

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER

DEVOTED TO *
THE
MANUFACTURING & MINING INDUSTRIES,
OF THE
DOMINION. * AND INDUSTRIAL WORLD.

VOL. XIII.

TORONTO, ONT., AUGUST 19, 1887.

No. 4.

GEORGEISM vs. SOCIALISM—A DISTINCTION WITHOUT A DIFFERENCE.

MR. HENRY GEORGE, in stating his views concerning the abolition of poverty, has declared that "Practically the greatest and most fundamental of all reforms—the reform which will make all other reforms easier, and without which no other reform will avail—is not to be reached without concentrating all taxation into a tax upon the value of land, and making that tax heavy enough to take, as near as may be, the whole ground rent for common purposes." In other words his land theories constitute only the foundation for other reforms, and after establishing a community of interest in land by this proposed system of taxation, he thinks that all other desired reforms will be easily accomplished.

We fail to see that the "State," acting as a general landlord and collecting ground rent for common purposes, would be any better off than it would be if the same ground was under personal ownership. If tenants are to be taxed so high that they must bear all the burdens of taxation, no man would desire to be a tenant. But admitting the desirability of a tenancy, the tenant would naturally desire to know how long he would be permitted to occupy the land. If indefinitely, wherein would consist the difference between State and personal ownership? If for a stated and arbitrary term—if he could be dispossessed at the will of the State—what inducement would there be for him to erect factories and workshops, or to build a residence for himself and family and homes for his employes? If land is valuable only according to that which may be produced on or from it, and if no one but the State has a right to the land, why should the producer tenant be allowed to appropriate anything he may obtain from it? The land can be worth nothing except something valuable can be produced upon it, and that production must come from the individual labor expended upon it. Therefore if Mr. George's land theory is correct, to be final and of any value it must extend to personality as well, and the State should also own and control everything that the land produces, or that may be produced or created upon the land.

The absurdity of the proposition is apparent. The circumstances which surround a man in one place may not prevail as regards another man in another place. The land is not all alike valuable or desirable, for in some places when tickled with a hoe it will laugh with a bountiful harvest, while in other places a man's bread must of necessity be earned by the sweat of his brow. Aside from that which may be obtained from the land, the land in certain places may be made very valuable by that which may be erected or placed upon it, while the

land in other places may not be at all susceptible of such improvement. If an individual may be permitted to have absolute ownership in property other than land, as for instance his dwelling house or factory, of what use or value would or could such property be without the land for it to rest upon? And if the owner of the residence or factory possessed no such land, of what value would any land adapted to such purpose be?

The promulgation and teaching of this George theory tends directly to socialism, which is but a very short remove from anarchy, and has aroused the public mind to such an extent as to put Mr. George and his reform orators on the defensive. At every opportunity that now presents itself these men denounce Socialism, and endeavor to explain the distinction—for there is no difference—between it and Georgeism. Who can define the difference between Georgeism and Socialism? Mr. George at present stops at absolute State ownership of all the land, though, as we have shown, should that theory ever be put into practice, it would be impossible to stop short of State control in all things, while Socialism would reach the latter result at one bound. Mr. George if opposed to Socialism, as he says he is, to be consistent must abandon Georgeism—if he will not abandon Georgeism he must sooner or later unreservedly accept Socialism, and become just such a socialist as he now denounces. At a recent meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society held in New York Mr. George mentioned "monopolies" as the point which separates the teachings of that Society from Socialism, maintaining that when any business became a "monopoly" it should be taken charge of by the Government and run by and for "the people." Will Mr. George promulgate a code of rules by which it may be known with absolute certainty when any business oversteps his prescribed bounds and becomes a "monopoly"?

MINERAL RESOURCES OF CANADA.

At the recent meeting of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, held at Duluth, Mr. J. H. Bartlett, M. E., of Montreal, made the following statement in a paper read by him regarding the mineral resources of Canada:—

"In almost every province iron ore is found in abundance, and the provinces which have not coal have an abundance of timber fit for making charcoal. We possess the only deposits of coal on both the Atlantic and the Pacific shores and in both Vancouver's Island and Cape Breton the coal seams run out under the ocean. In both these provinces of British Columbia and Nova Scotia, nature has been prodigal with deposits of various descriptions of iron ore of very good quality, and with plenty of flux all in the immediate vicinity of the coal fields. "San Francisco is largely supplied with Nanaimo coal, and the blast furnaces in Oregon get most of their iron ore from