

the poor. Governments play no favorites. Which somewhat rambling disquisition has led us away from Mayor Webb, of Winnipeg, with whom we began, and to whom again, Congratulations!

FEW public men have a better and more extensive knowledge of public affairs than Governor Smith of this state. It is to be regretted therefore that his acquaintance with practical economics is so elementary. In his veto accompanying a number of bills carrying with them appropriations of public money, he says:

To any person who has made a study of the situation it must be apparent that, if the rent problem is to be solved, something must be done by the various municipalities of the State to raise revenue for city expenses from sources other than real property.

WILL not some one tell the Governor that the effects of taxes are many fold, depending on the kind of taxes levied and the things they are levied on? For example, taxes on houses increase rents because they increase the cost of building houses; taxes on land, levied in proportion to the rent of land, do not increase rents—neither house rents nor land rents—but tend to reduce rents by bringing land into use that is now held out of use.

BUT it might surprise the Governor to be told that if all taxes, including the land tax, were abolished, and heaven rained the necessary revenue into the public treasury, rents would go up, not down. People would be compelled to pay more for living in a community where there were no taxes, and the landlords would take all that was saved. The housing problem would be just as acute.

BBROADLY speaking, there are but two sources from which revenue can be obtained—the rent of land and the products of labor. The first is not in its nature and incidence a burden, for if not paid to the state it must be paid to the landlords. The second is a burden that increases the rent of houses and the cost to the consumer of goods produced. The operation and effect is not the same in degree in all cases to be noted, but it is pretty nearly the same in kind—making for the higher cost of living and increasing the intensity of the struggle for a livelihood.

SINCE 1920 the United Kingdom has spent in doles to the unemployed the incredible sum of \$1,500,000,000. At present one out of every thirty-five inhabitants is supported by the state. It is estimated that there are today 1,250,000 unemployed in Great Britain, and this is probably a moderate estimate. Though these doles doubtless prevented riots and revolution when the young men returned from France, the effect has been to foster pauperism throughout the land. This must be the inevitable result of make-shifts that do not remove the real cause of social injustice.

Of course, it has produced no decrease in the number of the unemployed. Indeed it has only intensified or made worse a very bad situation.

AND what do the wise lawmakers of Great Britain propose to do about it? They are equal to the problem that has arisen—at least one genius is. He is Sir Alfred Mond. This gentleman proposes now to go a little further in this effort at bailing the ocean by adopting a new method of relief, which may be described briefly as doles to the employers rather than to the workingmen. And the reader is asked to note the simplicity of it. Direct subsidies to manufacturers would enable them to meet competition by reducing high costs of production and at the same time enabling them to pay union wages to their employes! A stimulus would thus be given to all industry! The unemployment question would be solved and doles to working men could be discontinued.

ECONOMIC intelligence has moved but slowly since the days of Bastiat and Cobden. The doles having failed to do little save to demoralize, so-called statesmen must turn to other devices. The time was opportune for the heaven-sent genius of Sir Alfred Mond—he has at least been able to contribute to the time-honored struggles of a nation to lift itself by its own bootstraps. Always the suggestion seems to be to take from some one to give to some one else. And these men shiver at nights at thoughts of the Communists, and Russia and the Bolsheviks!

CAN they never think in terms other than those of doles and subsidies? Will they never think in terms of land and human rights? Are they not aware that enormous revenues are being taken by those who contribute little or nothing to the public treasury, out of which all these doles and subsidies must be paid? And when they talk of the unemployed, do they not see what is squarely upon them—that men are denied employment because the avenues to employment are closed, because land is fenced, or bought and sold, without regard to men who would work it but have no rights in it, and no liberty to use it save by permission of the owners and at the owners' price?

TO whom belongs the land of England? To the Lords or the people of England? It is a truth uttered in Holy Writ, but forever denied by its surplined expounders; it is indeed the final letter of English law, that the land of England is the property of the crown and belongs to the people of England. From this it is a simple deduction that the right to this land of a child born in the London slums is equal to that of the noblest Earl. How indeed could it be otherwise? Is life on earth wholly planless and is the chance of survival in an ordered social state to