

LAND & LIBERTY

MONTHLY JOURNAL FOR LAND VALUE TAXATION AND FREE TRADE

Sixty-Third Year—No. 749

4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1

October, 1956

Party Conferences Consider Our Policy

Labour Party Land Policy Resolutions

Mixed views on land policy appear in the published agenda for the 55th annual conference of the Labour Party to be held at Blackpool, from October 1-5. North Hendon and Rochdale call on the National Executive to formulate plans for the nationalisation of (presumably all) land, and South Dorset wants the next Labour Government to make a start in that direction "by nationalising some selected large estates to be developed as models for the future of public ownership." West Cardiff, Cardiff Borough, Edgbaston, and West Swansea offer proposals for leasehold reform.

Derby Borough "recognises the social origin of all values attaching to land (excluding buildings and improvements)." It urges the National Executive Committee "to adopt this recognition, with a view to making the National Labour Party Policy the securing of all such values for communal needs, through the medium of the existing taxation machinery."

Similarly, South Battersea calls for the taxation and rating of land values in a resolution which asks for "forthright proposals for the nationalisation of the annual rent of land" to be included in the Party's next election programme. Urgent priority should be given to "the provision of a separate column in the Valuation List to show the annual rent of all land hereditaments, disregarding buildings and improvements, throughout the country." The valuation should be made expeditiously "under the heading of 'Finance.'" A substantial tax on the rent of land so found should be instituted and local taxation should be diverted to the same column of the Valuation List.

Ardwick, Manchester, wishes the next Labour Government to introduce an early Bill to empower local authorities to levy rates on the site value of land, and to mention the matter specifically in any policy statement.

Saffron Walden and the National Society of Operative Printers and Assistants call for the repeal of derating, agricultural and industrial. North Somerset wants the National Executive Committee "to examine all methods of raising local finance, both at home and abroad, and report with recommendations at the next annual conference." South Leeds, Dundee Borough and Birkenhead want rates to be levied on vacant houses.

Taxation and Nationalisation

Resolutions on taxation policy include demands by North Hendon and Wood Green that more reliance should be placed on direct, as against indirect taxation, that steps should be taken to deal with evasion (Wolverhampton Borough and Glasgow, Provan), that "a very heavy Excess Profits Tax" should be imposed as a first step towards reducing the cost of living (Southend-on-Sea, West), and that expenditure on advertising, above a reasonable level, should not be allowed for tax purposes (Plymouth, Devonport).

The published agenda contains 402 resolutions and numerous amendments. Foreign policy, disarmament, national service, Imperial and Colonial policy receive the greatest notice, followed by housing and rents, and automation. Industries recommended for nationalisation are: armaments, aircraft construction, building, building supplies, chemicals, engineering, insurance, oil, shipping, and the construction and wholesale disposal of cars, motor bicycles and lorries. Two resolutions condemn differential rents for council houses but S.E. Leeds considers that they accord with the Socialist principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need." Two Lancashire parties and the Textile Workers plead for further protection for the cotton industry.

Timid Official Liberal Attitude

The Liberal Party Assembly is being held at Folkestone as we go to press. A motion submitted by the executive expresses concern at "the failure of successive Conservative and Labour Governments to repeal the derating provisions of the Local Government Act, 1929, and to revise those included in the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896." While affirming that "continued derating of industry cannot be justified," the executive is "prepared to admit that the present position of agriculture still needs some assistance and considers that such assistance should be temporary and provided nationally rather than locally." The motion reaffirms the convictions of Liberals that the present rating system should be replaced by the rating of land values "but, aware of the reluctance of both Conservative and Labour Governments to accept this policy," demands as immediate measures the repeal of industrial derating and the amendment of the 1896 Act so that "though agricultural land remains exempt from rating, full rates are levied on agricultural buildings provided that the full burden falling on the farmer is not transferred to him immediately, but that for an interim period a diminishing proportion of the rates as assessed should be collected by the Local Authority from the Treasury."

Forceful Demands for Radical Reform

Eleven constituency associations have tabled amendments to this extraordinarily timid, faltering motion. Erith and Crayford demand the rating of site values, but are prepared to accept repeal of derating as an interim measure. Saffron Walden would add as a new sub-section, that counties and county boroughs should be granted local option to adopt the rating of site values in lieu of the present rating system. Businesslike amendments submitted by Salisbury, to be moved by Mr. J. Booker, the prospective candidate for that constituency, would put teeth and a backbone into the motion, converting it into an unequivocal demand for the rating of site values.

A motion on local finance tabled by Cheadle for discussion later in the proceedings, goes in the opposite direction. It calls for the complete abolition of the rating system, and the substitution of a flat rate tax payable to the Exchequer on all incomes, with Exchequer grants to local authorities based upon population served and services rendered. It is strangely at variance with the philosophy and long established policy of the Liberal Party.

We Over-Pay Ourselves

A few days before the annual conference of the Trade Union Congress, Mr. Harold Macmillan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, invited press correspondents to his room in the Treasury. There he read to them from a prepared statement a message to the T.U.C. and the nation. It was familiar stuff. The country could not afford higher wages; wage restraint was essential. "Another round of wage increases unaccompanied by corresponding increases in production is bound to cripple our prospects. This time we shall all suffer . . . I ask the trade unions to consider very carefully the national consequences of any action they may now contemplate." Foreign competition had increased and it was no longer possible for Britain to "get away with it." Inflation helped nobody. "We just give ourselves more money; we don't give ourselves more enjoyment." Wages had been rising twice as fast as output per man-hour. "As a community we have insisted on increasing our money incomes far more than we have been able to increase our output of goods."

How Do "We" Do It?

Once again the Chancellor failed to explain the technique whereby "we" have increased the supply of money. If the charge were well founded, would it not be extraordinary that (apart from the occasional small-scale forger) the press has yet to report a single instance of any one of "us"—trade union leaders, employers, employees, self-employed persons or pensioners—putting new notes into circulation?

One would expect the Chancellor to know that the Government has sole responsibility for inflation of the currency, that the high and rising cost of living is the *result* and not the cause of inflation or of constant demands for all-round wage increases, and that particular groups and individuals have benefited from inflation and will continue to do so at the expense of their fellows until it is halted.

Mr. Macmillan should understand that if Exchange control were scrapped, as it should be irrespective of what other countries may do, internal inflation would no longer affect the sale of British goods in overseas markets. The cost of British goods would continue to rise in terms of pounds (as more and more paper money was pumped into circulation in obedience to Keynesian full employment notions) but at the same time, and for that very reason, the cost of pounds would fall in terms of dollars, marks, francs, and other currencies. Notwithstanding inflation, British goods would be no dearer to the overseas purchaser. To illustrate: an American who pays \$2.80 for a British article priced at £1 would not be deterred from making further purchases if the price rose to £2—provided that his bank would sell him pounds at the rate of one for \$1.40. It is as simple as that.

"Wage Restraint" Rejected by T.U.C.

Unanimously and with acclamation, the Trades Union Congress at Brighton on September 5 firmly rejected the Government's "proposals to recover control of the economic situation by wage restraint." They did rightly because, as already noted, wage demands are not the cause of the present "eco-

nomic situation," and because the primary purpose of trade unions is to endeavour to secure the highest possible wages for their members. But in the resolution embodying this decision, the T.U.C. offered a false diagnosis and a false specific. Confusing effect with cause in a manner worthy of the Chancellor, Congress placed "a large measure of responsibility for recent inflationary trends on the Government's failure, after 1951, to maintain and improve the export trade."

In fact it is precisely *because* of internal inflation working in harness with fixed exchange rates that the export trade has been impaired.

Mistakenly the T.U.C. attributed our economic ills to the Government's (partial) abandonment of economic controls, not seeing that the trouble arises from the maintenance of so many artificial impediments to production and exchange. The resolution instructed the T.U.C. General Council "to make renewed representations to the Government for a return to a planned economy, based upon effective economic controls, as offering the only practical means of redressing the balance."

Pre-war and post-war Conservative administrations have much to answer for that working men should regard freedom as their enemy and should clamour for new chains to be forged for themselves and their country.

Two Sidelights on Nationalisation

Theoretically the trade union weekly *Railway Review* believes in the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange, the objective of the Labour Party for which it campaigns vigorously. Yet its intimate experience of nationalisation in practice is frequently sobering. As a result, there often appear in its pages news and views which lend support to those who do not believe that the interests of the national economy, the workers concerned and the consumer (to say nothing of the taxpayer) are best served by bringing industry into what is called public ownership. Two such instances were published in the August 31 issue.

On the front page was an account of how private enterprise has converted into a thriving, "smart modern hotel" the Crewe Arms Hotel which the British Transport Commission decided four years ago had "outlived its original purpose and the considerable amount necessary to convert it could not be justified." The paper comments: "In the last few years public enterprise has been on trial. We socialists have always said that public enterprise would prove to be better than private enterprise. . . . We can say that this round has not gone to public enterprise."

On another page an article contributed by an anonymous "humble railway worker" describes in frank, colloquial language "'the couldn't care less' attitude that has crept into railways in the past few years." There is said to be "petty jealousy between salaried and supervisory staff and the lower grades. Quite a few people employed by the railways have forgotten that they are the servants of the public and have got the mistaken idea that the railways are run these days just to keep them occupied and supplying them with money every Thursday, and these types adopt the attitude or idea that if the general public are mugs enough to want to travel on the railways, that's their own lookout." Illustrating that contention, the writer tells of sheer carelessness in handling goods. The manufacturer "spends a terrific amount of time and capital on research to find a good way of packaging his goods" but because of the mishandling his packages receive during rail transit, they reach their destination severely damaged. The manufacturer "vows that he will never send his products by rail again, and so we lose another contract. If by chance the bright spark who caused the damage to the

package was to get his marching orders, it is a ten-to one on shot that he would immediately run to [his trade union] the L.D.C. or the N.U.R. and say he was being victimised—like a spoilt kid."

Advice to American Building Industry

Published monthly in New York by Time Incorporated, the influential journal *House & Home* serves the manifold interests concerned in the design, construction, financing and selling of houses. In the July issue a seven page editorial, written in collaboration with Miles L. Colean, who is described as "home building's No. 1 economist", discussed the opportunities and problems confronting the industry. "Yesterday's house is as obsolete as yesterday's car"; everybody wants bigger, better houses in better surroundings. But home buyers can't and won't pay \$4,000 to \$6,000 extra. The critical problem to be solved is somehow to reduce prices.

The following extracts have a familiar ring. "In the past two years, while the cost of living has actually declined by 1 per cent, land prices have been so inflated by the sudden shortage of developed land that it often costs the 1956 builder \$1,000 a small lot more for land that is not a penny better . . . We could curb land price inflation by . . . taxing land more adequately. You need not be a single-taxer disciple of Henry George to believe the speculative profits in suburban land should be taxed at least enough to pay for many of the community facilities needed to make those speculative profits possible. Every state and every community should consider a local counterpart of the Pennsylvania graded property tax, which discourages land speculation and encourages property improvement by making the tax rate on land twice as high as the tax rate on the improvement."

Reverting to this problem and its solution, the August issue was equally forthright. "It's high time we got after the needless inflation of land prices (best and quickest way to do it: make land carry a bigger share of the local tax load and ease the tax burden on improvements)."

In our view the value of this analysis and recommendation reposes in the fact that it is addressed by a practical, specialist journal to businessmen in their own interests, rather than by a reform paper to visionaries of the good society. It may be read with equal profit by those who build and finance and sell houses in Britain, for the problem of high land prices, high-cost buildings, and dear money are not confined to one side of the Atlantic. We would remark only that houses and other buildings should be completely exempt from taxation, local revenue being derived exclusively from taxes (the rates) imposed on the value of land alone if development is to be signally benefited.

United States Farm Land Racket

With due acknowledgment to the editor and publisher, we reprint in full the following item from the American weekly newsletter *Human Events*:

"The Indianapolis *Times* has uncovered a \$20 million racket in the leasing of U.S. farm lands. The *Times* found that the U.S. Government was leasing farm land that it owns in Indiana for \$9 or \$10 an acre—some land for as little as \$1 an acre. Because it was U.S.-owned land, the leases did not provide for 'quotas' such as limit other farmers. The leased lands often consisted of good soil that yielded exceptionally good crops. As a result, the Federal Government was in effect buying back the crops for as much as \$105 an acre. In one instance, the Government rented back from its own tenant a little corner of its own land to store the 'surplus' created by the lease (while it rotted away) and

ON SUCCEEDING PAGES

Taxation and Privilege in Canada	84
Centre of Sutton Coldfield for Sale	84
"Tribune" Wants State Land Purchase	85
Britain Can Grow It	86
A Window Opened in Norfolk	87
The Season for Planting	88
Victorian Ratepayers Vote for Progress	91
A New Zealand Commission's Report	92
"Wanton Speculation" in Montreal	93
Bethal—An Ideal Health Resort?	94

the Government paid in rental for that little corner of its own land more than it got in rental for the entire piece.

"The *Times* reporter found that the U.S.-owned leased acreage amounts to 12,500 acres in Indiana and about 2 million acres in the whole country. The 'take' from the lease-and-buy-back-deal is estimated at \$2 million for Indiana alone and \$20 million for the entire country.

"Senator Capehart and Representative Ralph Harvey of Indiana have prepared legislation to make the plan illegal. However, conservative members of Congress comment privately that the rackets created by our 70 billion dollar Big Government spring up faster than they can be detected."

Seven Million Dollars An Acre

One of our readers in New York, Mr. H. C. Maguire, recently had the following letter published in the *New York Herald Tribune*:

"Just read in the *Herald Tribune* that New York City sold, at auction, the southwest corner of 59th Street and Park Avenue for \$160 a square foot. That is over \$7,000,000 an acre.

"Suppose, when Manhattan Island was sold for \$24, Old Chief Mah Wah had held out this corner. He would now get \$7,000,000 an acre, but could anyone say he earned it? Henry George claimed, and proved to me, that this differential in the price of land is made by, and justly belongs to, the community. In this case the rightful recipient, New York City, is collecting. The \$7,000,000 doesn't belong to Chief Mah Wah, to John Doe or any citizen."

Selling a Colony

Under this title, a correspondent in the *Estates Gazette* of September 8, described the sale of former German-owned lands in Tanganyika after the first World War as "one of the largest—and, perhaps the most extraordinary—sales of landed property on record." Nearly all private land, as distinct from land in African communal tenure, was sold by auction.

After ratification of the Treaty of Versailles in 1920, German East Africa passed into Britain's hands to be administered as a mandate. The Custodian was authorised to sell by auction, tender or private treaty the landed property of enemies and to apply the proceeds to the discharge of debts due to British, allied and neutral subjects.

It was, remarked the correspondent, a staggering task, since the number of properties exceeded 1,000. Most of the agricultural lands were coffee-growing farms in the highlands around Kilimanjaro which lies just south of the Kenya border. An auctioneer from Kenya was engaged and the list of pro-

properties for sale was prepared. Descriptions were short and simple—recording merely the area of the holding, whether with buildings or not, where situated, and the number in the German register of titles. There were no plans or pictures. As a result, overseas interest evaporated, for the value of a property could be assessed only after a personal visit. Furthermore, the post-war boom was then declining and money was becoming tight. Thus it was that competition at the sales was almost entirely local. Properties were sold at very much less than their true value. By 1924 the auctioneer was able to say that his task was within sight of completion. He had sold, in all, 1,870 square miles for £1,344,604.

The correspondent concluded by remarking on the good fortune of those who bought those lands. As early as 1930 official reports recorded that "many properties have since changed hands at a profit of several hundred per cent to the original purchasers." According to him it is not possible to say what the properties would fetch today, because the agricultural land has been intensively developed and most of the plots in the towns have been built on. But one plot near the "Piccadilly" of Dar-es-Salaam developed only recently stands in the books of the company which bought it at £35,000. In 1921 it was knocked down for £800.

A Sobering Thought for Canadians

The Canadian Federal Minister of Finance recently remarked: "On taking a good, careful look at the scope of our tax system, one comment is inevitable. It is awfully large . . . If to the federal tax we add that collected by the provinces and municipalities, we find that governments take away from our people in Canada nearly one-third of their incomes . . . This is a situation worth pondering."

Commenting editorially, the *Montreal Gazette* wrote: "The provinces feel that they pay a high percentage of the costs of growth, but do not receive a sufficient proportion of higher revenues—because these revenues lie within the fields occupied by the federal Government. The federal Government claims that with its obligations—notably with the defence costs that absorb nearly half of its revenues—it is not in a position to give up any fields it now occupies . . . All of which may lead to the very sobering conclusion that, although Canadians are now paying about one-third of all their earnings in taxes, no untapped reservoir is immediately available."

Response to this comment was published three days later as a letter to the editor. Mr. A. I. Strong wrote: "There is not only a new one but a natural one. That is to take the increasing public income from increasing land rentals which now go to private individuals, as unearned income, and use this fund to defray increasing public expenditures for the benefit of all the people whose very existence makes the land valuable. If this were done, speculative land prices would halt, and wage earners would not be strangled by having one-third of their income taken as taxes, in addition to having to pay for the increasing rents and selling prices of land in the form of lower wages and higher prices, and higher rents or higher down-payments and mortgage payments for residential sites."

How to Get Rich Without Working

Two ways in which fortunes can be made in Canada—without working—have been outlined recently by Mr. Arthur Laing, the Liberal Leader in the British Columbia Provincial Parliament and by Mr. Stewart Bates, president of the crown-owned Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

Speaking in the budget debate, February 15, Mr. Laing said he was with a stockbroker when Lands and Forests Minister, Robert Sommers, announced he had granted a forest management licence. The company which obtained the licence had 2,500,000 shares at a market value of \$9 a share. But after the announcement, according to Mr. Laing, the stockbroker gave orders to buy up all the shares possible. Each of them went up from \$9 to \$17 market value. "The actions of this government will permit a man to make millions without cutting a stick of timber," said the Liberal leader.

In Ottawa, March 6, Mr. Bates told the Gordon economic commission that although house building costs were likely to fall, the price of land was likely to rise. Prompted by the heavy demand for new homes, land speculators were active particularly on the fringes of cities and towns. Speculation was likely to continue "for some time."

Wherever some men are enriched without working, men who do work are impoverished. The one is the inevitable complement of the other. Invariably the cause may be traced back to the failure of governments to collect the full rental value of the land for public purposes and to the favouritism of sectional interests at the expense of the community at large. These two typical instances were reported in the *Victoria Daily Colonist*, copies of which were sent by our correspondent in British Columbia, Mr. Harry Hollins.

Inflation Doesn't Trouble Them

The *Estates Gazette*, June 9, reported that amongst properties then about to be offered at the London Auction Mart, was a group of three freehold investments in which the leases contain a clause giving the landlord power to increase the rent every time the cost of living rises 5 or 10 points. As an example, 103/109 Wardour Street was leased to Associated British Pathé in 1948 for £2,750 per annum. The rent has gradually increased with the fall in money values and from next June will be £3,750.

Midlands Town Centre for Sale

A preliminary notice of auction published recently in the *Estates Gazette* reveals how the value of land increases, and also how during the term of a lease, leaseholders may enjoy an even greater share of the rent of the land they occupy than does the ground landlord.

Offered for sale is the right to collect annually the ground rent in respect of a valuable site of about five acres in the heart of Sutton Coldfield, near Birmingham. This right is said to be "exceptionally well-secured" on 16 shops, the Public Library, 83 houses, garages, workshops and stores. Putting the matter another way: if leaseholders revolt, refusing to pay tribute annually for the right to dwell or trade there, the ground landlord will be able to invoke the full panoply and majesty of the law to hand over to him their valuable buildings.

The present annual ground rent for these five acres is only £83 18s. but in 35 years there will be reversion to rack rents estimated at £15,000 per annum. This means that the advertisers expect land values in central Sutton Coldfield in 1991 to be roughly 180 times as great as they were in 1892. It appears that the present leaseholders are paying the ground landlord very much less for their sites (on average under £1 a year) than they are worth. In addition, of course, they have their local rates to pay. But unless land-value legislation is meanwhile introduced (as surely it will be) their circumstances will be vastly altered in 1991. Then they will have to hand over their shops and homes in good condition

to the ground landlord, to pay the full economic rent of their sites, and still have to pay rates on their buildings to the local authority.

Meanwhile it is useful to point out that the advertisers, as practical men of business, make no pretence that the actual and anticipated rise in the value of land in Sutton Coldfield is in any way the result of the activities of those

who have placed bricks and mortar on the five acres in question. Nor do they suggest that it has been caused by any action on the part of those holding legal title to this small section of the earth's surface. Such pretences are held in reserve by the landed interests to mislead the public whenever controversy is joined with the advocates of land-value taxation.

"Tribune" Still Hankers After State Land Purchase

"The Labour Party must face it—there is no answer other than the public ownership of land." We quote the dogmatic headline used in the Bevanite paper *Tribune* of August 17 to preface John Mackie's article, "Here's The Policy To Get Us More Food."

According to the author, the Labour Party, when next in office, should "take its courage in both hands" and put his plan for agriculture into operation. The policy would not be easy, it would not be popular, it would not gain immediate electoral advantage with the agricultural community. But it is bold and it is based on a steady progress towards Socialism. It could be put forward only by a progressive Labour Party in the interests of the whole country and it would put agriculture in its "rightful place" in the national economy.

Mr. Mackie rested his proposals on these two opening sentences: "Britain must grow more food. That is sound, economic, social, and moral policy."

We disagree. It is economic folly and against human nature to produce little, expensively and laboriously, when with the same effort much could be produced. To illustrate: if adopted, this arch-protectionist plan would involve a man working, say, ten hours on a farm to produce as much food as could be bought from abroad with the value of eight hours labour at a bench in an engineering factory.

It is grossly immoral for the State to confiscate by taxation the rightful property of one set of citizens and to hand it to another. Yet such action is necessarily involved in Mr. Mackie's subsidy and cheap credit proposals. Nor is it "moral" to deny the people the opportunity to buy cheaply, and to force them to buy dearly. Mr. Mackie, however, is adamant that "advantage of temporary surpluses at home or abroad" should not be taken.

And putting the matter mildly, regimentation is not socially desirable. All along the line the regimentated are beginning to revolt: this plan if adopted would place more men at the whim and mercy of officialdom.

On each count the whole *raison d'être* of Mr. Mackie's policy stands condemned. For the most part his various socialist-protectionist proposals differ only in degree and detail from Tory-protectionist practice. But to his credit he has caught a glimpse of the law of rent at work. He would "organise differential rents" because this would "help to offset the fact that farmers receive level guaranteed prices."

Showing either prejudice or misunderstanding, he continues: "Apart from a vague suggestion of a land tax, based on a valuation that would take years to carry out, I have never heard how the opponents of land nationalisation propose to get over this difficulty." The unstated difficulty has its origins in the Labour Government's 1947 Agriculture Act, now operated by the Tories. Under its provisions guaranteed prices are fixed so as to afford a certain benefit to the farmers on poor land, with the result that those who own the better lands receive a fat bonus from the taxpayers. The solution of that problem presents no difficulty once it is realised that prices are guaranteed in part to mitigate the effects of land

monopoly, and in part to uphold the whole structure of protectionist policy. If land monopoly were destroyed, as it should be for both economic and social reasons, and could be by means of an adequate tax on the value of land apart from buildings and improvements, and if, moreover, the legislatively-imposed kinks were ironed out of the farming industry by removing our own barriers against food imports, there would be no case for continuing to guarantee prices.

There has been no vagueness about the suggestions that a land-value tax (not a "land-tax") should be levied on all land, city, urban and agricultural. They have been made with force, persistence and precision within and outside the Labour Party for many years, and especially during the summer of 1953 when controversy about land-value taxation and land nationalisation raged for many weeks in the columns of *Tribune* and *Forward*. The unsubstantiated assertion that a valuation "would take years to carry out" may be dismissed as a piece of journalistic embroidery although, in its context, it may be taken as suggesting that those who desire to nationalise farm land by purchase would not follow the prudent course of first ascertaining the cost of doing so.

We assume that Mr. Mackie does favour State purchase of farm land although he is so astonishingly vague himself that we may have misunderstood him. All that he writes on what after all is the keystone to his proposals is: "I can see no solution to all these difficulties and a host of others except public ownership of the land. The Labour Party must face this issue fairly squarely." And having thus lectured the Labour Party, he burks the issue and passes on to other matters.

Land nationalisation would take time. It bristles with equitable and technical difficulties. Some of the chief questions to be answered (and Mr. Mackie should have touched on them) are: 1. Does the value attaching to land rightfully belong to the community? 2. If (as we believe) it does, why should the State buy from rent-receivers that to which they have no moral title? 3. What would State land purchase cost? 4. How would this cost be met? 5. How would the community derive benefit from State ownership if as fast as revenue was received it was paid back as compensation to former owners, like water being poured into a collander? 6. Or is it the intention to short-change the owners of land nationalised, paying them very much less than their land is worth? 7. Without a proper valuation how could either the acquisition price or fair rents be determined? 8. How would economic production be increased under State ownership of farms?

STOP PRESS NEWS

LIBERAL PARTY ASSEMBLY. Delegates accepted by 90 votes to 87 the Salisbury amendment moved by Mr. J. Booker (see front page). The motion as amended was referred back.

AFRICANS ALSO LAND GRABBERS. The proposal to distribute 154 square miles to "deserving" Africans (see last issue) in Uganda has been defeated.

Reports will appear in our next issue.