

SINGLE TAX COLUMN. THE TWO SIDES PRESENTED.

Rev. S. S. Craig and Rev. Prof. Clark.

At the recent meeting of the tax reform convention an interesting debate took place between Rev. Prof. Clark of Trinity College and Rev. S. S. Craig, Presbyterian pastor of Oakville, on "The moral aspect of the land question."

Pressure on the space at the disposal of The Globe prevented an extended report of the debate appearing at the time, but a summary of the arguments presented on the subject are now printed. Mr. Craig, a believer in the doctrine of single tax, presented his case first. Following is an outline of his argument:—I wish, he said, to confine my remarks to one point, mainly, the relation which men sustain to the land. Negatively, this relation may be stated thus: No man has a moral right to claim private property in land. Positively, every man has an equal moral right with every other man to the use of land. I will endeavor to prove this to be the only tenable position on the land question. The seriousness of this problem arises from the fact that those who own the land have the legal power of compelling the landless to give them a living. A man-made law which enables one class of men to perpetually and systematically plunder their fellows, while the latter are perfectly defenceless, cannot be otherwise than contrary to right reason, to natural justice and to the moral government of God. I wish to found my argument on a theistic basis.

(1) I believe in the existence of God and in the perfection of His nature and of His moral government.

(2) I believe He created all that exists—sin and its fruits excepted; and that He is in no way responsible for the selfishness of men, nor for the evils of society.

(3) I believe that when He placed man on the earth He perfectly correlated the one to the other. Man's power to "subdue the earth," to develop and utilize its powers are apparent. On the other hand, the suitability of the earth and its potencies to the development of man (on his physical side) is just as apparent. Perfect correspondence between the God-created man and the God-created environment is perfect life. Private property in land—the basis of physical life—renders such correspondence impossible on the part of the landless, and is clearly a violation of the law, that is, the purpose of the Creator. The fundamental principle that no man has a right to private property in land and that all men have an equal moral right to the use of land is supported and demonstrated by the truth of economics, of sociology, of morality, and of theology. The failure to view a land question from all of these four sides has led to confusion and error in all of these sciences.

Any other position than this—the equal right of all to the use of land—is necessarily atheistic, and can only be supported by atheistical arguments.

THE SINGLE TAX CORNER-STONE.

This equal right of all to the use of land is the corner-stone of the single tax theory. If Prof. Clark will admit this principle he must also admit its corollaries. If he denies it, he is under the necessity not only of rejecting it, but of finding another basis for individual rights. Man's right to the use of land and to life are one. He may choose either of the two positions. First, that one man has a right to the ownership of land; that this right is vested in government. This would secure equality of right, but on an atheistic basis. Besides, (1) How can the government be possessed of properties, powers and rights of which the units of society are destitute? Even if it be admitted that the government is possessed of certain rights based on conquest, still these rights are only legal and most square with the moral law. God and nature are against a legal right which involves a moral wrong, and so is man when true to God and to nature. (3) If were physical force (conquest) gives moral rights, why should the landless consent to the perpetuations of their enslavement when they have the power to reverse conditions? Does not the denial of individual right lead to socialism (properly so-called), to communism and to anarchy?

Second, that some men have a right to the ownership and use of the earth. Who are they? They are those now in possession and those who have the money-power to purchase the right of the present owners. This absurd position must be defended by all who adhere to our present iniquitous system of land tenure. But it is not sufficient to admit that those now in possession of the land have a right to it. The moral title must be "searched" not in the courts of men, but in the courts of God.

How did the ancestors of existing British landlords get their land? (1) By grant from the reigning sovereign. By what right had he or she to take the land of the many and give it to the

few? (2) By enclosure of commons, 8,000,000 acres, by special class legislation, being closed between the years 1710 and 1843. This enclosure of commons, this legalized theft, and the double object of enlarging the estate of the landlord and securing him free from cost all the slaves he desired. There are no more intelligent and submissive slaves in the world than Englishmen. But, of course, they are not sufficiently intelligent to own land, or to be otherwise than servants, and, even if they do not get exact justice here, the Lord will abundantly compensate them in the future life. So say the landlords, and current theology applauds the wisdom of the utterance.

THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

(1) The rights of the individual in the use of the land were carefully guarded. Num. xxvii. 1-7.

(2) So were the rights of the family. Num. xxvii. 8-11.

(3) So were the rights of the tribe. Num. xxvii. 5-13.

It is quite evident from a study of Lev. xxv chapter, that the Lord never gave people individually or collectively any right of property in the land.

(1) When a man through need was obliged to sell his right, what he actually sold was not his right in the land, but his right to the use of the land, till the year of jubilee. Lev. xxv. 14-16.

(2) The Lord commanded that the land should not be sold for ever. Man literally rendered it would be, the land shall not be sold in fee-simple. Lev. xxv. 23.

(3) The Almighty claimed that He, Himself, was the only and the absolute owner of the land. Lev. xxv. 23. But it will be replied that this is going back to Judaism with which we have nothing to do. Judaism is a much abused scapegoat. Surely the 8th commandment is still in force. If the moral law favors private property in land it favors theft. The teaching of Jesus Christ confirms that of the Old Testament on the land question.

PROF. CLARK'S REPLY.

Professor Clark replying to Mr. Craig, said that the previous speaker had complained of not being aware of the line which he would take. The fact was that he had no line in particular. He accepted the present order of things as one which, although not perfectly satisfactory, yet was capable of being amended, and ought not to be revolutionized, and he was bound to say that so far, he had heard no good argument for the sweeping changes proposed by the advocates of the single tax. He was himself under the disadvantage of not having known the precise line which the previous speaker would take, but he would do his best to follow him.

Taking his main propositions, he began with the first—that no man has a moral right to claim private property in land. Here was a very equivocal statement. What was meant by private property in land? In the full sense of those words no such thing existed. The State had never allowed anyone to possess land except under conditions. All landowners, so-called, were tenants of the Crown, and were heavily taxed for the purposes of Government—some taxes falling upon them directly and many more indirectly. How far this should be extended was simply a question of expediency.

The second principle asserted was the following: That every man has an equal moral right with every other man to the use of land. This astonishing statement was repeated in a variety of forms, but there was not a tittle of proof given of its validity. Scripture was quoted, but it was perfectly well-known that property in land was recognized both in the Old Testament and in the New. The case of Ananias and Sapphira made that most clear.

THE VALUE OF CULTIVATION.

But the previous speaker had said a good deal about the divine ordering of the world, and that God had appointed mankind universally to subdue and possess the world. But supposing a number of the members of the human family should refuse to do their share of the work of subduing the earth, were they then to share equally with the men who subdued it? If not, what became of the proposition that every man had an equal moral right with every other man to the use of land? But, if on the contrary, it was said that those who had been standing idle might equally enter in and take possession, this would be introducing peculiar ideas of justice with human affairs. Suppose, for example, a thousand men should land upon an uncultivated island and subdue it and cultivate it and make it fruitful, should we say that ten thousand squatters, who had done nothing towards the reclaiming of the land, might settle upon it and claim equal rights with those who had done the work? Such a conclusion would hardly commend itself to the common conscience of mankind.

THE VALUE OF CULTIVATION.

But it was said that land might be taken from its owners because they had no right to possess it. Did this mean that they had no right to make it valuable? It would be of no value without their labor. Had they no right to labor upon it to give it worth? Professor Goldwin Smith had truly remarked that an acre of heath or of uncultivated land was of no more value than an acre of the sea; and a great deal of the land of this Province had cost its cultivators and owners as much in labor and money as it was worth—as it would fetch, if it were now sold.

This single tax scheme was very much the same as the nationalization of the land. This was denied by the single taxers; but every argument employed in its defence was equally applicable to the other theory. It would not at least be denied that it would immensely reduce the value of the land; so that the landowners would be greatly burdened, while the millionaires, who derived their wealth from manufactures and merchandise, would be exempted from the payment of taxes, which they could afford quite as well as the landowners. And so it would

come to pass that if two men, by their industry, saved a sum of money, and one invested the savings in land and the other in machinery and the like, nearly the whole burden of government would be imposed upon the former and very little upon the latter. Such a state of things might commend itself to single taxers; but to ordinary men it would seem unfair, unjust, robbery.

And what reason had they to suppose that such a scheme, even if carried out, would so greatly benefit the poorer classes of the people? It was one of the wildest dreams that we could remove poverty and distress from mankind by any economic measures. Doubtless changes might be made which would improve the conditions of living. Such changes had been made and were being made. But no sweeping changes were likely to be beneficial. Revolutions had never done much good, and for a long time had generally brought great misery to peoples. It was by industry and temperance that poverty and suffering were to be removed.

IS THIS THE BOLD TRAIN ROBBER?

George Carter, Ex-Convict and All-Round Thug, Supposed to Be the Ring-leader.

Washington, Oct. 15.—There is every reason to suppose that the leader of the gang which perpetrated the bold train robbery at Aquia Creek, Va., on Friday night has been identified. It is George Carter, a former resident of the neighborhood, an ex-convict of Sing Sing, a railroad engineer, and a man who has been associated with many scenes of robbery and bloodshed.

Carter is about 31 years old, 5 feet 10 1/2 inches high, weighs a little over 160 pounds, and has all respects resembling the man who fired the shot through the door at the express messenger and subsequently threw the stick of dynamite which shattered the sides of Adams' express car and made the robbery easy. Carter is described as a man of dark complexion, with high cheek bones, brown hair, deep set eyes, large ears and a sharp and angular face, with two moles on the left cheek and one on the under lid of his right eye. In addition thereto, the thumb and index finger of his right hand have been shot off in one of his many desperate deeds. Carter was sentenced to a seven-years' term of imprisonment in Sing Sing in 1893, for robbing the house of the superintendent of Blackwell's Island.

THE RUSH TO BIG CITIES.

A Single Taxer Tells How He Thinks It Can Be Averted.

Hermann Ritter, of East Wayne street, Lima, Ohio, writes as follows to The News: "You say with reference to the rush from country to city that the advantages of city life have no existence in fact. It would be well for many who have to earn their living by their labor to bear the wholesome truth contained in your statement better in mind, for it is easily observable that life in the country or smaller towns offers a great deal better existence to workingmen than in the great cities."

"There must be a reason for this fact and the question arises: Why should the masses of the people who earn their daily bread as workmen and workwomen be worse off in the great cities than in the country and smaller towns? There is no great difference in wages; food and clothing cost about the same. There is one thing, however, that costs a great deal more in the large cities, and that is land. The purchase price of a lot is so high in the cities that it is next to impossible for many ever to own a home of their own and so they keep on paying rent all their lives."

"And this rent is so high that it takes a very considerable part of their earnings. Not that there is not land enough for people to build their own home on, but it is largely in the hands of land speculators who want to reap a harvest from the increase of its value. The high taxes on their unimproved land as settle the land speculator's business, for then they would have to pay just as high taxes on their unimproved land as other people pay for similarly located land with its improvements."

"The low taxes paid now on the unimproved land speculators to hang on to it for high prices, but under the single tax the taxes on unimproved land, especially in or near the great cities would be far higher; consequently the speculators would be eager to get rid of their land and would sell it a great deal cheaper. It would then be much easier for people to have homes of their own. If the full rent value of land, irrespective of improvements, were taken by taxation, as the single tax would do if fully applied, then the selling value of land would disappear everywhere or be trifling, and people could then far easier make a living on their own account instead of being driven to compete with their fellows in the great cities. The rush would again turn the other way, viz., from city to country, and instead of having mammoth factories and tenement houses we would have far more smaller factories and people living in homes of their own."

The Jewelry Auction Fakirs.

The city papers report that a large number of the visitors to the Fair were duped in the "fake" auction rooms. The city authorities have often enough discussed the propriety of permitting these concerns to do business and know well the character of the average itinerant vendor of jewelry. It is a burning shame that irresponsible people should be given an opportunity of selling trashy stuff to visitors who would doubtless have made their purchases from reliable firms had not these temptations of "bargains" been thrust in their way. It is a poor advertisement for Toronto to send visitors home with the burning consciousness

of having been swindled. There are enough side shows and extra fees on the Exhibition grounds to eat up the surplus of the average visitor, without permitting fakirs to waylay the people on the business streets with make-believe auctions and cunningly-devised schemes for selling trashy stuff at a price of the genuine article.

Whoever is responsible for having permitted this condition of things during the Fair should at once be called down and such things suppressed in the future. It is not only an outrage on the visitors, but it damages the business of all legitimate concerns and casts discredit on the whole city.—"Don" in Saturday Night.

IS THIS THE BOLD TRAIN ROBBER?

George Carter, Ex-Convict and All-Round Thug, Supposed to Be the Ring-leader.

Washington, Oct. 15.—There is every reason to suppose that the leader of the gang which perpetrated the bold train robbery at Aquia Creek, Va., on Friday night has been identified. It is George Carter, a former resident of the neighborhood, an ex-convict of Sing Sing, a railroad engineer, and a man who has been associated with many scenes of robbery and bloodshed.

Carter is about 31 years old, 5 feet 10 1/2 inches high, weighs a little over 160 pounds, and has all respects resembling the man who fired the shot through the door at the express messenger and subsequently threw the stick of dynamite which shattered the sides of Adams' express car and made the robbery easy. Carter is described as a man of dark complexion, with high cheek bones, brown hair, deep set eyes, large ears and a sharp and angular face, with two moles on the left cheek and one on the under lid of his right eye. In addition thereto, the thumb and index finger of his right hand have been shot off in one of his many desperate deeds. Carter was sentenced to a seven-years' term of imprisonment in Sing Sing in 1893, for robbing the house of the superintendent of Blackwell's Island.

THE RUSH TO BIG CITIES.

A Single Taxer Tells How He Thinks It Can Be Averted.

Hermann Ritter, of East Wayne street, Lima, Ohio, writes as follows to The News: "You say with reference to the rush from country to city that the advantages of city life have no existence in fact. It would be well for many who have to earn their living by their labor to bear the wholesome truth contained in your statement better in mind, for it is easily observable that life in the country or smaller towns offers a great deal better existence to workingmen than in the great cities."

"There must be a reason for this fact and the question arises: Why should the masses of the people who earn their daily bread as workmen and workwomen be worse off in the great cities than in the country and smaller towns? There is no great difference in wages; food and clothing cost about the same. There is one thing, however, that costs a great deal more in the large cities, and that is land. The purchase price of a lot is so high in the cities that it is next to impossible for many ever to own a home of their own and so they keep on paying rent all their lives."

"And this rent is so high that it takes a very considerable part of their earnings. Not that there is not land enough for people to build their own home on, but it is largely in the hands of land speculators who want to reap a harvest from the increase of its value. The high taxes on their unimproved land as settle the land speculator's business, for then they would have to pay just as high taxes on their unimproved land as other people pay for similarly located land with its improvements."

"The low taxes paid now on the unimproved land speculators to hang on to it for high prices, but under the single tax the taxes on unimproved land, especially in or near the great cities would be far higher; consequently the speculators would be eager to get rid of their land and would sell it a great deal cheaper. It would then be much easier for people to have homes of their own. If the full rent value of land, irrespective of improvements, were taken by taxation, as the single tax would do if fully applied, then the selling value of land would disappear everywhere or be trifling, and people could then far easier make a living on their own account instead of being driven to compete with their fellows in the great cities. The rush would again turn the other way, viz., from city to country, and instead of having mammoth factories and tenement houses we would have far more smaller factories and people living in homes of their own."

The Jewelry Auction Fakirs.

The city papers report that a large number of the visitors to the Fair were duped in the "fake" auction rooms. The city authorities have often enough discussed the propriety of permitting these concerns to do business and know well the character of the average itinerant vendor of jewelry. It is a burning shame that irresponsible people should be given an opportunity of selling trashy stuff to visitors who would doubtless have made their purchases from reliable firms had not these temptations of "bargains" been thrust in their way. It is a poor advertisement for Toronto to send visitors home with the burning consciousness

TRUE ECONOMY

lies in buying good things, Good things need not be high priced. There's a certain hard wall of facts and figures, but there stands between possibility and prodigious prices. There are certain prices below which no good, honest furniture can be bought. Those prices are ours. If you pay less you get less. No use dodging a fact. We sell the following:

- PARLOR SUITES.....\$30 00
- BEDROOM SUITES.... 10 00
- SIDEBOARDS..... 6 00
- EXTENSION TABLES... 5 00
- CENTRE TABLES.....
- BEDSTEADS.....
- 6 CHAIRS.....

And a large assortment of PLUSH AND RATTAN GOODS which will be sold at prices away down.

Don't forget We lead the Trade in FURNITURE UNDERTAKING.

ANDERSON NUGENT & CO
KENT STREET LINDSAY.

W. G. WOODS

LEADER IN SUMMER GOODS.

SEE THE OXFORD OIL GAS STOVES

4 Sizes, can be used in every house.

THE OXFORD GAS RANGE

from 75 cents to \$20, each. Gas mains extended free charge to consumers.

LAWN MOWERS IN SEVERAL VARIETIES

PRICES DOWN. FRUIT TREE SPRAYERS, REFRIGERATORS, ETC.

NAME IT SEIRECORG

Why, of course, it spells groceries when you read it backward and that is just what

SPRATT & KILLEN

deal in. They carry a full stock of everything in the culinary line required at home.

CAMPERS' SUPPLIE.

- CANNED CORNED BEEF
- SOUPS
- SALMON
- LOBSTERS
- SARDINES
- TOMATOES
- PIG'S FEET.

ALL FRESH GOODS

PROMPT DELIVERY

Is a feature of our business. We deliver purchases of any kind, everywhere and at any time free of charge.

GIVE US A CALL SPRATT & KILLEN,

KENT STREET, LINDSAY

The Verulam Agricultural Society is to be commended upon their energy and enterprise in having the most successful ever held under its auspices. It was every way a pronounced success. The board of directors realized early last year that if the home of the good and the beautiful (Bobcaygeon) was ever to become famous as a fair centre they must forth greater efforts in the way of improved grounds and secure greater attractions than had yet been attempted. The arrival at this conclusion—the first step was to secure additional territory, to make a suitable tract for exhibition purposes, and enclose the same with a high board fence. This work was all accomplished early in the spring. The prize had been added to, and affairs in connection with the society were continuingly booming and the result which is highly creditable to the directorate as well as an efficient secretary, Mr. W. J. Read. To state that Mr. Boyd surpassed himself at this fair is putting it mildly indeed. In furnishing an attraction so unobjectionable, and at the same time keeping the general idea of a fair, stands unrivalled, even by the great industrial first on the list, within a stout enclosure, was the majestic buffalo bull, Napoleon. This is a noble looking representative of the fast disappearing breed, weighing fully 2,000 pounds, and with just sufficient temper not to become a "spoiled pet". This animal is being crossed with the native cows, and it is an experiment that many farmers are taking a great interest in. It is stated that the beef procured from this cross is far superior to that of the pure bred cattle. Adjoining this pen was a fine herd of nine head of recently imported West Highland cattle, the first has ever been our good fortune to see. They are certainly an oddity in their line, giving every evidence of being a hardy mountain cattle. At the same time it is likely that they would win a warm place in the esteem of our noted breeders. Next to these come the grand Polled Angus cows and two very fine calves. They are certainly beautiful animals and appeared to catch the public fancy even at Bobcaygeon, where they have become somewhat naturalized. Then followed an Arabian pair of Mexican Burro's, grown as the Rocky Mountain nightingales; a Persian ram and two ewes, a rosetta to sheep men, with their large haunches, a pair of white Angora goats, and then came the children's delight in the way of a beautiful cream colored pony and a magnificent St. Bernard dog. The exhibit was unquestionably the greatest attraction it has ever been our good fortune to witness at the fair, and we trust that the directorate of our own central fair will leave no stone unturned to induce Mr. Boyd to send the outfit to Lindsay next year.

In every department of the fair the improvement was marked. The inside exhibits were particularly good, embracing fine lines of everything in the way of handsome ladies work, as well as some really interesting novelties in other lines. An attractive exhibit was made from the Central School Supply Co., of Chicago, in the way of embossed maps, globes etc. Certainly the atlas was a revelation to many. In the way of novelties, Mr. M. Boyd showed a Mexican saddle, rawhide, rifle and reins, horse-hair whip and nose-hair rope, bridle and laso. The nose-hair rope referred to is not only useful for all purposes that a rope can be applied to, but is also claimed that snakes will net pass over it when laid on the ground and is therefore very useful when the owner sleeps on the ground or in his tent. Mr. Boyd also showed stuffed owls, hawks and loons. Next to this exhibit was the centre of attraction for the fair Mrs. Ross, the local milliner, having a neat display of fall and winter millinery in all the latest shapes and styles. The customary display of shawls, unions and knitted goods was seen in every hand. In roots and vegetables showing was well up, while in grains was the best in years.

The poultry exhibit was very fair indeed, but were badly boarded, being on ramps on the ground and a person had to climb with all the enthusiasm of a baby breeder to thoroughly investigate these show.

The different classes of horses were fully well represented, and so many creditable animals were shown in each. In draught horses, Mr. M. Boyd secured the honors with a grand pair of Suffolk hunches, one of the finest pairs that we have seen this year. In the classes for young stock Fred Steele secured the red ribbon with a neat but rather small colt of two year-old, while Mr. R. Robertson secured the same honor with a nice colt by Knight of St. Andrew's. In agricultural horses the competition was somewhat keener. In teams Mr. A. Braden, C. Fairbairn and F. Steele showed good teams. S. Thurston showed a fine colt by Merry Boy, that was a credit to that sire. T. Russell and Jas. McCallum also had superior colts. In the two year olds there was a fine lot. S. Thurston had a good Champion Fred and Mrs. Falls a ratling good Knight of St. Andrew's and divided the honors between them. One fine roan colt was unfortunately exhibited in this lot that should have been shown as a drafter and would have been ornamented with a red and blue. In the year old consignment Fred Steele had a very neat colt by Highland but his color certainly did not commend him. J. Falls had a good yearling in this class. In the carriage class the entries were very numerous and were really good. Mr. A. E. Buttum easily came first with a handsome bay driver by Black Diamond. Mr. Garlick followed second with a good Lapland Chief three-year-old. There was also two others the same age in this class and were a creditable lot. The other exhibitors were J. Haver, J. W. Wood and W. Warren. However, the animals shown while good were hardly what would meet with favor in a city market, and there is room for improvement in this class. The