

Working out these and some supplementary figures as to some other minerals, the following is given as "the total estimate for the royalties and wayleaves on coal, ironstone, iron ore, shale, and the metals of mines subject to the Metalliferous Mines Act, 1872, worked in the United Kingdom, in the year 1889 :—

	Royalties.	Wayleaves.
	£	£
Coal	4,008,353	201,916
Ironstone and iron ore	561,122	14,781
Other metals	87,068	—
Total	4,656,543	216,697

"It is to be observed that in these estimates minerals worked by proprietors have been included, the calculations having been based on the gross output, without any deduction on account of such minerals."

SCOTTISH STATISTICS.

Of the figures given above for various parts of the United Kingdom, those as regards Scotland are the most accurate, because, while in other parts of the United Kingdom the difficulties of collecting the statistics were considerable, in Scotland, as the Commissioners pointed out, under the Lands Valuation Act, 1854, "returns are made to the county assessors of the actual amount of royalties and wayleaves."

In order to bring these statistics for Scotland down to date, I have moved for a return of the corresponding figures for the last complete year for which the figures are available.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION.

The latest figures as to the output of coal and ironstone in the United Kingdom are those for 1907, published in the recent Census of Production, which are as follows :—

	Coal.	Ironstone.	Iron pyrites.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
England and Wales ..	224,966,000	7,379,000	11,000
Scotland	40,069,000	805,000	—
Ireland	99,000	—	—
Total	265,134,000	8,184,000	11,000

A comparison of these figures with the others seems to show that, while the output of ironstone has gone down, the output of coal has gone up. It is difficult to draw inferences as to the relative changes in the amount of royalties, as the Census of Production does not give the necessary data.

That, however, will soon be remedied, because when the Mineral Rights Duty has been in operation for a year or so, we shall have for taxing purposes, full information as to the output, the royalties and the royalty-owners throughout the United Kingdom. It may be safely predicted that there will be some surprises.

THE MOST HONOURABLE MARQUIS OF BUTE.

BY A HUMBLE CARDIFF VASSAL.

Cardiff is a city of 200,000 inhabitants; a little more than fifty or sixty years ago it was a small fishing village on the edge of a swampy marsh of practically valueless land. To-day it contributes over £300,000 per annum to its ground landlords, four of whom take the largest part. The whole place is built on the 99 years' lease system.

I have no desire to force myself on public attention, but my case is typical of some thousands in this great town. I will therefore venture to tell you how it lies between my ground landlord and myself :—

My ground landlord is the lord of the manor, Baron Cardiff, Earl of Dumfries, the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute, the holder of 22,000 acres of land in Glamorganshire. With my wife I live in one of the houses on the Cardiff Estate, just two of us; and the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute charges me £7-4-0 per annum ground rent, nearly three shillings per week. When I retire to bed I have the satisfaction of knowing that all the charges due are paid to the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute, and if during the night the house is burned down I have the knowledge that it is insured in the Estate Office of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. When I rise in the morning and look out of my window, I look across the well-kept estate of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. When coal is put upon the

fire in my kitchen or other room, the chances are a hundred to one that a royalty has been paid to the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute, and it is certain that carriage for it has been paid over the Most Honourable Marquis' railroad, the Cardiff Railway. When I go to my office I pass along Colum Road, a beautiful thoroughfare well-paved, well-sewered, splendidly planted with trees on either side, sufficiently lighted at night, all done at the expense of the ratepayers to improve the property of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. I have bought my house in that road and by the time the lease expires—about eighty-five years hence—my successors and I shall have paid the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute and his successors more than £700 in ground rent, but the successors of the Most Honourable Marquis will take every stick and brick in that structure from my successors and will not give them compensation. When I take an airing in the suburb of Penarth, I go by brake along the Penarth Road; at the end the coachman pays a toll for me to the persons who farm out that impost from the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. Some of my friends try to secure a living by exporting coal from the Cardiff Docks, for every pound they so export they have to pay dues to the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. When the electors go to the poll at the next Parliamentary election, the Conservative Party tell them they must vote for the brother of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. When in the course of nature my time comes to leave this world in which I have been so bothered by the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute, if that event happens in Cardiff I shall in all probability be laid in a grave in the cemetery purchased at tremendous cost from some of the kind of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Bute. Really the Most Honourable Marquis is getting just a trifle boring. I don't know where my readers expect to go to when they die, but I hope to go to that place where some say St. Peter guards the gate, and when I reach there I am going to ask him whether any Bute is inside because I am a great lover of singing and music but like to enjoy it in peace, and it occurs to me if any Bute is there he has already made a corner in harps and he will be annoying me by charging me for the entertainment.

THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

By LOUIS F. POST, in the PUBLIC (CHICAGO) December 10th.

History sometimes and in some ways repeats itself.

While the King's government of France was in desperate financial straits in the second half of the eighteenth century, and Necker's candid accounts had revealed to all France the fact that *the nobility paid no taxes on their lands*, Necker was harassed by the courtiers into resigning his office of finance minister in 1781, as five years before had been the great Turgot, forerunner of Henry George.

Another five years had gone by when the growing financial necessities of the government evoked the King's call for an "Assembly of Notables." This body, which had been convened occasionally by French Kings in the emergencies of previous centuries, met in February, 1787. Calonne, the finance minister of the day, urged a *land tax*; but, composed as the assembly was of the great untaxed landowners of France, it rejected that fair way out of the nation's dilemma and in three months was dissolved, having accomplished nothing.

Necker's help being again invoked, he caused a convocation of the "States General"—nobles, clergy and commons. It had not been assembled before for nearly 200 years, and was assembled on this occasion in May, 1789. The commons insisted upon having all three classes meet as one body upon an equal footing. But the nobles insisted upon sitting as a separate body, with veto powers upon the action of the commons. Stubbornly set against consenting to *land taxation*, this land-owning oligarchy of France were determined to fasten the financial burdens of the government, as well as the burdens of their own incomes, upon the very livelihood of the common people; and in order to fortify themselves they asserted a power of *veto* which the commons could not concede and survive. "In the sweat of *your* faces shall *we* eat cake," was the spirit of the nobility's demand upon the commons.

Thereupon the commons organized as the "National Assembly" and the French Revolution was on.

Had the more democratic elements in that revolution been more patient with developments after the work of the National Assembly began, a firm foundation for normal and just economic development might have been laid in France, and the Revolution been peaceful and triumphant instead of sanguinary and disappointing. But out of impatience came slaughter, and out of slaughter, the "man on horseback" and an empire.

In all this there is a great historical lesson for Great Britain in her present historic hour.

Great Britain is in financial straits as France was. Lloyd George, the finance minister of the day, has revealed to all her people, as Necker did to the people of France, the fact that *the nobility pay no taxes on their lands*. If he has not been ousted from the ministry in consequence, as Necker was, that is only because the great landed interests have been unable to oust him.

With the co-operation of his official associates, Lloyd George has brought into the House of Commons a measure designed to place some of the burdens of taxation upon the landed interests. The line of demarcation is not so strictly drawn between noble and commoner by landed interests in Great Britain in these early years of the twentieth century as it was in France in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and Lloyd George has found abundant opposition in the House of Commons itself. But after half a year of patient and considerate Parliamentary procedure, his bill for *the taxation of land values* goes to the House of Lords for their perfunctory approval. Instead of approving perfunctorily, that body of great land owners untaxed, asserts the very *veto* power which the French nobles claimed so unhappily to France and so disastrously to themselves, a hundred and twenty years ago.

The British House of Lords has defiantly vetoed a finance bill of the Commons. The Commons have appealed to the country, and not only for the finance bill with its *land tax*, but also for authority to extinguish the plenary *veto* of the House of Lords. The British Revolution is on, and under circumstances extremely analogous to those in which the French Revolution began.

Whether this revolution in Great Britain shall be a peaceful and deeply effective one as that of France might have been, or an aborted one as was that of France in great degree, and possibly sanguinary as well, as that one was, may depend upon the clear thought and patient skill in statesmanship of British Radicals. Measured by what they seek, the specific demands of the Commons are trifles; but tested by the manifest laws of social progress, those demands are as a thoroughfare to a journey's end. Unwisdom and impatience by Radicals at this crisis, might not only frustrate their own immediate purposes but indefinitely delay the fruition of their dearest hopes.

Consider the specific issues before the British voters at the approaching election.

Superficial as they seem to be, and trifling as they in their concreteness would appear in this country, yet when reduced to their essentials as both sides in Great Britain regard them, they involve (1) the abolition of the House of Lords as hereditary law makers, and (2) the restoration of the land to the people.

If Liberal and Labour and Irish members of Parliament are elected in large number at the approaching elections, the plenary veto of the House of Lords will doubtless be abolished. How this will be done it would not be safe to predict too definitely; but the probabilities are that the House of Lords would be allowed hereafter only a suspensory veto—the power, that is, to return bills to the Commons without approval, thereby requiring the Commons to readopt or abandon them, but the bills to become law in case of readoption. The method of forcing this limitation of legislative power upon the Lords is “another story,” and we reserve it for another article upon this general subject.

It is easy to see, however, that if a suspensory veto were substituted for the present plenary one, the House of Lords would cease to be a legislative body altogether. What that would mean to democracy in Great Britain, is written almost as it were in an open book. It is written so plainly that the Lords who are to lose by it understand it well, whether the people who are to gain by it do or not.

It means home rule for Ireland in home affairs; and so for Scotland and Wales, and for England and her municipalities as well; for it is the plenary veto of the House of Lords alone that stands in the way of those advances. It means adult suffrage regardless of sex, just as in Australasia; for it is the plenary veto of the House of Lords alone that stands in the way of that reform in Great Britain. And it means abrogation of the privilege of a few Englishmen to make all the rest “trespassers in the land of their birth”; for it is the plenary veto of the House of Lords alone that maintains the enormous landed privileges in the British Isles.

And as with the power of the House of Lords in legislation if a suspensory veto is substituted for their plenary veto, so with British landed interests—whether landlord or capitalistic—if the land clauses of the Lloyd George Budget are injected into the British Fiscal system under the circumstances that surround it.

Two Radical factors enter into the Budget controversy. For one, it rests upon the principle, not of *equal* taxation as American

land taxes do, but of *equitable* taxation. It would tax land values not because they are values, but because they measure the earnings of the community as distinguished from the earnings of individuals. It distinguishes earnings from privileges. Let this idea take root anywhere, and it will soon grow into a flourishing tree. The second Radical factor in the George Budget is supplementary to the other. It is the valuation machinery provided for in the Budget for all the land of Great Britain, and for its revaluation as community growth and general improvement augment its value.

With that basis for land value taxation, secured in an election campaign so distinctly demanding that Britons shall no longer be “trespassers in the land of their birth,” the goal of the land for the people may soon be attained.

Should this measure up to all the just demands of Radical democracy, the fighting will soon be over and peaceable developments be under way; should there still be capitalistic privileges to assail, those privileges would be at enormous disadvantage and the fighting ground for democracy be vastly improved.

HERE AND THERE.

From an American paper: “Who made ten thousand persons owners of the soil, and all the rest trespassers in the land of their birth?” Lloyd George in English House of Lords.—Not yet, American friends!

The total debt of London secured on the rates was in March last £109,931,239 as compared with £108,558,377 in the year before, the increase being mainly due to the increase of debt on revenue-producing services.

DEAR LAND VALUES.—The following lines of Whittier seem as if specially addressed to you at the present crisis:—

If ye have whispered truth,
Whisper no longer!
Speak as the tempest does,
Stronger and stronger;
Still be the tones of truth
Louder and firmer,
Startling the haughty Peers
With the deep murmur,
God and our charter's right,
Freedom for ever!
Truce with oppression,—
Never, oh, never!

AN OLD CORRESPONDENT.

At the North London Police Court on December 9th, a dress-maker was summoned by a machinist, for 5s. 4d., a week's wages, in lieu of notice. The complainant said she had been discharged for doing some work wrong, and in answer to the magistrate said she had been paid 8d. a day, and had worked from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. The machinist was awarded 5s. 4d. and 7s. costs.

Every day there is fresh evidence to encourage the fear that the coming political struggle will bring in its train terrible differences and discords. A man has been fined at Newmarket for using bad language in an argument with himself on a lonely country road, and if there are to be such grave differences of opinion between a man and himself, what are we to expect of a man and his neighbours?—WESTMINSTER GAZETTE.

The DAILY TELEGRAPH raises a new bogey in its issue of December 18th. It says:—

Only a lack of appreciation by the electors of the inestimable gravity of the issues at stake—not only for the United Kingdom, but of the British Empire—can save the enemies of both from sustaining a crushing and decisive defeat in the impending struggle at the polls. Should the Radicals win, there is but too great a likelihood that the Empire will disappear, and the United Kingdom sink to the level of a fifth-rate European Power.

Dr. R. F. Horton (Minister, Lyndhurst Road, Hampstead, a former chairman of the Congregational Union), says that the land system is the cause of the poverty which is a surprise