

**Delving After it in the Foundations of
Our Economic System.**

**But Those Who Violate Them Need Not Hope
to Escape the Penalty.**

The following is from a recent address delivered in Hamilton, by Mr. John Carrick, and presents a statement of the claims of those who advocate Land Nationalization or the Single Tax :

ADVANTAGES, THE HONORS AND THE RESPECT to the successful idle, while the idler we deem not so well-succesed in living upon the talents of others may even be anxious to live by his own exertions, is termed tramp and hounded down by the dogs law. If he is given to close reasoning may even wonder at the inconsistency which sends to jail the pauper who begs a few pennies from the compassionate, who it looks up with respect to the influential legislator who is to divert to one pocket a portion of the earnings of others without their consent. He will find it easy matter to square the result of his observations with first principle, but he will readily conclude that the condition which presents itself is not the result of obedience to natural laws, but rather their violation; that, therefore, the laws we deplore are not irremediable, the source the first duty of the economist is to discover wherein we have transgressed the laws in order that we may, with as much expedition as possible, get our car back into the grooves of the celestial wheels.

as a blessing, the philosopher or economist who would seek to abolish it and its attendant sorrow and suffering would properly be viewed as an undesirable citizen. Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby, in an article in the "Forum," referring to those who think that the Creator is to blame for the widespread poverty of the day and who are bringing about a better condition, says: "is not the fact of poverty, that troubles these people, but sheer envy"; and "of its own satisfaction he traces all poverty to

LIQUOR, LAZINESS AND IMPROVIDENCE

The rev. gentleman's opinion is almost to brutality, but the economist undisturbed; he is content to deal with facts and reasons, knowing that in the result of his work lies his justification and reward for having charity.

But allowing all that should fairly be conceded to incompetence, sloth, profligacy and intemperance—and I am prepared to make large concessions—there still remain the hard facts that thousands of thousands who would willingly support poverty by laboring fail to get employment and that millions who labor steadily and industrially have.

A LIFE LONG STRUGGLE

to keep the wolf from the door; a struggle more and by the knowledge in event of the struggle or incapacity for one will be thrown upon the care of the world. No wonder then that the ing men of humane impulses should to discover and extirpate the root of evil. The cause is not to be found in rigidity of nature. The earth is kind enough and to spare, and the methods of transportation, storage and distribution provide means of support for sectional or temporary shortages. Not were the idle employed the surplus would be increased. Why, then, is all have not plenty? Why is it that the vastly increased capacities for production arising from the advance in science and invention we have yet among the producers, the opportunity regarded as a boon, and the waste distribution cleaving asunder society?

GEORGE AND BELLAMY.

Among those interested in economic perhaps no subjects to-day receive more attention than those of the Nationalization of Land, of which Mr. Henry George is the chief exponent, and the State Socialism of the Edward Bellamy school. It is not my purpose here to enter upon a discussion of Mr. Bellamy's theory. I only wish to say in passing that the two propositions are essentially different—irreconcilably antagonistic in principle—having nothing in common save the wish of the promoters to benefit their fellows. Mr. Bellamy's contemplates the extinction of the individual in the State, and the assumption by the State of all the functions of ownership, management and employment. It views competition as an evil to be got rid of, and exalts the representatives of the people (the Government) to such a degree of infallibility as to make them incapable of trusting to the wisdom which prevents success even under the stimulant of self-interest and competition. The advocates of Land Nationalization, the Single Tax, on the contrary, are in no position

GREAT NATURAL LAW

operative in every department of the creation, and, would not interfere with human enactments, operating to the benefit of all. They see in *natural competition* a law as inviolable as that of gravitation, as necessary to the mundane economy, and, which, like it, can only be resisted at great cost. They do not propose to resist it. What they do propose is, instead of more paternal legislation is to remove the interference with the liberty of the individual. Our laws, not those of the Creator, are at fault. They ask that competition be restored to a natural basis; that the advantages given to some by man-made laws be restored to mankind as a whole; that within the individual sphere we shall say to corporate power: "keep off!" In short that the right of the people to the natural opportunities shall be restored to them. They ask why should people be deprived of their birthrights as then they should give effect to the deprivation? *Why* should they who produce abundance not reap abundantly? *Why* should men willing to work need alms? *Why* is the earth—the Lord's or landlords'?

THE ROOT EVIL.

Let us for a moment forget the complexity of the laws with which we are surrounded ourselves, and turn our consideration to first principles. When every wise man has to decide upon a course of action he tries it by the canons of Right and Wrong. He asks himself, "What is right?" and asks you now to bury ideas of temporary expediency, or rather while we view the matter to bear in mind that what is right is always expedient.

is always expedient. In the whole question, we advance the Single Tax content, is the deprivation of natural opportunities to vast property in land. We contend it is not only inexpedient but contrary to every principle of justice that Nature bestows to all men—the elements—should become the exclusive property of any man or set of men; that we give to one class the right to the earth, which is necessary to the life of all, and to handicap the others in competition, which Nature insists upon that in the nature of things land is property, and that even if we who to-day were to alienate our birth-right the natural opportunities we would have no right to disinherit posterity. We tend that to take from the individual the right to the soil is to compel him to chase the right to live and labor for a portion of his earnings, and is to extend an unequal form of ownership of man against man, and is not only obnoxious but also repulsive than the principle of chattel slavery. Let us please it.

THE NATURE OF LAND.

It is limited in extent; increased by the impossibility of being by his efforts made increased, or diminished; necessary human existence. Man can no more without access to land than he can without air, because land is the ultimate upon which labor is exerted and which sustenance is derived. Ownership of land involves ownership of men. Robinson Crusoe been able to enforce laws such as we respect to-day he would have been as truly master of Friday as ever Louisiana Planter was of Negro. Give a few men the land of the Nation the ability to enforce the land laws, much for all practical purposes, become the owners of the rest as if they hid them off the auction block; would added advantage that whereas the chattel slave-owner stood to by under-feeding, overwork and the landlords face no such constant. Increase of population means more debt for their lands, lower wages if they poor crops mean, higher prices for the a lighter man for the laborer; even means to them higher rents. L unnecessary to life; to deprive a child inheritance the land is to rob him birthright. To contend otherwise is to say that all are not equal before law and that some come into the with a better right to His boundaries than others.

LAND NOT PROPERTY.

I have said that in the nature of land is not property. All ideas of property spring from the right of a man to his own labor. As a man is owner of his own labor, so he is naturally owner of all that he produces by the use of his own labor. All titles to ownership are derivative. The first title to land is derived from the first principle, the title of a man to his own labor. The recognition of any other title would destroy this one. The

There is no reason that can be urged, beyond the purely physical one, why the water and the air of the planet should not have been parcelled out and made the private property of the few with as much of right and justice as can be adduced to excuse the prevalent idea of private ownership of the soil.

TITLES TO THE SOIL.

I cannot diverge to-night to deal with the various kinds of titles under which the world's lands are held. It is enough if you admit that all of God's children are entitled to life and are equal before His law, to stamp all titles to exclusive ownership of the soil as spurious. As a fact, however, they are all founded in discovery, and only one is true. Title by discovery is for which I defend, on principle, as superior to all others. But discovery, by whom? and for how much? Did the title to America vest in the Mound Builders? Or in the North American Indians? Or in the Norsemen? Or in whom did it vest? Did Columbus' discovery invalidate that title? How much territory does discovery entitle to?—an acre? a hundred acres? a county? a province? a continent? Columbus' Island had been a small, unexplored square miles in extent, and he had been entitled to tribute, as a land-owner, from all heirs. But he could transmit the title to his heirs? Isn't it absurd! Ownership in the land, I have said.

MEANS OWNERSHIP OF THE MEN,

who of necessity live on the land. In the ultimate it is but another form of the same thing already mentioned in the case of the older and more populous countries. In all cases it gives the power to absorb the earnings of the masses who labor. In Britain, at this date, a small proportion of the population—about 30,000—have the legal right to turn five-sixths of the people of the kingdom upon the streets (which is not belonging to the owners of the coal lands) and to the owners of the mines. That coal is ours. Coal is the property of the people. On our terms to wages and honors of labor or not a pound shall be mined. While you starve in idleness a coal famine will be sent in the higher prices is ensured." The few own the earth; the many have no air and water. The experiences of the older countries ought to be taken to heart before reform is years hence. Here the spectacle of population has hitherto masked the growing starving daily.

evil, but it is growing daily.

JUSTICE MUST BE DONE.

"But," you say, "how are you going to remedy the evil? You cannot with justice take the land from its present holders and parcel it out in equal shares to all." nor would such a course be desirable or practicable. But it is impracticable to do justice by any kind of arbitrary measure. Any scheme of amelioration must be one capable of constant adjustment without disturbance to holders of land, and the ever changing circumstances of population. Every child born into the world has as much right to the soil as has the Duke of Westminster or Jay Gould, Vanderbilt; but every one does not own land, and an equitable distribution, if such possible, would be destroyed every time a child was born into the world. Fixity of possession is a desideratum conducing to productiveness and improvement, and the sacredness of the right is to be ascribed to all that he owns must be respected. This we propose to secure while restoring to the people their birthright in the soil, without dispossessing anybody, without any shock to society, and without any worse result than the opening up of many opportunities for labor, and enforcing on the drones the long suspended sentence: "He that is without worketh not neither shall he eat."

[THE REMEDY PROPOSED.]

And how is it to be done?
We propose to do it by taxation.
We propose that instead of taxes on
houses, goods and chattels, poll tax, in-
come tax, customs and excise, a single
tax on land values should be levied, taking
the benefit to the community that
from which is added to the land, irrespective
of population, by the presence of
population. We propose that the unen-
richment, which now goes to enrich
land owner and speculator, be used
to relieve labor, production, commerce
improvement of the "burden" now im-
posed upon them. "But," the objector
may say, "a man's property is a right
of taking a man's property by taxation."
Discriminate. We would give him
has produced, all he has in improvement
in and upon the land, all he owns
from impost, but in lieu of all
taxes, direct and indirect, we would
for the common fund, in taxes (con-
rent), that value which he adds to
nor could produce but which is added
the land by the community, irrespective
any expenditure or effort on the part
it wrong to ask those who have pro-
shall possess? Or is it unnatural
those in the enjoyment of unearned
comes should strenuously oppose
of such a measure of justice?

HOW THE SPECULATOR IS FAVORED

Speculation in land is an evil which the gambling of the stock exchange has no economic significance. It has natural right to hold land for the purpose of obliging another to pay me toll before he permits him to turn it to production. Economically it is an evil because it creates fictitious values and diverts the money from the producers to the pockets of those who add nothing to the sum of the wealth but play dog-in-the-manger type of game who improve and produce. Our sys-

exemption is distinctively favorable to the speculator as against the producer. I need not go outside of the city for examples; you have all met with them. So to one of our land speculators who holds a valuable property—or rather property of varying value, low when the market is high when you buy—and spends a small lot. It may have been a very bad shape. You drain it, level it, enclose it, erect a house on it and in other ways add to the appearance of that part of the city. How is your labor and expenditure appreciated? Compare your tax bill with the less one paid by the speculator and you will see! Next year you add your front, plant some trees, add a fountain, and presto again

UP GO YOUR TAXES,
Until you almost feel that your improve-
ments are in the nature of an offense
against the community and wish you had
let your money lie in the bank and rented.
All this time the neighboring lots
held by Mr. Speculator remain
unimproved, but when a buyer
comes along he is asked a higher price for
them because of the labor and money you
have expended upon your lot and for which
you are so heavily taxed! You do your
heavy and expend the money; you are
heavily taxed. The speculator takes the
profit on the sale of your lot, and pays low
taxes, yet pockets the benefit resulting
from your investment and labor, in the
increased prices which he demands for the
neighboring lots upon which he has neither
toiled an hour nor spent a shilling. Why
do speculators often bid purchasers of lots
to build houses of a specified character?
To secure a good class of houses for the
city? Oh, no! Not at all! Every good
house erected enhances the value of the
neighboring lots; and this value, which be-
comes not merely of land and tax law
value, is a great asset to his own use.

A LAW AGAINST IMPROVEMENTS.

There are lots in this city to-day of great value, carrying more crokeries, but assessing comparatively low and paying their owners a good income. Some of these owners are greatly excited at the prospect and more creditably so, but upon making a prospective estimate they discover that the interest on the necessary outlay, plus the annual tax which the city would compel them to pay on a five new building, would leave them no better off than at present. The system of taxing a man according to what he owns or rather according to his industry and productiveness, tends to repress production and to discourage improvement. I am glad to see that following the state constitution of farm assessment the city has decided to examine in the right direction. This is a good move in the right direction, but it should be the exemption of all improvements, whether the plant of the manufacturer or the cottage of the artisan. There will be no advantage if the community or locates its own by the tax on the land value

TAX SPECULATIVE VALUES.

But it is said it would be hard on the farmer. It would not. Being a tax on the value produced by the presence of the population it would fall most heavily on the most populous centres. The rural neighbourhood would not be materially affected, save that it would prevent the locking up of farmlands for purposes of speculation. Farmers equally eligible would pay the same rate whether one started a farm stocked with game, lived in a hut and hoarded his money or improved his land, built good barns and fences and dwelt in a country mansion. "But you would destroy speculative values," you say. Yes, we would crush speculation as a form of gambling on natural opportunities; we would tax speculative values into the coffers of the community. But that would not be calamity. The land would be as good a world as it is. It is not a world of utility, but just as much for any useful purpose as if you had paid twice the price to a speculator. That eminence of authority, Fisher, says:

Natural laws forbid middlemen, who do not
ing make the land productive, and yet
sion upon the labor of the farmer, and rec
as rent part of the produce of his toil."

And again :

Land does not represent capital, but the
movements upon it do. A man does not
chase land. He buys the right of possession
any transfer of land there is no locking up
capital, because one man receives exactly
amount the other expends. " But the
of the land to become either more or less produc
by reason of the transfer from one perso
another; it is the withdrawal of labor
affects its productiveness.

OBJECTIONS MET.

I have heard it said that if the landholder failed to pay the tax he would be in danger of being dispossessed. That is true, but it is not a valid objection. If for a certain length of time the tax is not paid, procedure would be taken by sales to make collection. The reason why the holders of the holder to the proceeds of such sale, over the same and, consequently, would be as fully secured under the Single Tax system as they are at the case of tax sales now. The Single Tax would be a cheap tax, because it would encourage commerce and production from many hands and turn out an army of office-holding tax-esters to earn a living by protecting labor. It would be an easy tax to collect and would in that way alone save millions. It would take away the premium now paid to dishonesty, speculation and monopolistic practices in production, improvement and exchange. It would be a scientifically rect and honest tax, because it would share the fruits of all in the natural heritage for the benefit of all, instead of exalting a great majority from that heritage heavily taxing them afterwards. Again has been objected that in substituting single tax on land values for our present equitable, complex and expensive system which puts a penalty on the man who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before, we would act unjustly that all save the few rich would suffer. This objection indicates a failure to grasp the underlying principle of the theory of Land Nationalization; each has an interest in the land, it may not by whom it is held, the taking by State, as representing all, of even the annual value of the right of each work equitable and just. That all do not land has no relevancy to the argument. That many should be deprived of their share of nature's endowment is surely reason why they should be forced to contribute considerable percentage of what they own to the common advantage of those under similar conditions. In fact, the only real cause of the land revenue under any hydraulic system is the rent

THE GREAT LAW OF COMPENSATION.
There is a great law of compen

think he can divorce cause and consequence that he can do wrong and escape the penalty. The laws of Nature are the laws God. He is not mocked. It takes more than a Dominion or a Provincial Act to repeal this law :

peal their law :
 It will not be contemned of any one,
 For it is the law of life, and of peace, and of gain :
 The hidden good it pays with peace and bliss,
 The hidden ill with pains.
 It seeth everything and marketh all :
 Do right, it rewardeth right ; do one wrong,
 The equivalent must be paid.
 Tho' Dharma tarry long.
 It knows not wrath nor pardon, utter true
 Its faultless behests, and right
 Its laws are taught ; to-morrow it will judge,
 Or after many days.
 By this the slayer's knife did stab himself,
 The unjust judge, each lost his own defender :
 The tongue doth judge its lie ; the creeping thief
 And spoiler robs to render.
 Such is the law that moves to righteousness,
 Which none at last can make aside or stay :
 It is the law that ends the end of it,
 Is peace and consummation sweet. Obey !

EFFICACY OF THE REMEDY.

Perhaps if you are prepared to acknowledge the justice and wisdom of the principle for which I contend you may yet question its efficacy as a remedy for the prevailing poverty. I ask you to pause and consider that the question of poverty to-day is not one of production. Production, both actual and in proportion to labor expended never was more abundant; the Earth was never more fruitful. There is enough wealth to make all comfortable and yet lessen toil. The evil is one of distribution. Competition is rendered unnatural by the fact that an element necessary to labor and to life is made the property of the few. The few are free to contribute to their fellows for permission to labor, and are again taxed to maintain governmental institutions of a frequently prodigal and extravagant character.

WHO EARNED THE SPECULATOR'S PROFITS?

Every dollar made by the land speculator represents so much of the product of labor. Who produced it? Not the speculator. He is to society what the wolf is to the sheepfold. His business is to levy toll on progress; to prey upon the producers. It adds cent's worth to the sum of the world's wealth it is in the capacity of a producer. Speculation never made a dollar that was not taken from some man's earnings. Bear that in mind. The producer is always impoverished by exacting the sum taken by the speculator. He is a hole in the pocket of labor; a constant poor relation who might well be dispensed with. The single tax would be death to his craft, because it would destroy the speculative values, and labor would gain by relief from direct and indirect current imposts which, even in the most advanced countries, form a heavy and increasing burden. Taxation removed from production and exchange, which always affects restrictively, and places upon land values, would stimulate production, because it would not then be profitable to hold valuable land idle. There would be no speculative increase in value to look forward to, and the tax would be the same on lots equally eligible whether covered with thistles, producing abundant crops, or as the site of a factory employing thousands. It would vastly multiply opportunities for the utilization of labors which therefore tend to better wages. It would, in short, reform distribution.

A DEFINITE ISSUE.

Weight the proposition: A tax on products tends to restrict production; a tax on commerce tends to discourage exchange; both lead to less work and lower wages. A tax on land values tends to bring land into use to increase production, and, logically, more employment at better wages, which means more general comfort. The evil regarded as the distribution of wealth—system by which those who produce are enabled to possess themselves of a goodly share of the products of the earth—once corrected, and the right of each of all his earnings not only admitted given effect in practice; and the conditions which have made the right to land a boon, reversed, the results cannot be most beneficent. Competition will then be natural; the laborer worthy of his hire, as we now admit, will not be cheated out of a great portion of it; and if misfortune still make calls upon charity we shall be the better able to extend it without fear of pauperization when we have founded our economy on Justice. These gross extremes of wealth and poverty will rapidly disappear, and millionaires become fewer general comfort and happiness will increase, and every man will look back and marvel that a very association of idleness and riches and toil and poverty had not long ago pointed us to a solution of the problem.

NOT A REVOLUTIONARY PROPOSAL.

We are nearer the remedy than n imagine. Did time permit I might d the easy stages by which in Britain d to the community attaching to the e sive possession of land have been by i ested law-makers shifted to w shouldered, and how the idea of the nness of property in land has been p gated. Let me point out to you, how that no citizen under the British C owns land. The ownership vests in Crown as representing the whole peo not a few of them. A statute of Ed III. in force to-day, asserts :

"That the King is the universal lord and original proprietor of all land in his kingdom, and that no man can hold any estate or office, or exercise any power, or can possess any part, but what has mediately or immediately derived as a gift from him to be held on service.

And Fisher, referring to this, says

No lawyer will assert for any English subject a higher title than tenancy-in-fief, which is the impetus of holding and denies the assent of ownership.

THE WORLD MOVES.

We do not ask to invalidate any title to the land, or to interfere with its subsequent use. We simply propose that the conditions be restored and the rights of the people as now recognized in law be operative in practice; and that the shackles be stricken off and the removed from labor, production and

It was to be expected that a cause antagonizes such vast interests as that of Land Nationalization would with the bitterest opposition. What dell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison their handful of abolitionist friends of the chattel slaves of the South, the George McGlynn and their daily innumerable host of followers propose to do for the world's economic bondsmen, and

r
e
t
e
a
f
o
a
l-
y
a
at
d
no
ne
is
a-
is
id
id
is
id
o-
le
ld
ok
ne
ed
or
as
ly
or
er
is-

nos
m-
th
ax
se,
to
ich
in
the
not
f a
ers
to
but
ndi-
bor
not
ion
orer
will
if it;
our
to
tion
on
alsh
d if
fort
long
the
and
nted

nany
arac
uties
solu-
inter-
aker
ored-
ropa-
ever,
rown
n the
ple-
ward

t orig-
, and
of it
been
feodal

subject
bears
ertion

des to
ale or
atural
of the
made
the
fines
nd ex-

which
does
meet
Wen-
m and
lid for
orges,
easing
r the
in the