

somewhere or anywhere, or to live in any spot, the labourer must first come to terms with the owner of land—and always.

Very charitable are those who would "give work" to those who need it in order to buy bread. It never occurs to them, apparently, that if you own the ground on which the work must proceed, the rent of it will keep you comfortably outside the labour exchanges and not ticketed as one of the unemployed, although you work not at all. Sir Benjamin thinks in terms of a society that has no parasitism in it, no monopoly, no privilege and no injustice, taking *now* from the people and from the producers of wealth that which rightfully belongs to them. The land question—no, the Conservatives are not talking about that; nor mayhap the Churches, and certainly not the present Government. What about Sir Benjamin? Instead of denouncing the laws that protect and endow the land monopoly and that cause the poverty, which is an institutional cause, this mentor takes safety in flight—curb your acquisitiveness you who grow wealthy, even in your sleep; and as for the unemployed, write on the banners "it's more work we want!" Sir Benjamin is to be envied when, seeing further, he catches the glimpse of the laughing waters lit by the sunshine of economic freedom. We hope he may yet get that inspiration.

Question Time

Under this heading *The New English Weekly*, the organ of the Social Credit movement, answers the inquiries of those who are endeavouring to understand its policy. In its issue of 7th May the following question and answer appear under the heading "Land":—

How would you deal with profiteering in land values?

The introduction of the Social Credit Proposals would, in Major Douglas's view, as expressed in the Draft Social Credit Scheme for Scotland, necessitate the State (or the Crown) re-asserting its theoretical right to the whole of the land, by prohibiting its passing from one person to another by sale, except through a Land Office empowered to determine whether and upon what terms the transfer would be allowed.

Such Office might operate somewhat as the Inland Revenue now operates, legal title requiring the Land Office stamp in addition to the impression of the stamp duty required by law.

This seems to be the stock answer which advocates of social credit give to those who ask how the benefits (if any) of that policy can be prevented from passing to the landowner in the shape of higher land values. It is hardly necessary to point out that the question is not answered. The proposal of preventing people from selling land merely means that it will remain in the hands of its present owners, but it contains no means of preventing them from realizing higher values by means of higher rents. The two or three large landlords, for instance, who practically own the whole of Cardiff will not be perturbed at this proposal. So long as they have the land and can draw its rent, they will not mind much if they are told that they must not sell it to someone else.

TWO NEW PAMPHLETS

THE STUDY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY
By Henry George

LAND AND TAXATION: A Conversation between
Henry George and David Dudley Field

Price—ONE PENNY EACH

SPEAKER'S NOTE BOOK

The King George Memorial. One of the sites suggested for a statue to King George V. was Abingdon Street, Westminster, across the road from the House of Lords. It is a row of very old houses. In the House of Commons, 16th May, Sir William Davidson urging the Parliament Square site for preference said that the Abingdon Street scheme would cost nearly half-a-million. For the houses? We think not. It is pure land value.

Builders Know It. Five reasons were given by Sir Thomas Keens (*Daily Express*, 6th May) for the reduced profits in 1935 of the Ideal Building and Land Development Company. The first was the rapid rise in land values. Sir Thomas agreed that the peak demand for houses had been reached in certain areas. He means, at the prices that are demanded for them. It is the "land boom" again. The land speculator with his five-league boots has overtaken the builder and so the depression sets in.

The Highlands Problem. The *Glasgow Herald* of 14th May says that the problem of the Highlands has been engaging the attention of the Secretary for Scotland, Sir Godfrey Collins, and Highland M.Ps. are giving their minds seriously to constructive suggestions. New ideas will be welcomed as distinct from the mere paying out of Government grants. Here is one; at least it is a hint, and it comes from Mr William Adamson, Sir Godfrey's predecessor in office. When asked in the House of Commons, 14th May, why no part of the large quantity of land reported by the Committee on Deer Forests as suitable for smallholdings had been made available, the answer was *because it costs too much money*.

Contrasts up North. The tales about the distress in the Highlands of Scotland cannot all be true. We note in the *Glasgow Herald*, 16th May, that the sale of the sporting estate of Dunlossit, Islay, is advertised—14,450 acres at £23,000 with a small mansion house. The buyer has the prospect of bagging 600 grouse, ten stags, 500 wild pheasants, and varied shooting. He will own salmon and sea trout fishing, also a fishing lodge, also hotels, cottages, shops, twelve farms and a rental of £1,680.—It seems a rich island but still the desperate conditions of the people—the ordinary people—in these parts speak for a hearing.

Man Proposes but the (Land) Lord Disposes. The Curnock Town Council were given powers some time back to acquire land in Car Road compulsorily from the estate of Lord Bute (Messrs Mountjoy Ltd.) for erecting 100 houses. The Ministry of Health wish, for a better lay-out, that only 80 houses be erected. So more land is needed and the Council request 5 additional acres from his lordship, the Marquis, but he arrogantly replied through his factor to the effect that it is not his pleasure to consider the application before the houses are erected. Talk of dictatorship. The Council have no alternative but to go to the expense and trouble of compulsory purchase, if their request of the lord of the earth is not granted.—See the *Glasgow Herald*, 13th May. Poor, radical, ill-housed Scotland; what arguments it provides for a drastic measure of land-value taxation.

The Economic Planning Mad Hatter. The *Glasgow Chamber of Commerce Monthly Journal*, May issue, must be pulling someone's leg or it thinks its readers are absolutely dense. It praises the natural advantages of Scotland, its rich and varied soil, its large coal reserves, its splendid sea fisheries, its access to the great market of Southern England, and so on. Then comes the banality: "That a country possessing these splendid advantages should have distressed areas, rural depopulation, an