

All of the old enmities and bitterness seem to have been forgotten.

He speaks kindly of everyone, even of those who in the strife and struggle of the past years maligned and if they could would have wrecked him.\*

It was of such a man as this that the poet wrote:

So live,  
That when thy summons comes  
To join the innumerable caravan which moves to  
that mysterious realm  
Where each shall take his chamber in the silent  
halls of death.  
Thou goest not like the quarry slave at night,  
Scourged to his dungeon,  
But sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust,  
Approach thy grave  
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about  
him,  
And lies down to pleasant dreams.

\* \* \*

## JOHN PAUL OF GREAT BRITAIN.



No one knows the British movement for land value taxation without knowing John Paul, or of him.

\*He always did. Tom L. Johnson was never bitter, no matter how great the provocation.—Editors of The Public.

He has no history back of that movement, except the history of a Scottish working man who did not allow his working to put a stop to his thinking. But with its birth in Glasgow he was born again, born of the movement and into it. Its progress and his activities have been identified ever since.

As executive of the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, his weariless mind and straight-away business management—turning neither to the right nor to the left, with the goal ahead—have in the past ten years inconspicuously helped the Liberal party to make British history.

\*

John Paul came actively into the British movement for land value taxation in 1887, through an educational club which had sprung out of Henry George's agitation in Scotland.

George created a sensation there in 1882, and again in 1883. In 1884 he addressed a great meeting in the Glasgow City Hall, in a speech circulated still under the title of "Scotland for Scotsmen." At that meeting the Scottish Land Restoration League was formed, and under its auspices George campaigned Scotland. The Irish question overshadowed the work of the League later, and it grew obsolete. Its cause, however, had the vitality of planted seed.

In August, 1890, just before the first American single tax conference, held at Cooper Union, New York, Henry George, while on his way home from his trip around the world, fathered the organization in Glasgow of the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values, which is still vigorous. The time was ripe for it. Earlier in the same year, a member of the City Council whom George had converted and who is to this day a man of power in the movement, Peter Burt by name, had introduced into the Council a resolution on local taxation, and had thereby become chairman of an investigating committee. His report, submitted six months after the organization of the Scottish League by Mr. George, urged the cooperation of all the taxing bodies of Scotland in a petition to Parliament for authority to tax land values for local purposes. It was the same policy that Henry George and Thomas G. Shearman got under way in 1899 in New York, and which the New York Tax Reform Association, under the secretaryship at first of Robert Baker and then of Lawson Purdy, tried to impress upon the New York legislature; the same that has now been adopted under Initiative petition in Oregon.

Councilman Burt's committee report (Baillie Burt, they call him there) did not get beyond the discussion stage; but Mr. Burt was joined in the Council in 1893 by John Ferguson, one of their leaders whose memory the Henry George men of Scotland mourn. Between them, Burt and Ferguson kept the question incessantly before the Council; and in June, 1895, a large majority

agreed to the 1890 resolution of Burt's committee. For eleven years thereafter a special department of the town clerk's office was devoted to municipal agitation for the taxation of land values.

In those ways the question of the taxation of land values was brought by the city of Glasgow officially before all the local taxing bodies of Scotland. Nor was that the end. Baillie Ferguson was authorized by the Council—the subject having meanwhile been a burning issue before the people at the local election, which the land value tax men won—to carry a municipal petition to Parliament in support of a bill for the local taxation of land values. Neither was that the end. A conference of Scottish municipalities, called by the City Council of Glasgow and the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values, met in October, 1899, with 116 local taxing bodies represented by 216 delegates. This Scottish conference was followed three years later by one for England and Scotland jointly, called by the Glasgow Council on Baillie Ferguson's motion. It met in London in October, 1902, and appointed a committee of 25 municipal representatives to formulate plans. Two Parliamentary bills for the municipal taxation of land values, one for Scotland and one for England, were accordingly prepared and promoted by the committee.



Meanwhile Richard McGhee of Ireland (now a member of Parliament), J. W. S. Callie of Liverpool, and Edward McHugh of Birkenhead—but, with apologies to Kipling, that's another story.



The English bill was introduced in the House of Commons in 1902 by Charles P. Trevelyan (grand-nephew of Lord Macaulay), and defeated at first reading by a majority of 71. A similar bill also for England, introduced by Dr. MacNamara in 1903, was also defeated at first reading, but by only 13 majority. Mr. Trevelyan introduced his bill again in 1904, and to the amazement of the House and of the country it was carried at first reading by a majority of 67. But it got no farther. In 1905, however, the second reading of another such bill, introduced by Mr. Trevelyan, was carried by a majority of 90. It must be remembered that all these votes were taken while the Conservative party was entrenched in power.

The Glasgow bill was not presented in the House of Commons until 1905. It was then fathomed by John Stirling Ainsworth, member for Argyllshire. Owing to the fact that this was a bill for Scotland only, and also to the absence of Liberals who were speaking at public meetings in the pre-election campaign, the vote was light—only 266—but the bill passed first reading by a majority of 20. It had been urged by a second Scottish conference, held two months earlier at

Edinburgh, at which 57 taxing bodies were represented by 98 official delegates.

At one of the conferences of Scottish and English municipalities, which met at Manchester in November, 1905, only a few months after the favorable reception in Parliament of the Glasgow bill, a petition to the House of Commons was authorized. This petition prayed for a bill allowing the taxing bodies of Scotland and England to assess land values separately from other property and to tax them for local purposes; and in February, 1906, the Liberals having then come into power, a deputation of 150 municipal representatives of 15 local taxing bodies presented the petition to Mr. Asquith, now Prime Minister, but at that time Chancellor of the Exchequer in Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's cabinet. The petition bore the official signatures of 518 local taxing bodies.

Once more the bill for Scotland came before the House of Commons, now under Liberal control. It was introduced by John E. Sutherland, member for Elgin Burghs, on the 23d of March, 1906, and carried by 319 to 61—a favorable majority of 258. Thereupon the Ministry appointed a special committee to take evidence on the measure, and of this committee Alexander Ure, now Lord Advocate for Scotland, was chairman.



All the bills thus far had been "private bills," not having the sanction of the Ministry and getting a hearing and a vote only by rules of parliamentary courtesy. With the next bill, it was different.

Mr. Ure's special committee reported late in 1906 in favor of a Scottish land-valuation bill. This recommendation made no provision for taxing land, only for valuing it; but the landed interests recognized more readily than many advocates of land value taxation did, that valuation was but a necessary prelude to taxation. Upon the passage of a Scottish bill on the lines of the Ure committee report—and this was done by a record majority—the Ministry made no secret of its intention to follow with a like bill for England.

The Scottish bill came before the House of Lords in due time and that irresponsible body mutilated it beyond usefulness or recognition. Thus began the political fight in Great Britain which secured the Budget of 1909, with its unprecedented land valuation and taxation features, and which has now brought the House of Lords face to face with the abrogation of their veto power.



The history of the Budget measure of 1909 runs back plumb into the office of the United Committee mentioned above, of which John Paul is executive secretary.

Here is the story. While the Scottish League

for the Taxation of Land Values was making British history from Glasgow, the English League for the Taxation of Land Values was both co-operating and working on its own account in London. The English League is yet as active a force as ever, and stronger, under the executive management of Lewis H. Berens and Frederick Verinder; but that also is another story, as is the story of the Yorkshire League, promoted largely by C. H. Smithson, now a member of the Halifax City Council, which was and is under the executive management of Frederick Skirrow of Keighley. Such in general was the situation when the Liberals came into power in 1906, and Joseph Fels of Philadelphia and London recognized the great opportunity to help effectively in securing a realization of Henry George's democratic dream. He came wholeheartedly into the movement, and the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values was thereupon formed of representatives from the various Leagues, and under its general direction a great campaign on the Lords' rejection of the Ure bill was made.

The slogan of this campaign was the absurd futility of promoting a land valuation bill for England when the Lords had so loftily torn the Scottish bill to shreds. So the United Committee urged the Ministry to make the taxation of land values a budget measure in order that the Lords might not tamper with it without defying the British Constitution, and Mr. Ure took up the campaign on those lines. The Prime Minister, Campbell-Bannerman, not only did not oppose the plan, but gave it aid and comfort. He died in the midst of the agitation; but Lloyd George, who succeeded Asquith at the treasury when Asquith succeeded Bannerman, took up the measure with eagerness and carried it brilliantly to victory.

Notwithstanding the British Constitution, the Lords challenged Fate by voting down the Budget, and Fate promptly accepted their challenge. Land valuation is consequently now a fact throughout Great Britain, the House of Lords notwithstanding, and land value taxation has begun to do its work—its perfect work if allowed to go on unrestrained by the land monopoly interests of the country.



Never conspicuous, but always "on deck," John Paul has been in and of that movement steadily from its inception in Glasgow under the leadership of Burt and Ferguson, to its great victory in the Commons under the leadership of Asquith and Lloyd George.

At the beginning he was one of a small group of enthusiasts who formed the Henry George Institute of Glasgow, under the auspices of which George first delivered his famous sermon, "Thy Kingdom Come," at the City Hall of Glasgow. It was then that John Paul himself was really born. His appearance in the world a score of years or

so before, and his sensations in the interval, are to his memory only indistinguishable throbs in the pulsations of man in the mass; but when he had come, mind to mind and heart to heart, into communion with Henry George, then it was that he began to live.

His associates saw it and called him into the Institute's executive committee. Then they made him secretary. He held these offices in the Institute during its ten years of active service. Long before this, the Scottish Land Restoration League had lost vitality, and when the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values rose out of its ashes, John Paul was among its promoters. It began the publication, in 1894, of a monthly organ, "Single Tax," and Paul was the editor. The name is now "Land Values," but its first editor is its editor yet, and has been from the beginning, although now he has an efficient associate in John Orr, another of those serious Scotsmen who knows what he thinks and why.

The movement in Glasgow having assumed political proportions in the middle '90's, Mr. Paul was engaged as salaried secretary to give his whole time to its work; and in that position he remained until James Busby was called into the place upon Paul's being drafted to serve jointly with Crompton Llewelyn Davies as secretary of the United Committee at London and manager of its executive work.



Our portrait resembles John Paul in outline and general feature, but the photographer's craze for polishing negatives has robbed him of his distinctive character-lines. As a platform speaker his presence is engaging, and his direct Scottish thinking on his feet makes him a force in speech no less than in counsel. But like Agassiz who couldn't spare the time to make money, John Paul can't spare the time to speak or to work for anything but the cause into which he has been reborn. He commands respect by his abilities and wins affection by his tenderness; and he knows his Henry George.



### A WELCOME GUEST.

For The Public.

I have a little guest each week  
Who cannot walk, or see, or speak;  
But on this silent little friend  
For truthful statements I depend.

So quiet, calm, so dignified—  
But full of fire and life inside;  
A soldier ready for the fight,  
In cause of Justice, Truth and Right.

Oh, would I were a millionaire,  
So I could send it everywhere.  
The little Public, without peer,  
Should find a welcome far and near.

ANNE W. RUST.