

vested, not the franchise or privilege value. Inferentially this is an assertion of the people's rights in the streets. But we will let the paragraph speak for itself:

"The fact that the company, by rendering competition impossible, has been able to earn large dividends, does not justify it in adding to the value of its plant an additional amount for good will or earning capacity and thereby justify a continuance of excessive charges. If this were permitted it would be able to secure in perpetuity the maintenance of exorbitant rates. Extortion for a series of years would be sufficient excuse for further extortion. Indeed, there would seem to be no escape from the conclusion that successful imposition upon the public would warrant increased charges upon the ground of enhanced good will. The company is entitled to a fair return upon its capital actually invested, but it is not entitled to capitalize its grip upon the public. The fact that it may be proper to value good will due to efficient organization and to the securing of public esteem through good service under ordinary conditions of competition furnishes no reason for an addition to capital to maintain high charges of an amount which while termed good will, is really an estimate of an earning capacity due to a monopolization of a public service."

This is the significant paragraph of the Report which should be given wide publicity, since it shows the manner in which the governor regards the matter of public franchises, and is of immense importance at this time. Will he, now that the law which he has forced the two parties to put through the legislature is finally enacted, appoint as his commissioners to carry out the provisions of that law only such men as are able to stand the test of the distinction between franchise value—land value—and improvement value which he has laid down?

Now why during all this talk of the gas company and of its defiance of the people have we not heard of this report, known as the Stevens Report? Why have we not heard of the assertion made from this high official source that the Consolidated Gas Company has no right in the street—that no franchise was granted to the company save the franchise to be a corporation? And to the statement also made in this report that "it is a serious question to what extent the Brooklyn Union Gas Company is lawfully exercising rights in the streets of that borough?"—in other words, conveying the intimation that it is unlawfully exercising some of its rights, at least.

No wonder that this Report seems to have well nigh disappeared. So scarce has it become that several well known officials of this city have been unable to secure copies either from the Gas Commission or the Senate document clerk at Albany, though finally an inquiry addressed to the latter

has resulted in the REVIEW securing a copy, though earlier inquiries for the pamphlet had brought the answer that it could not be obtained. But whether the scarcity of this document has been brought about by design or not it is easy to understand how the friends and organs of privilege would wish to suppress these radical utterances of the man now occupying the office of Governor. For to somebody's discomfort someday these radical utterances like chickens will come home to roost.

There are many matters of importance in this report. But it is chiefly of significance in that it reveals the fact that if the chief counsel of that committee who made the report will in the office of governor adhere to the very vital economic distinction that appears in the paragraph quoted, and which is of general application, we may have more than one reason to thank ourselves for the defeat of Mr. Hearst.

J. D. M.

SPEECH OF WINSTON CHURCHILL,
M. P., AT DRURY LANE THEATRE,
LONDON.

(As Reported in Glasgow (Scotland) Land Values.)

Mr. Winston Churchill, who was received with loud and prolonged cheers, said that he saw upon the platform a great number of gentlemen who had devoted their lives to the study of the land problem. He did not suppose there ever was a moment in the whole of their lives when the prospects of land reform looked brighter or rosier than they did to-day. (Cheers.) It was not a light thing they were going to do. They had pulled the curtain up on a piece that was going to have a good long run. (Cheers.)

"We have," he continued, "to face all the resources of a great monopoly so ancient that it has become almost venerable. (Laughter.) We have against us all the modern money power. We have to deal with the apathy and levity of all sections of the public. We have against us the political machinery of class and privilege, represented by the Second Chamber in the State. We have the innate difficulties and perplexities of this subject itself."

This island alone amongst civilized States presented the melancholy spectacle of a landless peasantry. Side by side with, and arising directly out of it, they saw a blighted agriculture. No one could doubt that there was great cause for alarm at the great physical deterioration that was taking place in the great cities. Whereas in France one-sixth of the population were employed in agriculture, and in Denmark—a Free Trade country—one-fifth were so working, in England only one-fortieth were employed in agriculture. (Ories of "Shame.")

He observed that a very distinguished man attributed the migration of the agricultural laborers to the towns to their love of amusements. (Laughter.) The motive which inspired an agricultural laborer to exchange a cheerful life in the country with 14s. a week and the workhouse at the end of it for the squalor of the city slums was not rollicking hilarity. (Laughter.) If there was a steady stream of the best men from the villages into the towns it was because, as the Prime Minister had said, they could not call their souls their own. (Loud cheers.) They wanted to be free men, to rise in the world by their own resources, and the country had no career for them. (A Voice; "Perfectly true," and cheers.)

GOVERNMENT INTENTIONS.

"His Majesty's Government intend to introduce a Land Bill dealing with the question of small holdings in England, as a companion bill to that which the Lord Advocate has introduced in regard to Scotland. A bill has been prepared by the President of the Board of Agriculture, Lord Carrington. (Cheers.) When I tell you that it is to be piloted through the House of Commons by Mr. Harcourt—(cheers)—I think you will be sure that it will not lack Radical inspiration, or successful parliamentary defence." (Cheers.)

They did not want to steal anybody's land. (A voice: "Whom did the landlords pinch it from," and laughter.) They wished to pay a fair market price between buyer and seller. (A Voice—"Did they pay for it gov'nor," and laughter.) In regard to the land acquired by the State, it could never be alienated. (Cheers.)

No Liberal or Radical Administration ought to consent to provisions which might be calculated to delay or obstruct a system of public ownership. He dismissed the idea of a policy of advancing money to the landlords to enable them to start small holdings, and also the idea of conferring upon the small owners a private ownership which they could transfer or mortgage at any future time. They were working, not only for the day, but for generations that are to come, and they did not want the job to be done all over again. (Cheers.)

PRODUCTION AND PLUNDER.

The urban problem was not less important than the rural problem, and it was a good deal more controversial. It excited fierce passions. Whereas a policy in regard to rural land was gradual, the reform of our rating system required one bold stroke. (Cheers.)

All roads lead to Rome. All considerations of the urban land policy led to one central point—valuation. We required and we were going to have a Valuation Bill—(cheers)—first, to disentangle site-values from buildings and improvements; sec-

ondly, to adjust rates according to ability to pay; and thirdly, to intercept the future unearned increment in land. (Cheers.) They must repeat in local taxation the same triumph which was achieved in Imperial taxation when the Corn Laws were repealed. (Cheers.)

"There are only two ways in which people can acquire wealth. There is production and there is plunder. (Laughter.) Production is always beneficial. Plunder is always pernicious, and its proceeds are either monopolized by a few or consumed in the mere struggle for possession. We are here to range definitely on the side of production, and to eliminate plunder as an element in our social economic system. The present land system hampers, hobbles and restricts industry. Just as the reform of the old system of taxation was followed by a remarkable expansion of enterprise and contentment amongst all classes, so, I believe, a reform of our rating system and our system of land tenure would be followed by an upward movement in the material welfare of the nation. Our rating system is a patchwork of perversity." (Laughter.)

There was no intention of plundering the landlord, and there was no intention of allowing him to plunder us. (Cheers.) They did not want to take from any class that which belonged to it; but they were resolved if they could—and he was not quite so sure that they could not—to prevent any class from steadily absorbing under the shelter of the law the wealth in the creation of which they had borne no share—wealth which belonged not to them, but to the community—wealth which they could only secure by vexatious obstruction of social and economic progress—far more injurious and wasteful than could be measured by inordinate gains.

A recent lecture by Mr. Bolton Hall in Philadelphia before the Clerical Brotherhood at the Church House, Twelfth and Walnut streets, was the occasion for a remarkable demonstration of the progress that is being made. About sixty clergymen were in attendance, and one who spoke in opposition to the Single Tax was received with very evident symptom of dissent. Bishop Mackay Smith announced himself as a believer in our principles. The Philadelphia *Evening Telegraph* gave nearly a column in report of Mr. Hall's lecture, which had for its title, "The Single Tax; or Poverty, its Cause and Cure."

Mr. Lewis H. Berens writes us that Mr. John Paul's transference to London has imparted fresh vigor into the movement, though unfortunately they are without the funds proportionate to the work that must be done.