To one as well as another.

Augustine J. H. Duganne, 1856.

DEATH OF SIR EDMUND VERNEY.

On May 8th, Sir Edmund Verney, Bart., died at his home, Claydon, Buckinghamshire. Sir Edmund was in his 73rd year. In his death the movement loses a warm supporter. Well advanced in years before he became interested in the Taxation of Land Values, Sir Edmund displayed great enthusiasm in advocating strong and universal measures. Many will remember his speech at the Conference held in Caxton Hall, in February, 1909, and similarly robust speeches at meetings of the English League. Sir Edmund was a good type of those English gentlemen who occasionally stand out from their class and take a courageous part in promoting causes which they believe to be good for their country.

PRIVILEGE AT WORK.

COTTAGE RENTS RAISED IN SOMERSET.

In the Press on April 22nd some facts were given in relation to the cottage property of Lord Hylton, in the villages around Radstock, Somersetshire. We are indebted to the *MORNING LEADER* of that date for the following particulars:—

The cottages in question are poor little properties, some of them let at three, six, eight—and possibly there may be amongst them a palatial tenement fetching ten pounds a year. But they have proved very useful in a district where housing accommodation is scarcely to be found owing to the onerous conditions imposed by the great landowners. Some of the occupants are glad to have the cottages in order to be within three or four miles of their work!

By notice issued from the Hylton Estates Office, Kilmersdon, bearing the date of the day that the Budget closure resolution was passed by the House of Commons, the tenants of Lord Hylton's cottages have been notified of an increase of rent of from 50 to 100 per cent. A £5 cottage is to be charged £9 a year, a two-room dwelling-place is to be rented at £8 instead of £4 per annum.

The increase is very keenly resented, for the least said about the accommodation these cottages provide the better. There is one part of the estate (writes the *MORNING LEADER* special correspondent) where you will find half a cottage so dilapidated that it has had to be abandoned; you will find another cottage quite uninhabitable. In old Lord Hylton's time, as the present peer's father is referred to, some of these cottages used to be rented at a shilling a week and they have not grown younger since, nor has any attention been paid to the sanitary arrangements to make them of more value.

Lord Hylton is able to secure his temporary triumph thanks to the fact that the housing accommodation is so limited in this squire-ruled district. There are half-a-dozen couples who would marry in one parish if they could only find cottages in which to live. Nearer Midsomer Norton notice to quit a cottage was given, and within two or three days there were 40 applicants for it!

The Rev. Geoffrey Ramsay, rector of Writhlington, proposed to devote 20 acres of glebe land to the erection of buildings to relieve the house famine in the neighbourhood of Radstock, but was unable to get Lord Hylton's sanction.

Pressure is being put upon the Rural District Council to take action under the Housing Act.

Lord Hylton wrote a long letter on the subject to the *DAILY CHRONICLE* of April 27th, stating that the increased rents would only apply to some fifty cottages at the outset, or about one sixth of the total number on the estate (without counting the leaseholds). He mentioned that the hamlet of Charlton had been partly rebuilt and that over sixty new cottages have been built close to Kilmersdon Colliery, one mile distant from Charlton. The *CHRONICLE* correspondent replied to Lord Hylton's letter stating that the partial "rebuilding" of Charlton has left the place with six fewer cottages than formerly.

NEWS OF THE MOVEMENT.

MANCHESTER.

In addition to those already announced, the following meetings have been held:—

- April 26.—Hyde League of Young Liberals, Market Place, Open air, A. H. Weller.
- " 27.—S.W. Manchester League of Young Liberals, Open air, A. H. Weller.
- " 28.—T. Davies and Sons' Works, Openshaw Dinner-hour Meeting, J. Bagot.
- " 28.—Economic Class Meeting at the Manchester Office.
- May 3.—Great Harwood League of Young Liberals, J. Bagot.
- " 5.—S. and J. Watts' Shirt Factory, Dinner-hour Meeting, Miss H. M. Hamar and J. Bagot.
- " 8.—Alexandra Park, J. Bagot and D. Catterall.
- " 12.—Crossley's Works, Openshaw, Dinner-hour Meeting, J. Bagot and A. H. Weller.
- " 12.—Economic Class Meeting at the Manchester Office, 8 p.m.
- " 15.—Queen's Park, J. Bagot and A. H. Weller.
- " 15.—Queen's Park Parliament, D. Catterall.

- May 22.—Philips Park, D. Catterall and O. O'Grady.
- " 24.—Memorial Hall, Manchester, Joseph Fels and John Paul.
- " 24.—Tintwistle League of Young Liberals, Open air, J. Bagot.
- " 26.—Economic Class Meeting at the Manchester Office.

Up to the time of going to Press the following meetings have been arranged:—

- June 3.—Market Place, Farnworth, Bolton, Open air, J. Bagot and A. Hollas.
- " 6.—Radcliffe League of Young Liberals, Open air, J. Bagot.
- " 10.—S.W. Manchester League of Young Liberals (for '95 Club), Dr. P. McDougall.
- " 15.—S.W. Manchester League of Young Liberals, Open air, A. H. Weller.
- " 20.—Radcliffe League of Young Liberals, Open air, Dr. P. McDougall.

The Secretary, A. H. Weller, writes from the offices of the League at 134, Deansgate, Manchester:—The Economic Class meetings at the Manchester Office will continue to be held throughout the summer, but the hour has been changed to 7.30 p.m. from 8 p.m. Members and friends of the League in Manchester are invited to support the meetings in the Manchester parks on Sunday afternoons, at 3 p.m. It is intended to hold these meetings every Sunday during the summer months (weather and the Parks' Committee permitting) and to advertise them on the front pages of the *EVENING NEWS*, and the *EVENING CHRONICLE* on the preceding Saturdays.

Mr. John Bagot is continuing his good work amongst the Young Liberals around Manchester with excellent results. The Secretary of the Saddleworth Federation wrote recently expressing sincere thanks to the Manchester League for sending Mr. Bagot, "whose enthusiasm," he writes, "is catching, and fairly fired our young men. As a result of his address we have a fine class of about 15 studying, 'Progress and Poverty,' with weekly meetings at Greenfield Liberal Club."

The Hyde League of Young Liberals have started a Speakers' Fellowship. The members will meet on Thursdays and intend to take up the study of "Progress and Poverty." The Young Liberals in the Hyde Division are particularly keen advocates of Land Values Taxation, thanks very largely to the splendid work done by Mr. Francis Neilson, M.P.

At the weekly meeting of the West Salford Young Liberals on April 25th, Mr. A. H. Weller gave an address on the Taxation of Land Values. The meeting was well reported in the *SALFORD REPORTER* of 30th April. Mr. Weller made a good speech, and a resolution in favour of the principle of the Taxation of Land Values was passed unanimously. A vote of thanks to the chairman (Mr. T. F. Spence) and speaker was proposed by Mr. W. J. Emery, seconded by Mr. R. J. Lumby, and carried unanimously.

The *MIDDLETON GUARDIAN* of May 21st contained the full text of an address delivered by Miss Hilda M. Hamar, before a meeting of the Manchester League. The subject of the address was an appreciation of Henry George's *PROGRESS AND POVERTY*. Miss Hamar treated her theme in an interesting and instructive manner.

A meeting, under the auspices of the United Committee and the Manchester League for the Taxation of Land Values, was held on May 24th in the Memorial Hall. Mr. L. W. Zimmerman, President of the League, was in the chair, Mr. W. Barton, M.P., was on the platform, and Mr. Joseph Fels and Mr. John Paul were the speakers.

Mr. Fels gave a characteristic speech, saying that, to him, it was not a political but a moral question: it was a question of bread and meat; a question of house room; a question of opening up land to labour. The people were being forced more and more into the cities and towns, and the towns were circumscribed as if by a ring fence. In Huddersfield, a town of 90,000 people, they would find slums of the worst description, while within a quarter of a mile of the slums there was nothing but smiling fields held up by the landlord. In America there was the same sort of thing. Poverty stalked in open daylight in New York city. Whatever Protectionists might say to the contrary, there were certainly 80,000 men without work in New York. There was not an American town that had not a slum of some kind.

Mr. Paul said the League for the Taxation of Land Values proposed to relieve industry of the entire burden of taxation. They said it was wrong and foolish to force taxation upon men producing wealth while allowing others, who owned the opportunities without which wealth could not be produced, to escape

entirely, as they did at present. In the Budget they had advanced only the first step, but the Valuation Clauses would stimulate the local rating bodies.

HUDDERSFIELD.

A very interesting conference of workers in the movement for the Taxation of Land Values from all the centres of the West Riding was held in the Liberal Club at Huddersfield on May 23rd, under the auspices of the United Committee and the Yorkshire League for the Taxation of Land Values. Some forty to sixty enthusiasts in the movement, including representatives from Bradford, Halifax, Keighley, &c., assembled, and were met by Mr. Joseph Fels and Mr. John Paul. After an informal gathering for general discussion, a meeting for the consideration of future policy was held in the smoke-room, under the chairmanship of Mr. Frank Sykes, at which brief addresses were delivered by Mr. Fels and Mr. Paul. The former, in quite a characteristic speech, said that experience had convinced him that the solution of the poverty problem was to be found only in the application of the principles of Henry George, and he had thrown himself into this movement, which had made more headway in a few years than any other movement ever known. In thirty years many nations had been worked up to recognise the importance of this reform, and they would not go to sleep again,—certainly England would not, because here the people had come to the very verge of destruction by reason of their land system, which was responsible for monopoly and private privilege. Mr. Paul, touching on the same subject, said that the introduction of the land clauses into the Budget had put a tone not only into the policy of our country but into the politics of other countries, and had influenced the whole English-speaking world.

PORTSMOUTH.

His many friends will be sorry to hear that Mr. J. H. McGuigan has had an accident, and has been confined to bed in the Royal Naval Hospital, Haslar. Mr. McGuigan writes us that he is now convalescent, and anxious to secure speakers for a series of meetings in Portsmouth. We sincerely hope he will be soon fully recovered, and able to resume the active part he has played in the movement for so many years.

MR. W. R. LESTER IN MID-NORFOLK.

Mr. Lester, accompanied by Mrs. Lester, had a busy day in East Dereham on May 17th. In the afternoon a great anti-veto demonstration was held at which he spoke, and was accorded a cordial reception. Following the meeting the new Liberal Club was opened by Mrs. Lester. Both Mr. and Mrs. Lester made speeches and were most enthusiastically received. A tea and concert followed at which a pair of silver candlesticks were presented to them by the Liberals of Dereham in appreciation of the gallant fight Mr. Lester made at the General Election. The day concluded with a mass meeting on the veto question.

WOMEN'S LIBERAL FEDERATION.

The Annual Council meetings of the Federation will be held on June 14th, 15th and 16th at St. James' Hall. Mrs. Edward Pease of Oxted and Limpsfield Women's Liberal Association will move the following resolution on the taxation of land values:—

"That the Council of the Women's Liberal Federation, recognising that the Land Clauses of the Budget did much to rally the Liberal forces in the industrial centres at the recent election, urges the Government to proceed with the valuation of the land with all possible speed, in order that the Taxation of Land Values may be put into operation in urban and rural districts, thus stimulating the use of land, increasing the amount of employment, and presenting an effective alternative to Tariff Reform."

SCOTTISH NOTES AND NEWS.

The officials of the Scottish League have been busy during the past month in connection with the removal of the offices to 67, West Nile Street, Glasgow. The members of the League and many adherents in the different progressive organisations throughout the city and district were keenly disappointed at the postponement of the Lord Advocate's meeting, which was fixed for the 17th May, owing to the lamented death of King Edward.

DUMFRIESSHIRE.

The Political Economy Class conducted at Annan during the winter months by Mr. Norman McLennan closed its session at the end of March; but the enthusiasm for the study of this important science continues among all the students, who followed the course to its close. On Thursday, April 14th, Mr. McLennan was entertained to tea by the members of the Class, and presented with a souvenir in the shape of a complete edition of the works of Shakespeare in 40 volumes, encased in a stained oak bookcase. Among those present were Town Councillors Joseph Jardine and Thomas Farish, both members of the Class, and Mr. and Mrs. Harry Llewelyn Davies. The tea was provided by Mrs. Watt, and the presentation made by Miss Dyson, two of the lady students. Mr. McLennan continues to be inundated with answers to the examination paper which he set for the Class, and by questions of all kinds in the higher stages of Political Economy. Mr. McLennan conducts these classes in an absolutely non-political spirit, and sternly refuses to draw any practical lessons from the theoretic truths of Political Economy. But many of the questions now being asked of him refer to the bearing which the Law of the Rate of Exchange has on Tariff Reform, and which the Law of Rent has on the Taxation of Land Values. To all of these questions he replies by saying that—the Laws of Political Economy being known, every one must make his or her own deductions.

On April 22nd, at a Social Meeting of the Ecclefechan Branch of the Dumfriesshire League of Young Liberals, Mr. Harry Llewelyn Davies and Mr. Norman McLennan spoke; and on April 25th both of them were also present at a small meeting at Kirkpatrick, at which a Branch of the League was formed. On April 30th Mr. McLennan and Mr. Davies addressed a meeting in the Schoolroom at Chapelknowe—a moorland district situated on the ridge between Kirtle-dale and Eskdale. Here Mr. McLennan was subjected to half-an-hour's heckling by an able Tariff Reformer—a schoolmaster, temporarily conducting the Moorland School at Chapelknowe. On Saturday, May 7th, Mr. McLennan and Mr. Davies addressed a meeting at Moffat. On Monday, May 9th, Mr. A. W. Madsen, of the Staff of the United Committee, was the principal speaker at a meeting at Kelhead.

WHAT THE ENGLISH LEAGUE IS DOING.

The following meetings have been addressed during the past month:—

- May 1.—North Camberwell Radical Club. Fredk. Verinder.
- " 7.—Hammersmith League of Young Liberals. J. W. Graham Peace.
- " 12.—Queen's Road Council School, Dalston. Fredk. Verinder.
- " 23.—Bevois Ward Liberal Association, Southampton. Jas. Erving.
- " 25.—Herts Chamber of Agriculture. T. W. Toovey opens debate.
- " 25.—Keighley, Town Hall Square. Tom Woffenden.
- " 25.—Co-operative Society's Rooms, Fratton. —. King.

At a meeting of the Executive held on May 10th, the following Resolution was moved by Mr. C. W. Loveridge, seconded by Mr. A. Powell, and unanimously adopted:—"That this Executive heartily congratulates the Right Hon. D. Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the passing into law of the Finance Bill, 1909-10; expresses its gratification at the setting-up of machinery for the valuation on a capital basis of the whole of the land in the United Kingdom; and urges the Government to complete the valuation with all possible expedition, in order that it may be made the basis of such a system of taxation, national and local, as will relieve the materials, processes and results of industry from the burdens of taxation and rating."

The death and funeral of the King, and the consequent suspension of ordinary political activities, has greatly reduced the number of meetings during the past month and in prospect. Advantage is being taken of the interval, to prepare an extended list of organisations to which the lecture circular of the League for the coming season may be sent. The secretary is grateful to those members who have already sent him useful lists, and will be glad to receive the addresses of debating societies, political clubs and associations, or other organisations which organise lectures or discussions, in order that the circular may be sent

to them in due course. As many Conservatives are favourable to rating reform on a land values basis, it is hoped that some Conservative clubs may be willing to invite a lecturer from the league.

The General Secretary regrets to hear that Mr. J. H. McGuigan, a member of the Central Council of the League and an able and untiring worker for the cause in Portsmouth, lately met with an accident, and has had to undergo an operation. Mr. McGuigan is, however, making good progress, and hopes to be able to take up his share of the work again early this month.

Members are requested to note that the Annual Meeting of the League will be held in the Essex (Large) Hall, Essex Street, Strand, London, on Wednesday, July 20th, at 8 p.m. Fuller particulars will be given in our next issue.

JUNE MEETINGS.

- Wed. 1.—Keighley, Town Hall Square. J. H. Robson and W. T. Hawkins.
 Wed. 15.—Keighley, Town Hall Square. Ashley Mitchell.
 Sun. 19.—Peel Institute Men's Meeting, Hugh Myddelton School, St. James's Walk, Clerkenwell, E.C. Fredk. Verinder, 3.30 p.m.

COLONIAL AND FOREIGN.

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

A Dispatch of May 17th says it is officially stated that in view of the increase in production and the general development of the agricultural, pastoral, and mining industries in New South Wales, Mr. Wade, the Premier, is taking steps to provide new railway facilities linking up the main trunk lines in the interior with the neutral outlets on the seaboard. Mr. Wade is appointing a Royal Commission to report on the decentralization of railway traffic and the development of new ports on the north and south coasts.

WEST AUSTRALIA.

A Reuter message of May 4th says: "The Minister of Lands reports that last year 1,776,730 acres of agricultural land were surveyed for selection, while during the last ten months no less than two and a half million acres have been surveyed, showing how the demand for land has increased. Against each block is set the amount which the Government Agricultural Bank is prepared to advance to the settler. So great is the demand from all quarters that the Government is unable to obtain a sufficient number of surveyors for the work."

CANADA.

HARDSHIPS OF THE NORTH-WEST.

A recently published book, "The Riders of the Plains," by A. L. Haydon, consisting mainly of an account of the duties and adventures of the Royal North-West Police of Canada, incidentally throws much light on the difficulties and dangers awaiting the emigrants to that country, as may be seen from the following interesting extract:—

"Another unpleasant duty that a mounted policeman may be called upon at any time to perform is the escort of a lunatic from an outlying settlement, where no provision is made for such cases, to some town where he may receive proper attention. It is a sad feature of life in the unsettled parts of the north-west that some would-be home-steaders there are unable to stand the strain of the continuous heavy work, and endure the awful loneliness of their situation. In the summer, life may be easier to bear; it is the winter, when all the prairie is one vast white sheet of snow for months on end, and communication with the outside world is more or less cut off, that the mind falls to brooding and comes near to breaking-point if it does not actually give way. It is a case too often of the man being in the wrong hole. To wrest a living from the soil while condemned to practical isolation for a great part of the year, needs a strong man; not everyone can make the sudden change from the life of the town to that of the wilds and be adamant against failing crops, business worries of all kinds, and, not least, the oppression of solitude."

LESSONS FOR A NEW COUNTRY.

Addressing the Canadian Club, Toronto, on April 18th on "Some Lessons from Britain for Life in Canada," Dr. J. A. Macdonald, Editor of the *TORONTO GLOBE*, spoke on the land question as follows:—

One of the campaign songs in Britain was, "God Made the Land for the People." The sentiment of that refrain needs to be brought home to the people of Canada. Our country is too young to feel the pressure and the pain of the landless people of Britain. But a century of history will make as great a difference in Canada as it has made in England and Scotland. If we squander the resources of land with which this young nation is so richly dowered a generation will arise whose curses on our heads will be as bitter as those that now fall on the Kings and nobles who alienated from the people the lands in Britain a century or two ago.

And not the land only, but all the great natural resources of the country. God made them for the people too. He who put fertility into the soil, put electric energy into the waterfalls, and ore into the rocks, and timber in the woods, and fish into the waters. He made all these for the people. No King, no Parliament, no one generation has a right to alienate from the people's use for all time these natural resources which God made for the people's good. I am not talking Government ownership, or municipal ownership, or private ownership. I am asserting the principle that, whoever may be given control and the right to operate, the objective of it all must be the interests of the many and not the few. We in Canada to-day are on the eve of unexampled developments. If great corporations or syndicates are allowed to control our resources of land, or water, or mine, or wood, our children and our children's children will have to bear the curse of monopoly and absentee landlordism that has vexed Britain for many generations.

The social situation in British cities is the outgrowth of the land situation. Just because the people were driven from the land, just because they were compelled to follow their industries in the towns, there were created those conditions which made the slum inevitable. The crowding of people into industrial centres produced unemployment, and unemployment produced degeneracy. That forcing of industries in Britain resulted in over-production for which there was no market, because the people were not on the land. The depopulation of rural Britain destroyed the home market for the British mills and factories. In the United States thirty-seven per cent. of those reported as employed in occupations are on the land, producing wealth from the land, and consuming the output of the factories. In Germany thirty-nine per cent. of those so employed are on the land, in France forty-four per cent., but in Britain only ten per cent. of those employed in occupations are on the land. No wonder there is no home market: no wonder over-production in the factories produces congestion at home. No wonder congestion produces unemployment, and by the law of life unemployment leads to degeneracy and to the slums.

That law holds for Canada as well as for Britain. We have the beginnings of slum conditions in every one of our large Canadian cities; all that is required is time. Time and the down-grade tendency of life will produce in our midst the results deplored in the old land. For this reason the utmost official care should be taken in the planting of towns, in their surveys, the width of their streets, allotments for parks and gardens, and all those considerations for public health and happiness which reason and experience have approved. It will not do to allow the commercial enterprise of land speculators or the cupidity of great corporations to determine the physical conditions under which coming generations shall be born and shall live. Some of the large commercial centres, like Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Fort William and Winnipeg, are not without their social perils.

Congestion, unemployment, drink and vice—these four will convert any district into a slum in two generations. They say in Britain it is not more than three, or at the most four, generations from the health and vigour of the moor and the glens to the fecklessness and despair of the city slum. And this is a question for you, members of the Canadian Club. It concerns every one of you. No man is safe, no class of the community is safe, if there is allowed a festering and a fevered slum within the radius of our city. The down-town tenement is in touch with the up-town villa. Every man of you who cares for the good name and the good life of our city is under obligation to have

concern for everything that makes for industrial efficiency, social happiness, and a high standard of life. Democracy means that we are all members one of another, and that if one member suffers degeneracy and decay all the other members suffer with him.

PROGRESS IN LAND VALUES TAXATION.

The DAILY CHRONICLE of May 19th published the following statement from a Canadian correspondent:—

The manner in which the land tax system which obtains in Canada is developing affords, I think, a remarkable object-lesson to this country. A telegram from Vancouver, the splendid city of British Columbia, on the shores of the Pacific, states that the municipality—land taxes are collected and “operated” by the local and city governing bodies throughout the Canadian Dominion—has just adopted what is known as the single-tax system, as applied to the taxation of buildings on real estate, which means that there will henceforth be no tax on buildings at all.

Thus the position in Vancouver is the exact antithesis of that in England, under your present antiquated land laws.

In England the poor man who by industry and perseverance gets on and builds houses or shops, or some form of property, is taxed up to the hilt, while the landowner, paying little or nothing to the State in the form of taxes, is all the time pocketing unearned increment resultant from the enhanced value of the land created by another man's enterprise. Canada taxes the idle landowner, but encourages the citizen by letting his houses go untaxed. So that the man who leaves his land idle, puts no buildings up at all, and waits for other people to put its value up, is treated rather as an enemy of the State, in contrast to him who uses it for the purpose it was intended—viz., the support of human life.

Throughout the whole of the Canadian Dominion land is taxed by the several municipalities upon the basis of what the land could be sold for, so that it may be pointed out to the selfish interests that are crying out in England about taxes on land being “robbery,” “spoliation,” and the like, that in asserting this they are insulting every Canadian, and the splendid system of land taxation they have, through the foresight and wisdom of their legislators, inaugurated.

In Vancouver (my native city), and in all parts of Canada, the people are heartily in favour of Mr. Lloyd George's Budget proposals in regard to the land, as Mr. Joseph Fels has recently stated in an interview in London.

Let the electors of England remember that land taxes are in force in practically every one of the British Colonies, and see to it that the selfishness of landlords and aristocrats, which would not be tolerated one moment in Canada, shall not stand in the way of so grand a reform.

Within recent months the movement for the Taxation of Land Values has spread itself rapidly and widely over Canada. It is not only that in Vancouver the City Council has adopted the Single Tax, but throughout the whole Dominion the Press has given itself up largely to the advocacy of this reform. The OTTAWA CITIZEN has taken a leading part in the agitation, and in addition some fifty papers in Ontario are pressing the Government to move in this direction. The CALGARY HERALD has also taken up the question, and every sign points to some practical achievement in the near future.

SOUTH AFRICA.

UNDEVELOPED LAND AND HIGH RENTS IN PRETORIA.

The MANCHESTER GUARDIAN of May 14th had the following statement on this problem from its Johannesburg correspondent:

The present position in Pretoria is an argument for the principles embodied in Mr. Lloyd George's Budget. The old Transvaal capital has been chosen as the executive centre of United South Africa, and with the coming into force next month of the Union, it is expected that some 2,000 civil servants and officials, most of them married, will be added to the existing population. The immediate consequence is that rents are now bounding upwards at the rate of 25 per cent. a month, and the first new comers find themselves obliged to pay a quarter of their incomes in rent, while their successors, it is expected, will probably have to pay half. The consequent reduction in the purchasing power of salaries has caused a violent reaction among officials in the coastal districts, who are now desperately

anxious to escape so-called promotion to the seat of the Union Executive Government.

Besides, not only is the housing cramped, but there is a general lack of conveniences in the older towns. The existing population is also groaning under the higher expense of living. Thousands of artisans are therefore to be imported to execute enormous Government and municipal programmes of improvement, which will cost a total of four millions, during the next four years. At present houses are unprocurable. The existing artisans have suffered an increase of a pound a month in rent and expect another increase of the same amount. Wages are therefore likely to rise pretty sharply before long.

Pretoria showed a similar inelasticity in its slowness to recover after the declaration of peace, when owing to the dearth of land, artisans and professional men, returning to the city, moved in a wholesale manner some miles distant from the city into boggy and malarious suburbs; the efficient municipalising thereof will involve the community in an outlay in drains and the like of some three millions sterling.

There is nevertheless plenty of land vacant in Pretoria, but it is tightly held, and every member of the Council is said to be interested in one way or another. Meanwhile Rand builders are speculatively laying out new suburbs four miles from the centre of Pretoria.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. Royden Powell writing from St. Peters, South Australia, on April 20th, says:—

I am watching with interest the doings in the English House of Commons as well as I can through the imperfect and distorted cables which our papers print. The Labour Party in this State at the elections a few weeks ago gained a majority and have now 22 members to 20 Conservatives and Independents. There are six Single Taxers in the 22 Labour members and one Single Taxer in the 20 Independents.

A new plank in the Labour Platform is a proposal to abolish income tax derived from the produce of land (farmers and stock raisers will only receive this exemption I think) also to lower railway fares and freights (the Government run the railways here) and the deficiency to be made up by our increase in the all-round Land Values Tax. All-round is the distinctive term to progressive land tax. So we are hoping great things from our State Labour Party.

In the Commonwealth election held last Wednesday the Labour Party swept the polls, in the Senate gaining the whole 18 seats. Only half the Senators come out each three years. These 18 Labour Senators and 13 Conservatives who did not stand this election will have to come before the electors. In the House of Representatives, Labour secured 42 seats to the Fusion Party's 31, and Independent members secured two seats.

The Federal Labour Party propose a progressive tax on Land Values starting at a penny in the £ on land of the value of £5,000 and increasing to fourpence in the £ on the largest estates. The object of the tax is to make the owners of large and valuable tracts of land sell out to smaller farmers. In my opinion the progressive Land Tax will fail to do a great deal of good because owners of large estates will nominally divide them up among the members of their families in order to avoid the progressive incidence of the tax.

Well, the S.A. Single Tax League is getting a move on. At a meeting last night we decided to hold something every Thursday evening during May. We are going to push “Land Values Taxation for Local Purposes” at the Municipal Elections towards the end of the year, and we are getting to work on that shortly. The Labour Party are pledged to support Land Values Assessment for local purposes, and that seems where we will make the earliest advance on right lines. There are already two municipalities, Thebarton and Moonta, rating on Land Values. Building fees in Thebarton have increased 250 per cent. since the adoption of Land Values Assessment.

UNITED STATES.

TOM L. JOHNSON.

Tom L. Johnson has arrived at his home in Cleveland, Ohio, safe and feeling all the better of his trip. He writes:—“I had a very successful voyage and my friends met me with open arms—after a successful escape through the custom-house. I would not have missed my trip to Great Britain even if I knew it would shorten my life. The love and affection heaped on me there will

always be one of my dearest recollections." In a later communication he says:—"I seem to be getting better every day. I remember a lot of the good stories and have told them to the boys here. Things are looking first-class, politically. The revolution is on here strongly as it is all over the United States. Give my love to all."

DEATH OF MRS. F. M. MILNE.

Mrs. Frances Margaret Milne, known to many of our readers as the authoress of several beautiful poems, inspired by the philosophy and religion of Henry George's teachings, died at San Luis Obispo, California, on April 21st. Mrs. Milne was for many years librarian of the public library in that town. She was one of Henry George's earliest and oldest friends. At this time we may reprint the first verse of the poem she wrote on the death of Henry George:—

Hast thou a requiem strain,
Glad, free and strong?
Meet for the glorious life,
Sorrow would wrong.
Tears for the vanquished, the weak,
Crushed in the fray;
This is a conqueror's soul,
Passing to-day.

SPAIN.

Senor Antonio Albendin, of San Fernando, Spain, had an article in the *HERALDO DE MADRID* on March 26th, in which he gives an account of the fight over the Budget in Great Britain. The article was illustrated by portraits of Henry George and Lloyd George. Senor Albendin also describes the progress of the "Land Values" movement in Spain, and tells us that there are men at work in Austria and Italy promoting this subject.

ARGENTINE.

THE PROBLEM OF LAND TENURE.

The *ECONOMIST* of May 21st describes part of the Argentine problem in the following passage:—

"The system upon which large areas of arable land are exploited in this country has been explained by Mr. Lahitte in his report to the Minister of Agriculture, upon the petition of certain 'colonisers' in the Provinces of Buenos Ayres and Santa Fé. The petitioners ask for a loan from the Bank of the Nation of £43,750 to enable them to purchase seed for sowing the 292,500 acres of land belonging to them, and divided into 715 farms. These farms are let to agriculturists, little better than labourers, without capital, who either pay a rent of about 8s. 5d. per acre, or give the 'colonisers' from 20 to 30 per cent. of the produce. With good crops, the 'colonisers' make an enormous profit upon the capital advanced to the farmers, stated to have been £201,250 in this last season, but if the crops fail the tenants can neither pay rent nor return the money advanced to them for cultivating the land and for the maintenance of their families. This is what has occurred this year, and it is alleged, and Mr. Lahitte verified the statement, that the farmers in the district to which the petitions relate have not even seed for resowing the land. Still, it is obvious, as he says, that the Government cannot reasonably be expected to help speculators out of their difficulties, for many other 'colonisers' are in a similar predicament, and £875,000 or more would be needed for assisting them effectually. The Land Office has sold by auction this week 2,268,470 acres of land in the Rio Negro Territory. The sales realised £662,699, or an average of 5s. 10d. per acre. The payment of the purchase money may be by 14 annual instalments, without interest and without any stipulation as to occupation; therefore it may be considered that the purchasers were, in general, speculative, as the land (a large portion of which is now of little value) will be improved by the irrigation works that will be carried out in the Territory. A large area of public land will also be offered for sale by the Land Office (but not by auction), the Minister of Agriculture having ordered the formation of an agricultural and pastoral colony in the Pampa Territory, to be divided into lots of 1,250 acres each, the price of which is to be 2s. 10d. per acre, besides the surveyor's fees for measurement. The purchaser of a lot must cultivate at least 62½ acres, and invest in buildings and livestock not less than £131 5s. The Government of the Province of Mendoza has also sold, this

week, some of the public land, measuring 590,690 acres, which realised £156,454. The Province is in need of the money, for the proceeds of the recent loan have been almost all absorbed in the cost of the improvements of the City of Mendoza, which the ex-Governor Civit (whose term of office has just ended) carried out during the last three years. The expenditure has added greatly to the attractions of the city, and has caused a great rise in the value of building land. The land sold is situated at the south of San Rafael, which is growing rapidly in importance, especially by reason of the discovery of petroleum springs, which yield large quantities of oil of good quality."

The agriculturalists of Argentina are victims of a vicious land system. If they raise bad crops they suffer hardships, and if they raise good crops they are very little better off, for the "colonisers" take all the cream off the milk. When the "colonisers" can't get their rent they appeal to the State to loan them money in order to put the agriculturalists in a rent-producing condition.

It seems to us a pretty unreasonable scheme to sell large tracts of land "which is growing rapidly in importance" in order to cause a rise in the value of building land, for the benefit of private speculators. A good measure of the Taxation of Land Values is sadly needed in this country.

DENMARK.

THE DANISH PEASANTRY'S POLITICAL PROGRAMME.

It is but ten years ago since the first Peasants' Union was started in Denmark with avowed political intent, such associations as had previously been formed being more in the nature of social or agricultural societies with philanthropic or educational aims, perhaps tinged with a certain class consciousness. But with the opening of the new century fresh influences might be felt working here and there in the island of Zealand, that first had tangible results at the small town of Koge in 1902, when a conference of these political Peasants' Unions passed a resolution in favour of the Taxation of Land Values. Three years later, so rapidly had the Peasants' Unions taken up this question, the left wing of the Liberal party formally included it in their official programme, and the following year the "Reforming Liberals," the largest group of the Parliamentary Liberals, also embodied it in their programme, the Socialists meanwhile lending it somewhat tacit support.

The peasantry, however, were not yet quite unanimous in their attitude. In Jutland, especially in certain districts where the Socialist influence predominated, some opposition was offered to the Henry Georgists, but in 1909 this was finally overcome and all the Jutland Unions agreed in conference to place the Taxation of Land Values at the top of their political programme. It must be remembered that the majority of these small holders own their little farms, and at first sight a proposal to tax the value of their land would not unnaturally raise alarm. But when it was made clear that the proposal was to relieve them of other taxes, taxes on their industry, their buildings, their purchases from abroad—their good sense and receptivity for new ideas soon made them realise that even a twenty shillings in the £ tax on their land would be a bagatelle compared with the taxes they are now paying. The relative importance of their interests as landowners and as land users, *i.e.*, as workers, was quickly brought home to them, and a few weeks ago, at the first congress of all the Peasants' Unions from all parts of the country, a manifesto was issued destined to have far-reaching effects in the Danish political situation.

A few brief extracts from this document will serve to illustrate the grasp the leaders of this movement have of political economy, as of their saving common sense and moderation.

"The right of the people to the soil of their country is confirmed and amplified. The value of the land, alike in towns and country, being due to presence and activities of the community, our object should be to secure such value for the community through taxation.

"Pending the full application of such a tax, the existing tax on property and incomes should be retained, but on a strongly graduated scale.

"Further to assist the working classes to gain access to land, the Government should lend money to small holders, allotment societies, building societies and the like, provided such loans involve no loss to the community.

"The tenure in such cases to be freehold, but subject to the taxation of the unimproved value.

"The existing customs duties imposed for revenue should be gradually abolished.

"Protective customs duties also to be abolished gradually and systematically.

"Such undertakings as are by law or nature monopolies should be conducted with regard to the interests of the public, and if necessary to secure this, should be taken over by the State or Local Authority."

It will be seen that there is no demand for special privileges for any one class, not even in the shape of loans at unduly low interest. Such loans are to involve no loss to the State. Elsewhere the peasants carry this principle to the length of deprecating the special privilege of the existing "Domestic Animals Act" on the ground that it is in favour of only a section of the community. Though Free-Traders in the fullest sense, they are yet men of the world enough to realise that the present tariff has built up vested interests which call for due consideration in its gradual removal. Income and property taxes are only tolerated in the transition period till the single tax on Land Values is sufficient to enable all such imposts to be done away with. That the organised peasantry of Denmark is fully imbued with the teachings of Henry George is clear. It has nailed the flag of "The Single Tax" to the political mast, and it has both the will and the power to make its doctrine the law of Denmark. Speed the day.

C. W. S.

FREEHOLD ESTATES IN JAVA.

From the TIMES of April 22nd.

The fears regarding the tenure of land in Java, awakened by a Board of Trade notice, have already been allayed by further information from the Consul-General for the Netherlands. A Bill introduced by the Dutch Government provides for restoration to the State Domain of the so-called *particulière landerijen*, which has nothing to do, as the Consul-General rightly pointed out, with the estates held under a lease, the usual form of granting land to Europeans for agricultural purposes. The measure which is now submitted to the States General, and has repeatedly been promised as one of the most necessary items on the programme of Dutch colonial reform, has been hanging fire for a long time. Apart from contracts with the semi-independent Princes of Surakarta and Djokjakarta, there are in Java several ways of acquiring landed property, according to the object in view, such as building and the raising of produce for the European market, &c. In the latter case land is generally acquired on lease for a term of 75 years, the rights so conferred passing to the heirs of the original lessee. Only 434 estates are held in free ownership, and the history of this freehold system is rather curious.

After the taking of Jacatra, in 1619, part of the neighbouring country, abandoned by the natives, was given out, first under leases, later in freehold, to intended colonists, whose presence and improvements were supposed to ensure safety to the new settlement, henceforth to be known under the name of Batavia. The calculation went wrong; outside the city gates marauders and outlaws terrorized the whole neighbourhood almost unchecked, and the situation did not improve when separate tracts were leased to native chiefs, who, in return, at a fixed price, had to deliver certain products of the soil to the East India Company. The district round Batavia only began to enjoy anything like order and tranquillity in the middle of the 18th century, with the direct result that the private estates rose in value. The first sale on a large scale, as Professor de Louter informs us, took place in 1705, when Dopok and Seringsing were bought by Chastelein, member of the Indian Council, who transferred all his property to his emancipated slaves on condition of their embracing Christianity. In 1745 van Imhoff purchased Bogor for a song, and built the palace of Buitenzorg, that beautiful country-seat being conveyed from one Governor-General to the next until Daendels divided it into lots which he sold with great profit to the highest bidders, reserving nothing beyond the site of the palace and the grounds occupied by the world-famous botanical garden. To aid the depleted treasury Daendels sold the better part of the later residences, Probolinggo and Besuki, which were re-purchased by Raffles, who, on the other hand, disposed at a ridiculously low valuation of vast areas in Krawang, Samarang, and the Preanger Regencies. Especially the doings with the Sukabumi estate, re-purchased under van der Capellen, will be long remembered as a characteristic instance of the land jobbing indulged in. Since 1816 no further sales of State Domain have occurred in Java. Government abstaining from

partnership in such deals, though that mode of raising money was often advocated—e.g., in 1849. Since 1854 the *Regeeringsreglement*, the mother of laws for the Dutch East Indies, expressly forbids the transfer of land to private owners, with the sole exception of small parcels for the extension of towns and villages, and for the erection of industrial establishments.

Rights of Owners.

But the *particulière landerijen* remained and remain a sore in the body politic on other accounts. Forming *imperium in imperio*, their owners exercise in several directions almost sovereign rights. They enjoy a revenue from the fields cultivated by the natives, consisting in the *tjukeh*—i.e., a share in the produce, levied at harvest time; or in a *contingent*—i.e., a share annually agreed upon at the ripening of the crop. They dispose at pleasure of the land not under cultivation within their boundaries, save the privileges of the natives with respect to pasture grounds and the gathering of forest produce. They are entitled to call the natives out in forced labour, one day every week, for work in the fields cultivated exclusively for their own benefit, and for the repairing of roads, bridges, water conduits &c. Government has guaranteed protection of the natives against extortion and oppression, keeping in its hands the administration of justice and the police, leaving, however, the appointment and the remuneration of the chiefs entrusted with police functions to the freeholders. With these three-cornered relations between them, the natives, and the Government officials, in many respects but loosely defined, there was always plenty of room for friction, as proved by the remarkable Tjomas affair of 1887. In that particular case the trouble originated in the falling out of Mr. van Rees, then seated on the Vice-regal throne, with his old friend Mr. de Sturler, owner of the flourishing estate.

Labours of the freehold Commission.

Though the owner of Tjomas was vindicated, this *cause célèbre* once more drew attention to the disadvantages of the freehold system, and in 1890 a Commission was appointed to revise the regulations, issued in 1836, for the *particulière landerijen* to the west of the Tjimanook, and to consider the possibility of their repurchase by the State. The distinction of freehold in Java to the west and to the east of that particular river was made because the private estates to the west (345 in number, with a population estimated at 1,150,000) are of much more importance than those to the east (89, with a population estimated at 125,000). The Commission began and continued its labours after the fashion of Dutch East Indian Commissions. To repeat the information vouchsafed in the States-General by successive Ministers for the Colonies: in 1891 and 1892 initiatory steps were taken for collecting data and a deep study of the question; in 1893 the Commission was busy examining the data collected; in 1894 the Governor-General had written that the question was still being considered by the Commission; in 1895 no further news had reached The Hague from Batavia; and in 1896 the Commission had thought it desirable to spend more time on preliminary investigation, while an expert had been directed to compile an historical-juridical review of the institution of freehold in Java as a guide for future proceedings and the framing of new regulations. In 1897 the new regulations were under consideration, and the Minister felt confident that the Commission would soon finish its task; in 1898 the Commission was still revising the old regulations; in 1899 the Governor-General van der Wijck had paid 30,000fl. to the retired Resident Faes, the soul of the Commission, 20,000fl. as compensation for expenses incurred, and 10,000fl. as reward for his services. The end, however, was not yet.

The Present Position.

The freehold problem, then moving towards a solution with, for Holland, phenomenal speed, seven years elapsed, in addition to the ten of the commissal stage, before the question was deemed ripe for Parliamentary debate, Resident Faes's suggestion eliciting sharp criticism, especially from the side of Mr. Sibenius Trip, retired President of the Supreme Court at Batavia and a most competent judge, whose arguments in the subsequent controversy anent feudal and allodial rights, &c., carried great weight. In 1907 the States-General were invited to lend their co-operation to an experiment with the re-purchase of the freehold estate Nanggoong. The second chamber declined the invitation. Reporting on the Budget for the current year, the Minister for the Colonies now in office, following the custom established by his predecessors since 1887, announced his intention to try once more, and on a broader basis, at the first

opportunity. In spite of this, the estate Kandanghauer was singled out for a second experiment on a small scale. Persistent rumours of the transfer of the combined Pamanukan and Tjiasem estates and the Djasinga estate to syndicates working with British capital may have had something to do with his promise actually blossoming into a project of law. If he gets it passed there will be reason to rejoice. The *particuliere landerijen* sorely impede the development of those residencies where they most abound. Quite a number of them, under control of Chinamen, are breeding-places of all sorts of iniquity—haunts of opium smugglers, fugitives from justice, robbers, and thieves who prey upon the villagers and infest even the environs of Batavia, making the outskirts of the capital itself notoriously unsafe, reminding one of the crude early days of the East India Company. No one expects the Bill now introduced to perform miracles in this or in any other direction. Supposing that it does become law, it is to be hoped that it will be less of a delusion than so many Colonial Bills of the past; assuming further that the law does hold its own against the adverse claims of penurious finance, the greatest stumbling-block of Dutch Colonial administration, the expropriation of the freehold estates, involving large disbursements, will yet proceed at an exceedingly slow rate. But certainly a beginning should be made in the removal of this evil of too long standing. And after Java, the exterior possessions await their turn—the west coast of Sumatra, Bencoolen, Celebes, and the Banda group.

"MINING ROYALTIES."

By W. B. NORTHPROP.

(In memory of the Whitehaven Colliery Disaster, May 12th, 1910.)

- "Five miles under the sea
We slave from morn till night,
With never a ray of the blessed sun
To cheer us with its light;
With frames bent down by toil,
With lungs belogged with dust,
We miners work in the seams below
For the wage that brings a crust.
- "Pick—Pick—Pick
In the tunnel's endless gloom,
And every blow that our strong arms strike,
But helps to carve our tomb;
But what is that to those
Who live by our grim toil?
For 'mining royalties' must be made
To swell the landlord's spoil!
- "O, ye who sit by the coals
As they glow in the cheery grate,
Do ye ever think of our fearsome lives,
Or bemoan our children's fate?
Our children reared in rags,
Our wives but drudges and slaves,
While all our days are turned to night
Five miles beneath the waves!
- "They tell us in the books
No Briton is a slave;
But we are owned, both body and soul,
Five miles beneath the waves.
We toil from morn till night,
But not for our own gain,
But only that 'royalties' may be wrought
From out our sweat and pain.

"O, ye who see the Light,
And know that God is just,
Will ye not help to put things right?
To claim us more than a crust?
O, not the crust of toil,
But the fulness of our own;
For now our children cry for bread,
And they give them but a stone!

"Yes; open your purses wide,
To aid our present need—
But more we ask than this alone:
The death of private greed!
O, free for us the land,
Restore to us our own,
So that our children who cry for bread
May not receive a stone."

"LAND AND LABOUR: LESSONS FROM BELGIUM."

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

Publishers, Macmillan & Co., London. Price 10s. 6d. Post free, 11s. from these offices.

Though evidently somewhat prepossessed in favour of small holdings, Mr. Rowntree's searching investigations, which leave no branch of his subject untouched, have led him to the conclusion that: "Belgian experience shows that though there are many advantages in the wide distribution of the ownership of land, in the ultimate solution of the land problem many other factors must be taken into consideration. . . . Her example must serve as a warning. It shows us the wonderful results that can be achieved in agriculture, but it shows us also that these have mainly benefited, not the workers, but the accidental owners of the soil."

Nor will the reader who follows Mr. Rowntree's most careful investigations doubt for a moment the truth of this conclusion. Time after time was it forced upon his attention how futile had been all the efforts of statesmen, philanthropists and social reformers of the familiar type, to improve the economic condition of the masses of the people, and how impossible it was for these permanently to benefit even by their own almost super-human efforts. For all their efforts simply resulted in increased land values, in an increase in the rent and price of land. Light railways, cheap capital or credit, the use of chemical manures, improvements in stock breeding, new varieties of crops, the spread of agricultural education, low rates for transport on the State railways, co-operation whether in dairy farming or for the sale or purchase of commodities, import duties avowedly imposed for the benefit of agriculture, all these have been tried and found to have the same result, viz., to increase the price which land-users have to pay for the use of land. Every successful effort reveals the same effect. To use our author's own words:—"Unfortunately, a farm tenant cannot permanently better his condition to any great extent by improving his methods of cultivation or by taking advantage of co-operation, for no sooner does he do this than his improved position tempts more men to seek for land, thus forcing land values up still further. Indeed, it may be said that farmers are in the long run penalised for improving their methods of cultivation."

Though primarily a land of small holdings, yet, as Mr. Rowntree repeatedly reminds his readers, "Two-thirds of the land of Belgium is cultivated by tenants and only one-third by owners." The effect of high land values on tenant cultivators is admirably summarised by our author as follows:—

"It has been shown how many are the advantages enjoyed by the agriculturalists of Belgium: among them, ample means of cheap and rapid transit, a good system of agricultural education, and co-operative societies everywhere for all kinds of purposes, including the provision of capital and the insurance of live-stock at very low rates. Surely with all those blessings, their life should be almost ideal! But is it? A closer acquaintance with the small holder shows us that although he seldom, perhaps never, suffers from want, he generally lives roughly, and, except in winter, works unreasonably long hours, for low pay. . . . The immediate cause of this is that the rent of land is so high—twice as high as in 1846, and nearly twice as high as in England at the present time. This being

The IDEAL Policy

ISSUED BY
The CITY LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, Ltd.
(Formerly the British Homes Assurance Corporation, Ltd.),
PROVIDES
LIFE ASSURANCE WITHOUT MEDICAL EXAMINATION.
For full particulars of this unique scheme send post-card to
M. GREGORY, Managing Director, 6, Paul St., Finsbury, London, E.C.
AGENTS WANTED.—EXCELLENT PROSPECTS.

so, the tenant cannot pay it without living sparsely and working excessively hard. . . ."

"But what of those who are proprietors of their holdings, a class by whom a third part of the land of Belgium is cultivated? Is their lot a desirable one, and does the solution of the problem of poverty in agricultural districts lie in the direction of making the tenants into proprietors?" Answering these pertinent questions, Mr. Rowntree points out that, "The peasant proprietor's mode of life is very similar to that of the tenant. Both have to live sparsely and work extremely hard to make a living." He gives the following interesting explanation of this fact:—

"This may at first sight seem an extraordinary fact, for one would suppose that high land values, which affect the tenant so adversely, would operate in favour of the (cultivating) owner. The explanation of the seeming anomaly is that land belonging to a peasant is scarcely ever sold except on the death of the owner. When a peasant dies leaving his property to his children, those who wish to carry on agriculture find that their personal shares are insufficient and, consequently, are compelled to rent or to buy more land. If they buy, the high price which has to be paid makes the purchase burdensome. It is true that the children who forsake agriculture for the town benefit by high land values, whether they sell their shares or let them, but those who remain agriculturalists suffer, as do all other peasant proprietors who have not enough land on which to live comfortably and wish to add to their holdings. . . ."

"Thus we see," continues our author, "that in the case of the peasant proprietors, as well as in that of the tenants, the immediate cause of the hardness of their lives is not that they cannot produce enough from the soil, but that land values are so high."

Mr. Rowntree then answers an objection which would occur to many of his readers:—

"It may be argued that since there are nearly 720,000 landowners in Belgium, the distribution of unearned increment is already so general that this question need not trouble us. But although land is much more widely distributed than in most countries, and enormously more so than in Britain, even in Belgium it is true that 62 per cent. of the land is owned by 2½ per cent. of the total owners, while four-fifths of the 720,000 owners have less than five acres each."

Mr. Rowntree subsequently gives us the following necessary warning:—

"If even in Belgium the large landowners absorb the lion's share of the profits of agriculture, it seems probable that in Britain, where land monopolies are far stronger, the problem of unearned agricultural increments might become even more serious if agriculture were successfully developed. Such a contingency cannot be lightly dismissed when we recall what has actually happened in connection with urban land values in the great cities of the United Kingdom."

In closing we would express our grateful thanks to Mr. Rowntree for an admirable piece of work, which will be invaluable to political students and social reformers all over the world. He teaches us what steps are necessary in order to promote agricultural industry, which is important; but he also teaches us what steps are necessary if the lion's share of any such increased productivity is not to accrue to those who, though they may take no part in the work, "happen to own the agricultural land," which is of far greater importance. The chief lesson to be drawn from the experience of Belgium might, we think, have been expressed even more strongly; but Mr. Rowntree's moderation should help to commend his work to all interested in public questions. Even the most bitter opponent of the Taxation of Land Values will scarcely deny the statement with which Mr. Rowntree concludes his book:—

"In unearned increments, both urban and rural, there is a source of revenue which will grow with every development of agriculture, industry and commerce. To take advantage of it would discourage no industry, and rob no individual, but would in time sensibly lessen the burden of taxation on the community at large."—L.H.B.

GLADSTONE LEAGUE LEAFLETS.

The Gladstone League have issued a number of useful leaflets dealing with the taxation of land values and other parts of the Liberal Programme. Five of these leaflets deal specifically with the question of Rating and Land Tenure. The arguments are very effective and the leaflets are well printed. The League has also issued as a leaflet Mr. Lloyd George's speech at the Queen's Hall on March 23rd.

THE LAW OF RENT.

(AS STATED IN "THE BEE," A PERIODICAL WORK, BY DR. ANDERSON, VOL. VI., P. 273, &C., PUBLISHED AT EDINBURGH IN THE YEAR 1791.)

Grain is in no case raised without a certain degree of labour or expense, which must be repaid to the grower; otherwise he cannot afford to produce it. This may be said in the strictest sense to constitute the intrinsic price.

Money being accounted the common measure of value, this price will be affected by the quantity of money that can be obtained for labour in general, in that place, at that time. The farmer must give those he employs wages in proportion to what they can get in other employments, so that if these wages be high, the farmers' charges must be high likewise, and the intrinsic price of his corn must rise as the rate of this charge is augmented.

Thus do we perceive that there must be a necessary connection between the price of grain and the prosperity of manufactures, and the degree of emolument to be derived from them; so that any attempt to advance the one at the expense of the other is contrary to nature, violent in its operation, and must be transitory in its effects.

The intrinsic price of grain, however, all other circumstances being alike, must vary with the fertility of the soil on which it is produced. On a rich soil, less labour and less seed will produce a given quantity of grain (more) than they would do on a soil that is less productive: so that, strictly speaking, this intrinsic price of corn, when considered only in this point of view, would be different in almost every different field. How then, may it be asked, can the intrinsic value be ascertained over a vast tract of country, possessing a diversity of soils of various degrees of fertility, and how shall matters be so managed, that all the rearers of it shall draw nearly the same price for their grain, and have nearly the same profits? All this is effected in the easiest and most natural manner by means of rent. Rent is, in fact, nothing else than a simple and ingenious contrivance for equalising the profits to be drawn from fields of different degrees of fertility and of local circumstances which tend to augment or diminish, the expense of culture. To make this plain, a few elucidations will be necessary.

In every country where men exist there will be an effective demand for a certain quantity of corn. By effective demand, I mean a demand which can be supplied, so that the inhabitants may be properly subsisted. It is this demand which in all cases regulates the price of grain: for the quantity of grain required in this case must be had, and the price that is necessary for producing it must be paid, whatever that price may be. These calls are of such a pressing nature as not to be dispensed with.

For the sake of illustration, we will suppose that the soils are arranged into classes, according to the degree of their fertility, which classes we shall at present denominate by the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, &c. Let those comprehended in the class A be richer than in the class B, and so on, decreasing in fertility for each class as you advance towards G. Now, as the expense of cultivating the least fertile is as great or greater than that of cultivating the most fertile field, it must happen that if an equal quantity of grain, the produce of each class of fields, can be sold at the same price, the profit on cultivating the most fertile fields will be greater, if no precaution be used, than could be obtained by cultivating those that are less fertile; and as this profit must continue to decrease as sterility increases, it must happen, whatever be the price of corn, that the expense of cultivating some of the inferior fields may be equal to or exceed the value of the whole produce.

This being admitted, let us suppose the effective demand was such as to raise the price of grain, say to 16s. per boll, and that the fields included in F could just admit of defraying all expenses, and no more, when corn was at that price; that those of the class E could admit of being cultivated when the price was 15s., and that in like manner the classes D, C, B, and A consisted of fields which could be respectively cultivated when the prices were 14s., 13s., 12s., and 11s. per boll.

In these circumstances, it would happen that the persons who possess fields in the class F would be able to afford no rent at all, nor could any rent be afforded for those of G, or other more sterile fields, for the purpose of raising corn; but those who possessed fields in the class E could not only pay the expense of cultivating them, but could pay to the proprietor a rent equal to one shilling for every boll of the free produce. In like manner those who possessed the fields D, C, B and A, would be able to pay a rent equal to 2s., 3s., 4s. and 5s. per boll of their free produce respectively. Nor could the proprietor of these fields

find any difficulty in obtaining these rents, because the farmers, finding they could live equally well upon these soils after paying such rents as they could upon the class F without any rent at all, would be equally willing to take these fields as the others. Thus it is that rent equalises the profits on different soils in the most natural and easy manner, without tending in any way to affect the price of grain.

Let us now suppose once more that the produce of all the fields A, B, C, D, E and F, were not sufficient to maintain the whole inhabitants of that district. In that case one of two things must happen. Either the price of grain must rise to 17s., so as to induce the owner of the fields in the class G to bring them into culture, or a supply must be brought from some other place to answer the demand. In the first case the fields G being brought into culture, those in the class F would now be able to afford a rent of one shilling per boll of the free produce, and all the other classes would admit a similar rise. Now then we clearly perceive that it is the price of grain which affects the rent, and not the rent which affects the price of grain, as has been often mistakenly alleged.

The natural effect of such increasing demand for grain and augmentation of price, is the converting of barren fields into corn lands, which otherwise would never have become such.

I must not, however, conclude without taking notice of one particular which was purposely kept out of sight, not to embarrass the demonstration. I have taken notice of land that might produce corn without affording any rent. But that, although a physical possibility, cannot practically happen. Land, in every case, when in pasture can afford some rent, and when the pasture is rich, among a luxurious people, it can afford more rent in many circumstances than while in corn. This rent must always be deducted, whatever it is, before such land comes to the state in which our reasoning above is philosophically just.* If, therefore, the price of grain be unreasonably depressed by injudicious regulations, while the price of live stock increases, a wonderful diminution of the quantity of grain raised may take place, so as to occasion phenomena that may appear very inexplicable to short-sighted men, and occasion alarms that are altogether unfounded.

THE BREAKFAST TABLE DUTIES AND FOOD TAXES. †

The Breakfast Table Duties are Customs taxes on sugar, tea, cocoa, coffee, chicory, currants, figs, dried plums, prunes, and raisins. The revenue derived last year (ending March, 1909) by levying taxes on the importation of these articles was more than £10,200,000.

The annual revenue from food taxation is £10,200,000.

Some speakers, when declaiming against taxation of the people's food, miss the fact that the people's food is already taxed to a considerable amount by the Breakfast Table Duties.

The Breakfast Table Duties are taxes on earnings—taxes on the property of many who have to work hard and long for their wages.

One of the Breakfast Table Duties is the Tea Tax.

On every pound of tea a customs duty of 5d. is levied, and every year tea drinkers pay £5,800,000.

This is what is collected by the Customs House, but the consumers pay very much more by the time the tea reaches them, for the importer, the merchant and the shopkeeper must make their profit, not only on the cost of the tea, but also on the cost of the tax, and the cheaper the tea, the heavier is the tax on it in proportion to its value!

We are taxed when we buy tea just as we are taxed when we buy coffee, cocoa, sugar, raisins, and all the other articles on which the "breakfast table duties" are levied. There is no use trying to defend these taxes by saying they are raised for revenue purposes only, or that they represent the "share of the working classes." These taxes on foods and comforts are taxes on labour and taxes on wages, and fall with peculiar severity on the poorest of the poor. Why do we have to suffer such burdens? The State, failing to go to the proper source when levying taxation, must get revenue from somewhere, and it forces tea drinkers to make a very considerable payment to the Exchequer.

These vicious indirect taxes have been defended on the ground that they are "purely revenue producing." They have even

*This rent, in fact, ought to be accounted part of the expense of cultivating the soil, as it must be sunk when it is subjected to the plough.

† Leaflet No. 26.

been justified as a means of reaching the working classes and thus making "the less well-to-do" contribute their fair share of taxation. And so the Protectionists or "Tariff Reformers," charged with being "Food Taxers" are ready with an obvious retort which they have used with more effect than some Free Traders care to acknowledge.

The honest course is to denounce all food taxes and taxes of all kinds that afflict trade and industry.

To do so is to be free to face up to the Protectionists with clean hands. No sound Free Trader can meet the proposal to put taxes on breadstuffs, meat, dairy produce, &c., unless he is prepared to denounce the existing food taxes. All of these taxes are part of an iniquitous policy which will put money into the pockets of a favoured few at the expense of the great body of the people. Such taxes are mean and contemptible, falling as they do so severely on the scanty earnings of the poor.

THE REAL FREE TRADE POLICY.

Free Trade rightly understood means trade which is free from all taxation. The great bulk, however, of our present revenues are obtained by interfering with and restraining trade and production. This is true of our national revenues, and truer still of our local revenues. Cobden and the early Anti-Corn Law Leaguers, as far back as 1838 demanded:—

The repeal of all laws relating to the importation of foreign corn and other foreign articles of subsistence, and the carrying out "to the fullest extent, both as affects agriculture and manufactures, the true and peaceful principles of Free Trade, by removing all existing obstacles to the unrestricted employment of industry and capital."

That is to say that taxes of every kind which stand in the way of labour ploughing the land, of industrious and enterprising men sinking mines, building homes and factories, and erecting machinery, and of their selling and receiving payment for the wealth so produced, shall be abolished.

Freedom to exchange without freedom to produce is not Free Trade at all.

Before any article can enter into commerce and become a thing to be traded with it must first be produced, but land monopoly everywhere exacts its enormous tribute, and production is hampered and often nearly strangled by a fiscal system that taxes every farmstead, every house, every shop, every factory, every building, all fixed machinery, and every improvement that comes into existence. In face of these obstacles, the mere freedom to exchange is after all a small part of the greater freedom which you have to fight for, and which should be boldly advocated by every Free Trader.

You have to fight for Free Production and for real Free Trade by insisting that the land be taxed according to its value, so that it may be put to its best use, and industry be relieved of the burdens it has to bear. Break down the unjust laws by which landholders are permitted to appropriate the value of the land, pocketing what is morally not theirs, obtaining untold wealth and rendering no service in return for what they receive. It is because they (the landlords) take and keep the land value which is made, maintained, and enhanced by the community, that the State, compelled to get revenue from somewhere, at present forces industry, forces labour and capital to provide the moneys it requires.

As far back as 1899 the present Lord Advocate (Mr. Alex. Ure, K.C., M.P.), pointed out the iniquity of the breakfast tables duties, and pleaded for their complete abolition. Speaking at Stoneyburn in July of that year he said:—

"The taxation of tea, coffee, tobacco, dried fruits, and other commodities at present paying Customs duty should be entirely taken away, and there should be no taxation upon these commodities. At present (1899) the income was something like eighty-eight millions, fifty of which was raised by indirect taxation—that is taxation upon tea and other commodities. Working men who used as much if not more of these commodities, therefore yield the greater share of the taxation of the country. The extent of the income which could be derived from Land Value taxation was enormous—besides it would tend to brisken the building trade."

It is for you, therefore, to uphold this policy of freeing the breakfast table duties; to declare emphatically that this unjust deduction from your wages must be stopped and that Land Values must be taxed, not food, nor comforts, nor luxuries, nor any of the fruits of labour.

The community creates Land Values. The community makes Government expenses necessary. Pay the one with the other, and stand firm for the taxation of Land Values.