

In the Oct 29, 1887  
issue of 'The Standard'  
page 3.  
This issue is no 17 Vol.

5378

## THE STANDARD

### SINGLE TAX VS. SOCIALISM.

THE DEBATE BETWEEN SERGIUS E. SHEVITCH AND

HENRY GEORGE.

A Crowded House, with Hundreds Turned Away - A Full  
Statement of Socialistic Objections to the Single  
Tax - The Possibilities of Labor with Free Access  
to Natural Opportunities.

The debate between Henry George and Sergius E. Shevitch, the socialist leader, took place last Sunday evening in Miner's theater, Eighth Avenue, near Twenty-fifth street. The building was packed as it had never been before, fully three thousand people being jammed within its walls, and over a thousand others clamoring in vain for admittance.

A supply of tickets had been distributed by the united labor party and by the socialists, an equal number to each. The socialists' tickets were printed on red cards and the united labor tickets on blue ones. This distinction was used by the ushers to divide the audience into two parts, the reds taking the left of the house and the blues the right. The main aisle divided the two sections. This was done to prevent any disputes in the audience which might interrupt the debate on the stage.

On the stage were John McMackin, Frank Ferrell and others among the united labor men, while James Redpath had a seat in a box. Among the progressives present were Hugo Vogt, Alexander Jonas, Dr. F.W. Lillenthal, Charles Sotheran and Edward King.

At 8 o'clock precisely Mr. Samuel Gompers took his seat at the

presiding officer's table, placed his watch and a bell upon it, and opened the meeting by announcing the conditions of the debate. Drawing attention to the fact that the gathering was not a campaign meeting, he urged the audience to refrain alike from applause and hisses. He announced that Mr. Shewitch and Mr. George would speak alternately each for forty-five minutes; after which each would be allowed fifteen minutes for replies.

#### MR. SHEVITCH'S ARGUMENT.

Mr. Shewitch then arose and began his address in a calm, deliberate voice. He said:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In coming on this platform to-night, I come to you with all due consciousness of the great task which I have undertaken and of my unworthiness to perform it. I ask your indulgence from the very beginning. I want only to say that the words I will speak to-night will be that which I consider to be the truth without any reference whatever to personal feeling.

The subject of discussion to-night is the scheme of Mr. George of the single land tax, to substitute which for all other forms of taxation, will, as he represents, solve the social and labor questions of our day. I propose to show that this single land tax system is not only insufficient to solve those questions, but if considered alone, if considered as a social panacea, independently of all other social reforms, it will be productive of results which will be more hurtful to labor than beneficial.

I will in the second part of my remarks show how, on account of this false basis on which the labor movement, so far as the united labor party is concerned, has been placed, the whole political movement

of labor has been side-tracked, has been distorted, has been put upon a platform on which no true labor movement can stand.

This is what I will attempt to show during my remarks.

Production, as it is organized now, is regulated by two vast instruments of labor; machinery, with all the powers of nature which now produce such <sup>e</sup>tr~~m~~endous wealth all over the civilized world, and the land, which produces the necessities of life. Now let us see. If we nationalize one of these instruments of production; if we nationalize what Mr. George calls the natural opportunities given to man by nature - that is to say, the land - will this nationalization of the land by itself solve the social problem? Mr. George does not advocate the nationalization of land. He does not want to disturb anybody in the title to property in land. All he wants is to confiscate the rent which the present proprietor of the land gets, by a taxation equivalent to the whole rent. But let us study the question broadly. Let us assume that he does want to nationalize the land. What would be the consequence? The consequence would be that a certain lot of land which now belongs to a private citizen, Tom Jones, will belong to the community. The man who builds on that land will have to pay his rent, not to private proprietor, but to the community. That rent will perhaps in the long run be a little less than the rent he pays now.

Now, suppose a city in which there are ten factories. In each of these factories one hundred men are working for wages. The factories are supplied with all the necessary machinery. These hundred men get \$2. a day under present circumstances. Now the system of nationalization of land is introduced. The man who owns the factory, the boss, will pay his rent not to the proprietor of the land, but to the com-

munity. Will his workingmen in consequence of that simple fact get higher wages? Why should they?

If to-morrow a new machine is made which renders half the men superfluous, the proprietor will throw out half of his hands. Each of these factories will work, instead of with one hundred men with fifty men. The men thrown out will come to the proprietor and say: "We are ready to work for less wages; give us instead of two dollars a dollar and twenty-five cents." And other men who have no families to support will say, "Give me a dollar a day." The same process of competition between laborer and laborer, ground down by that terrible monster, the machine, will go on whether the land belongs to the community or whether it belongs to Tom Jones. (Applause.)

But Mr. George will say: "This is not true. The competition between the laborers will be, if not entirely destroyed, at least greatly relieved by the fact that the land is free, that these men thrown out of employment by the machine may go out somewhere, in the uptown districts of the city, take from the community for a very small rent a lot of land, construct their houses on it and live there in peace." How will they build a house on it? With their hands, with their nails, with their feet? (Applause and hisses.) Where is the money to purchase the instruments of labor? Where is that engine of production, capital? They have'nt got it. Does land give them capital? Does bare land give them anything except the land? Where are they to get the necessary machinery in order to bring materials so as to be able to subsist from the products of that land? I don't think that any answer can be given to that question. (Laughter.) You may laugh, gentlemen, but it is nevertheless a truth. It is not the

first truth that has been laughed at in the world. (Applause and hisses)

Somebody will say that the building trades will have a good deal to do. That is true to a certain extent. House-rents will certainly grow cheaper. But don't you know that as long as capital, concentrated in private hands, has control of the labor market the rate of wages is regulated by the means of living. If rents grow cheaper wages will have a tendency to fall. With every new machine, every new invention in industrial production, a great number of working men and women will be thrown out of employment. The labor market will be crowded precisely as it is now. Where is the difference?

There is one other argument in favor of the land tax. You force those who hold land for speculative purposes to make it productive. This argument we indorse in full; but no single land tax is necessary. What is necessary is simply a land tax especially high on unimproved land, compelling speculators to put their land to profitable use.

The single land tax would be a single tax. All other taxes would be abolished. The tremendous concentrations of capital would be entirely free of any taxes at all. It would mean absolutely free trade. American labor would have to compete with the combined force of capital all over the civilized world. (Applause.) If you introduce absolute free trade dozens of branches of industry would droop and die.

A voice: "Name them."

Thousands and thousands of workmen would be thrown out of employment. A commercial crisis would be the consequence such as we have never seen yet in this country. The labor market would be overcrowded. What would we do with free land then? Sit on it or lie on

it or be tramps upon it. (Applause and hisses.) Land without the instruments of labor to cultivate it is just as worthless as a boat without sails.

Mr. George takes the example of Robinson Crusoe and Friday. Suppose Robinson Crusoe said to Friday: "You are not only a free citizen of this island, but this land belongs to you just as well as to me. But there is a little hitch in the matter. I expect a vessel to-morrow to bring me all the necessary engines to cultivate this land and some workmen, but you are free to do so just as well as I." Where would poor Friday be then, without a penny in his pocket, without a single instrument to cultivate that land? (Laughter.) Would he not be the slave of Robinson Crusoe?

Mr. George does not want the nationalization of land. All he desires can be obtained by the single land tax. What would be the consequence? Take the city of New York. The real estate of this city is held under various conditions at present. Some of it belongs to some men to whom the buildings belong. Some belongs to other men than those to whom the buildings belong. What would be the consequence of the single land tax? First, where the land and the buildings belong to the same men? Now the community gets the full rental value of that land.

The man will say: "I will pay that tax and I won't give up the land, or if anybody wants to have that land let him pay for the house, which is worth two millions of dollars." How are you going to get out of that?

Let us take the instance where the land and houses belong to different parties. The man invites other millionaires to join him. They form a combine and say to those who own the houses, "You will have

to pay an equivalent to us for this horrible tax." And the men who own the houses will go to the tenants who rent the offices and say, "Now you will have to pay us so much more in order to compensate for that land tax." The man who rents the office will take it from the one who sells his goods to. Who is that? Who? It is always the same poor wretched beggar, the proletarian, the workingman. (Applause.) The whole theory of the single land tax is founded on the sophistry that the present robbery of labor centers in the one fact of private ownership of land, which is not true. If the means of production remained in private hands labor would be robbed just as it is now. The great land owners will immediately form a combine to resist the land tax. In a few years the condition of the laborer would be the same as it is now.

But what will not be the same as this - by that single land tax you will give to the government a tremendous power which it does not possess now. Mr. George likes to accuse the socialists of desiring a paternal government. I tell you Mr. George's scheme is much more horrible paternal government than the socialists ever proposed. (Applause and cheers, mingled with hisses.) To the government will belong a vast amount of land, and the government will have the possibility of determining the height of the rent for that land. It will furthermore and that is perfectly right - have the railroads, the telegraphs and all the means of communication. Think of the power that government will have. The great industrial corporations, the machinery of industrial production, remains just as it is now. Capitalists will have the same powers over the government officials as they have now. The government will fall into the hands of the monopolists of industry just as it does

now into the hands of the monopolists of industry and land combined.

The single tax does not touch the labor question. That question centers in the robbery committed on labor by those who hold possession of the instruments of labor. And it is not the socialists who say so, it is the men of organized labor. (Applause.) Mr. George thinks that rent is the robbery committed on working men. He forgets that at the bottom of that robbery is simply the competition between labor and labor, and that competition will not be destroyed by any amount of single land tax.

The land tax scheme, whether it be wrong or right, is an utopian theory born in one mind, uncorroborated by the actual state of facts. It is a theory of one man, and that theory has been forced upon the large labor movement while that movement was not in any way prepared, not only to understand, but even critically to examine that idea! Mr. George may ask why did all the trades of New York as one man support him in the last campaign? "Where is the difference? I was the same man and my theory was the same?" We can answer that. The great majority of the working population of this city supported Mr. George last year, not because of his land theory, but notwithstanding his land theory (applause,) , as a sincere and honest man - which he is now (tremendous applause) - because he had written in his book, "Progress and Poverty," one of the most tremendous indictments against the present order of society which has ever been published. (Applause.) The critical part of his work is grand. Every man who is dissatisfied with the existing order will shake hands with Mr. George even now. The laboring population accepted him as a standard bearer, thinking he was broad minded enough to sink part of his petty theories in the



one vast, grand labor movement, which is not one-sided, but which has many sides and is as broad as the civilized world itself is broad. (Applause.) The man who can force one idea upon millions of people can be the originator of a sect, or, if he is a politician, can be the originator of a political machine; but he will never be the originator of a great political party of labor. (Applause and hisses.) When Mr. George attempted to do so he smashed the party of united labor. (Hisses and applause.) As I told him on the Syracuse platform under the ban of expulsion - "If you attempt to force this one idea upon the labor movement, you will smash the party to pieces," and they have done it. (Cries of "No! no!" hisses, applause and cries of "order." Mr. Gompers and Mr. George both arising and motioning the audience to keep quiet.)

From the very beginning, after the close of the campaign last year, the whole system of Mr. George and his friends has been to substitute for the large party of labor something on the one hand like a church, and on the other hand like an ordinary political machine. (Great disorder, hisses and cheers.) Instead of leaving the movement in the hands of the labor organizations they called the bogus mass meeting in Cooper union and elected, or rather nominated, their central committee without any other powers than those which Mr. George himself conferred upon them. This same line of policy was continued throughout the year (a voice, "Stick to your subject!"); land and other labor clubs were formed throughout the state without any constituency behind them - (Cries of "Question! question!" Mr. Gompers rising and requesting the speaker to confine himself to the subject of the debate.)

My reasoning is that a false basis implies a false policy. A certain theory propounded by one man may, as I have said, form a church

but it will not form a great party. The movement of labor has been side-tracked into these land and labor clubs, practically under no control of organized labor whatever, composed of men not belonging to the laboring classes. Mr. George has succeeded in founding what I might call the Church of Progress and Poverty, but he has not founded the great American labor party. (Applause and cheers.)

HENRY GEORGE'S REPLY.

Mr. Gompers then introduced Mr. George who was received with intense enthusiasm. He said:

I am about to speak on the time limit, and therefore your applause will simply take away so much of my time. What Mr. George has founded or what he has not founded I do not propose to discuss. We are here tonight for a more important object. We all agree that labor to-day does not get its fair earnings. I come to defend what I believe to be not merely the best but the only possible way to emancipate labor. I do not claim for this measure - the taking for the use of the community the rental value of land - that it would do everything. It is the beginning. After it is done all other things will be made easier, and until we have done that we shall be rowing against the tide in all other reforms. (Applause and hisses.)

Now, the great difference between the opinions that I represent and the opinions that Mr. Shevitch represents may be seen in Lasalle's open letter to workingmen of Germany. He accepted the law laid down by the orthodox political economists - the law that wages must always tend to the minimum which will enable the laborer to live and to reproduce. That he calls the iron law of wages. There I and those who think with me take issue. We do not believe that there is in nature any such

thing as the iron law of wages. We hold that it is merely the law of wages where natural opportunities are monopolized.

This competition is a one-sided competition of men debarred of their natural opportunities for employment. The means of production, what do they consist of to-day? The answer will probably be land, machinery and various other things. There was in the beginning nothing but man and the earth. Human labor exerted upon the land brings out, produces, all other means of production. Therefore it is that land is more important than anything else. Given men and given land and all other things can be produced. Give a man everything else and deprive him of land and it avails him nothing. (Applause and cheers.)

To recur to that illustrations of Robinson Crusoe and Friday. Mr. Shevitch says that Robinson Crusoe having machinery, and tools, Friday would have been perfectly helpless. Well, that I deny, Friday, without any machinery, could certainly have gone fishing. (Laughter and applause cheers and hisses.) If the island had belonged to Robinson Crusoe he could not have done that. Friday could have done without machinery or tools just as Robinson Crusoe did. Friday could have made him a hut out of the limbs of a tree. Friday could have lived and produced as a naked man, applying his labor to the natural opportunities offered by that island. If three or four others came there, they could have lived as well. But the moment Robinson Crusoe owned the land, that moment he could say to Friday: "Unless you do so and so you walk off." (Laughter.) Friday would have been his absolute slave.

Wages in all branches of industry are not what they ought to be. That increase in productive power that comes from discovery and invention

does not raise wages as it ought to do. But what is the reason of that? It is perfectly clear that wages in all occupations must tend to a general level. Now, the broadest of all occupations in the United States is - what? (A voice: "Farming") Those occupations which apply directly to nature, which extract wealth from the soil. Now, in the state of New York, can the man who comes here with not merely his natural powers, but with something more, with a little capital - can he go to work and cultivate the soil? The ordinary renting rate in the state of New York to-day is one-half the produce. The man who does the labor gets only half of what his labor produces. The rest goes to the owner of the farm. There, in that primary occupation, labor is divested of one-half of its earnings. When, in that primary industry, labor is shorn of one-half of its earnings, what do you expect in those industries that rise above it? To put a tax on the value of land, removing all other taxes that now bear upon labor and to take for the use of the community the value that attaches to land by reason of the growth of the community, would have in the first place the operation that Mr. Shevitch concedes. It would make the holding of land on speculation unprofitable. That of itself would tend to destroy that competition which everywhere tends to press wages down. I don't mean to say that every one would want to be a farmer. That is the one thing all men could be. And enough could and would become farmers to relieve the glut in the labor market. (Applause.)

Mr. Shevitch asks what could a man with merely his hands do with the land. We have in this city illustrations of what the very poorest classes can do when they have the land. Did you ever see Squattertown? (Applause.) There are men who by going on vacant land put up some sort

of a rude dwelling and make themselves some sort of a home. And so everywhere let man have access to land and he can in some way use it.

Take this city of New York. Mr. Shevitch divided the people into two classes - the owners of land and houses and the owners of land where other parties were the owners of the houses. He spoke of these two classes, and I think, forgot another class - those who own land where there are no houses. (Applause.) The effect of the tax on the first class would be to simply make them pay the value of the land to the community and relieve them of all taxes whatever upon the houses. The mere ownership of land would become utterly worthless. Mr. Shevitch paints a picture of the real estate owners making a grand combine and putting up rents, so as to recompense themselves for the additional tax imposed upon land values. If they can do it by making a combine, why don't they do it now? Let us suppose that the owners of used land were to make such a combine, what would they do with the owners of vacant land? Would they take them into the combine also? (Laughter applause and hisses.)

Here is the principle of taxation: A tax which is levied upon the production of a thing that must constantly be produced by human labor will, by making supply more difficult, raise prices, and the man who pays the tax is thus enabled to push the tax upon the consumer. But a tax upon the value of land has no such effect. Land does not have to be constantly supplied in order to meet the demand. Its price is always a monopoly value, and a tax which falls upon land values does not fall upon all land, but only upon valuable land, and that in proportion to its value.

It is perfectly true that were we to raise all our revenues in

this way we could get along without the custom house and, have absolute free trade. But I for one can see no horrors in absolute free trade. On the contrary, what labor wants is freedom, not protection. (Applause.) Absolute free trade in any sense worthy of the name means free production. Once make production free and labor can take care of itself. (applause.)

In what consists the value of land? It is a premium, an advantage, which the use of any particular piece of land will give over what the same application of labor and capital can get from the poorest land in use. Therefore, if we take that premium for the use of the whole community we put all land upon a substantial plane of equality. We can abolish all other taxes and enormously simplify government. Opening opportunities for labor, we get rid of that bitter competition that today everywhere tends to force wages down. Then we could go on, not to a paternal government that attempts to regulate everything, but to a government that can control businesses in their nature monopolies. (Applause.) Once put the social foundation on a firm and equal basis and then we can march forward in that direction as far as may be necessary. We do not hold that everything is done when this one single measure is carried out, but we do hold that a firm and true beginning is made. Men have lived and can live without the railroad and without the telegraph, but no man ever has lived or ever can live without land. (Great applause.)

Here Mr. George hesitated, while the audience remained in silent suspense. Finally he said: "I was stopping, trying to think of some points I have not covered, but I have forgotten them."

A voice: "The ownership of machinery."

Oh, yes; about that factory. (Laughter.) Mr. Shevitch says that the owners of those factories may get a new invention which will enable them to produce the same result with only one-half the labor, and then those who are discharged will beg for employment at reduced rates. That would not be so if the men had opportunity to employ themselves. No man will work for an employer for less than he can get employing himself. The natural result of increasing productive power is to increase the earnings of labor. Employment being free and natural opportunities open, there could be no such thing as dispensing with labor. But the shutting up of natural opportunities drives men back and forces them to seek for employment from those who can employ them.

Consider land and the use that is made of it. The extractive operations on land are not merely farming, not merely building houses. There are hundred and one operations, fishing and cutting of timber, mining, and so on.

A voice: "Fishing on land?"

Yes; fishing on land. (Laughter.) You have either got to sit on a piece of land or stand on it and fish (laughter, cheers and applause.) Or if you go upon the water you must use material drawn from the land to prevent you from sinking. There is no productive occupation that is not in the last analysis the union of human labor with land. Until land is free to labor there cannot possibly be anything that will fully emancipate labor. (Applause.)

Mr. Shevitch's Rejoinder.

"Mr. Shevitch now has his second inning." said Mr. Gompers, as Mr. George sat down.

Mr. Shevitch at once arose, and was received with applause from the reds. "I would prefer," he said, with a smile, "to get the applause from the other side of the house," pointing to the blues. The latter cheered him heartily at this pleasant sally, and he continued:

Mr. George paused for some moments to recollect some points he had forgotten to answer. It is my impression that he has forgotten to answer nearly every point of my discourse. He has not shown that land taxation is equivalent to land confiscation. He has not shown that under his land tax system a combine of large land holders is impossible. He has evaded that question and he has asked me what would <sup>a</sup> combine do with the men who had vacant lots? They would leave them alone or take them in just precisely as the wheat merchants do in cornering the wheat now in the west. They take them into the combine and raise the price. That is what the members of the combine in lands would do and who could prevent them?

Mr. George did not show that the competition of labor would be destroyed by that land tax system. He did not show, he simply made an assertion, that natural opportunities would be open to labor. He said that laborers might go fishing, and he very graciously said that he did not expect a man to go naked in the city of New York. But that man would be naked practically and the ideal of George's free land would be shantytown. When I hear such things on a platform in New York city in the nineteenth century I begin to believe that Mr. George is a Rip Van Winkle of social economy. (Applause from the extreme left.) He actually has been born in antediluvian times and has all at once waked up in time for the Syracuse convention.



At this there was a storm of hisses from the right and cries of "Question! Question! Question!"

"It is the question," continued Mr. Shevitch amid hisses. "It is the question (hisses), and you cant choke me down. (Hisses and hootings.) It is precisely the question, and you shall not choke me down."

The left broke out in applause, and the right went wild with yelling and hooting, amidst which there were cries of "Order! Order!" Mr. Gompers had to get up and speak for several minutes before he could quiet the trouble. Then Mr. Shevitch continued:

You surely do not expect me to compliment Mr. George. Mr. George seems utterly to forget that we are living in the grand century of machinery, in a great age of production on a large scale, where the mere laborer is absolutely the slave of those who possess the instruments of labor. This simple land tax <sup>will</sup> not free the laborer from the competition with his fellow laborer. The laborer with his free land must have capital to construct his house, and capital to begin farming on a small scale. even. And there will be a big man with a big boodle, who will come beside the laborer with his lot, and take not one but ten, twelve, twenty or two hundred lots and will begin the cultivation of the soil on a grand scale with all the necessary machinery, and will crush down the free-born citizen on the lot by his side. (Applause from the reds.) There is no such thing as free competition as long as the instruments of labor are in private hands. The labor question, the social question of the day, is not a fiscal question. The social question of to-day is the abolition of wage slavery, and that is impossible as long as the in-

struments of labor do not belong to those who create wealth. And if there is a man belonging to organized labor who believes that such a thing is possible, then he deserves to enjoy the paradise of Mr. George in Shantytown, and it is good enough for him. (Hisses and applause.)

#### HENRY GEORGE CONCLUDES THE DEBATE.

Then Mr. George arose to conclude the debate. He said:

The object of the labor movement is the abolition of wage slavery. How do you propose to abolish it? That is the question. (Applause.) If any man has any better plan than that I propose let him come and state it. Mr. Shevitch's plan, as I understand it, is that of forming a number of co-operative societies, embracing all the working classes, who are to be furnished by government with capital.

(Cries of "No! no! No, sir!" from the reds.)

With ~~with~~ machinery, then. That plan, I say, is utterly impossible. There attaches to it the same disadvantages that attach to all dreams of the elevation of the workingman by the formation of co-operative societies. You must raise from the very foundation. You must make labor free. Now, such catch phrases as my picture of Shantytown as an ideal city can avail nothing with any thoughtful man. (Great applause.) What I say is this: That even the poorest man, if he has free access to land, can make some use of it, and the condition of those Shantytown people, poor as it was, was very much better than that of many who are herded in tenement houses, liable to be turned out at the end of the week or the month. (Applause.) This tax that will take the value of land for the community will in

*the* first place put all men upon an equality with regard to land. It will put in the treasury of the community a vast fund for public expenses. It will abolish all the taxes that now rest upon men by the increased prices in the things that they produce. Take the case of the renting farmers, who have to pay one-half of their produce for the use of land; out of the other half <sup>f</sup> they now pay all their taxes. Under the other system these taxes would be taken out of the landlords hands. (Applause) The tax would do away with all temptation to monopolize land. Mr. Shevitch is mistaken in saying that the laborer would have to pay for land. There would be no tax upon land, only a tax upon the value of land.

 A voice; "What is the difference?"

Here is the difference; that land of itself has no value. Land never has any value until two men want to use it. The prices that are charged for land on the outskirts of a city are a speculative value due to the anticipation of what it will be worth when the population crowds out. Under our system the employment of labor would be facilitated in every direction. Laborers would not be merely saved from paying rent, but would get employment during times when they were not engaged in their trades. Every man who goes to work extracting wealth from nature not only does something to lessen the glut of labor in other occupations, but by producing wealth for which he demands other wealth in exchange creates a demand for labor of other kinds. Take the coal miners who are standing idle in Pennsylvania. Apply this system and it would be impossible for corporations to keep those vast coal fields idle. (Applause.) Those men, given the opportunity, could go to work for themselves, and then they could readily

get capital enough.

A voice: "Do you see it now?" (Laughter.)

Mr. Shevitch says that out in the west men can get all the land they want. If that were true there would be no such thing as tramps in the United States. Not only is that not true, but even on the Pacific, in Washington territory on the one side, and in southern California on the other, men are paying one-third and one-half the produce of their labor for the privilege of tilling virgin soil.

(Applause.) It is our system which permits these great values that attach to land by reason of the growth of the community to go into private hands, that gives the speculators a premium for getting just in advance of the settler; and wherever the settler goes there will he find the speculator ahead of him.

Now, as to capital. When the farmer has to give up one-half of his produce for the privilege of applying his labor to land; when all through the other occupations the same law holds; when men have to pay to an individual for the use of what they call their country one-quarter, one-third, one-half the produce of their labor, is it any wonder that the working classes find it very hard to get capital?

---

Capital is produced by labor exerted upon land. Here, in the fact that we make the land the private property of some our number, is a constant drain of capital from those who produce it into the hands of those who are merely proprietors and monopolizers. "The destruction of the poor is their poverty. " Take from men one-half of their earnings and you reduce their power of treating with others, you reduce their power of employing their labor upon the best of terms. You

create a fundamental difference, from the foundation, a tendency which on one hand tends to make one class richer than they ought to be and on the other hand to make the other class poorer than they ought to be. (Applause.) Labor is the producer of all wealth (applause,) but labor without land is helpless, and that is the reason why any attempt to bring about more healthy social conditions must begin with the land. (applause)

Mr. Gompers then adjourned the meeting.

October 29, 1887.