

fight for the union, the same as the boys with muskets. After the war he will give it back, if the enemy don't blow it up. Of course it will have to take its chances like the others. And you are drafted to run the plant. We will make you a lieutenant-colonel of powder-making at \$125 a month."

He worked vigorously at the time of America's entrance into the late war for a policy of conscription of capital and war materials, not because he was a pacifist, but because profit from war was abhorrent to him. Yet he had just come from an emergency job of re-organizing and rebuilding an explosive plant.

Utterly free from the class consciousness of upper strata, he talked jokingly of the time when the common people would "wake up and begin to cut throats." When that day comes, he declared, "I am going to change my name to Murphy."

Whimsical and contradictory, yet with a deep underlying vein of earnestness—his successor in the art of rough-and-ready controversy will be very difficult to find. And with due respect to his very considerable attainments and business, it is as a charming companion and loyal conspirator in right causes that he will be longest and most fondly remembered.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT COMPETITION PRIZES AWARDED

Forty competitors took part in our Newspaper Advertisement Competition, and the United Committee have awarded prizes as follows:—

First Prize, £10 10s., to Miss Mary Waugh, 26, Hotham Road, S.W.15.

Second Prize, £5 5s., to Miss Margaret Calder, 27, Cannon Street, E.C.4.

Third Prize, £2 2s., to Mr. G. W. W. Somerford, Tenbury Wells, Worcester.

Six Prizes of 10s. 6d. each to:—

Mr. Geo. Frankland, Rectory Cottage, Farnham Royal, Bucks.

Mrs. F. L. Hine, 398, High Street North, Manor Park, E.12.

Mr. M. A. Bryan, 46, Bedford Row, W.C.1.

Mr. A. H. Weller, 5, Cross Street, Manchester.

Mr. Jas. Milne, 110, Onslow Drive, Glasgow.

Miss Alice Riley, 181, Moorside Road, Swinton, Manchester.

The first and second prize advertisements were printed on the back page of our August issue, entitled respectively "The Three Georges" and "God Gave the Land to the People." The advertisement which gained the third prize appears in the present issue, and is entitled: "The Case for Land-Value Rating." We regret that for lack of space we are not able to reprint any of the other prize efforts, but we hope to show them in our columns as occasion arises, after they have been chosen for use in our publicity campaign in the newspapers.

£75,000 is asked by the owners for the Mornington Crescent site of 4½ acres in Hampstead Road, St. Pancras, London, which it is sought to acquire for the public.—*The Star (London)*, August 15th.

THE CAUSE OF THE TROUBLE

Caithness occupies a position peculiarly its own among the counties of Scotland. Not only is it the most northerly of the counties on the mainland, but its population is of Scandinavian rather than of Celtic origin, and its agriculture impresses the visitor by reason of its obvious dual character.

In the old bad days, as one who knew these things well recently put it to the writer, whenever a small farmer or crofter began to keep his place tidier than his neighbours, to clean his land well, and generally to exhibit signs of prosperity, it was concluded that he was making money. The equivalent of that was interpreted as meaning that his place was too cheap, and his rent was forthwith raised because of his own improvements. The alternative to acquiescence in the raising of his rent was eviction, and in most cases the former alternative was chosen. Hence two phases of the agrarian situation in the far north—the indifferent farming of the small farmer and crofter, and the strength of the movement for reform in land tenure. In no part of Scotland did what, for brevity's sake, may be termed Land League doctrine, take deeper root than in Caithness. There the whole political situation has, for at least forty years, been dominated by the demand for reform in land tenure, and in particular for security of tenure to the farmer and crofter so that he might not be at the mercy of those who did not hesitate, when they had the power, to raise rents or evict because an occupier had improved his holding.

Sometimes visitors from the south, or those who may go from the south to the north to find a home are surprised at, if not staggered by, the comparative indifference of the rural population of Caithness to questions of imperial politics. That attitude of mind may be indefensible, but it is quite intelligible to one who inquires deeply and probes the rural problem to its roots. Nor will there be any improvement in this respect until first of all the occupier of land has security of tenure and some legal guarantee that he or his, and not another, will reap the fruits of his industry.—*SCOTTISH FARMER*, July 20th, 1918.

In the same issue, the *SCOTTISH FARMER*, commenting on the need for greater production and the blessings of honest toil, says: "The harder a man works, the more work there is for his neighbour." This may not be disputed, but it is also true that the harder a man works the more leisure (unemployment) there is for the non-worker, if he happens to possess a patch of ground that is wanted for public purposes. That is manifestly what the writer of the preceding note had in mind when registering his complaint.

The advantages of utilizing the services of the Inland Revenue Land Valuers in negotiations for the purchases of land are becoming more fully appreciated by the promoters of housing schemes. Considerable reductions in price can often be obtained by this method. A return of nine cases in which the Board objected to the prices for land agreed upon between local authorities and land owners, and insisted upon valuation by a Government valuer, shows a saving in all of nearly £32,000. A summary of this return may be of interest. The prices asked and provisionally agreed upon between land owners and local authorities amounted to £101,680. Government land valuers estimated the value of the land at £64,502. The prices for the land finally agreed upon and approved by the Board amounted to £60,808, a saving on the original price of £31,872—the average saving per acre being £108. It was as high as £495 per acre in one case.—*From the L.G.B. Weekly Return on Housing, July 4th.*