

contradictory and stifling land laws are out of step with the growth of our free institutions and with the march of civilization itself.

CONCENTRATION OF TITLE HOLDING

Land is a natural resource and the private holding of land is a natural monopoly which tends to a concentration of land holding.

The history of titles in this country presents three phases. First, the holding of large estates in a few hands similar to the feudal system. Large grants to the Duke of York, Lord Baltimore, William Penn, General Oglethorpe were typical of our colonial days. The breaking up of these large grants into small individual holdings followed the Revolution and continued until about the year 1890. During this period, the number of titles not only increased in the aggregate, but increased in proportion to population. Land went through the process of commercial development and was largely sold in individual lots. Manhattan Island, starting with a single title from the Indians, became divided into 77,000 individual lots. In Greater New York there are 813,000 separately assessed parcels.

From 1890, however, to the present day, the trend has been in the opposite direction, towards a concentration of titles.

Today, Manhattan Island, with a population of nearly two million people, with 77,000 separate lots, has about 40,000 title holders. Of these 40,000 land owners in Manhattan, about 35,000 own single lots having relatively small values. These small holders are the rapidly disappearing home owners of a preceding generation. The bulk of the four billions of land value in Manhattan today is owned by about 5,000 people. Less than one per cent of the population own approximately 95 per cent of the land value. The number of land owners in Manhattan Island is steadily decreasing not only in the aggregate but also in proportion to population.

WITHOUT ties to bind the people to the land, they have been driven, especially of late years, in ever-increasing multitudes to the towns. Here they have herded apart from the better classes, forming an atmosphere and a society marked on the one hand by an absence of the elevating influences of wealth, education and refinement, and on the other by the depressing presence of almost a dead level of poverty, ignorance and squalor. They are not owners either of the scrap of land on which they live or of the tenements which cover them; but they are rack-rented by the agents of absentee landlords, who know less of them than Dives knew of Lazarus.

CARDINAL VAUGHAN.

I HAVE been a convinced supporter of Henry George's main proposal ever since I heard and read him. I see no other escape from our social troubles so clear and just. I have also remained a Free Trader since my youth.

HENRY W. NEVINSON.

The Dole

EVER since the "dole" in England has been doled out from the dolers to the dolees, the question has been raised as to the excellence of the idea and it is being denounced on every hand by press and pulpit.

The chief charge against it is its demoralizing influence. I sometimes think that it must be a dreadful thing to be "demoralized" and again it might be a very delightful and interesting experience.

Now just what is a dole? Well, to be perfectly frank it is a governmental gratuity; it involves a process of taking wealth from one class of citizens and handing it over to others. That is the dole. That is what it is and that is what it is ultimately for. Now, let us pause to inquire further and see what we will find. What is the purpose of a protective tariff except just that? What is it but a dole? Did you ever hear the beneficiary of a protective tariff talk about the demoralizing influence of this dole, when called by another name? Of course not.

The Grundys, Hawleys and Smoots of this country are already so badly demoralized by this practice that they laud it to the skies. They tell us that we can never be prosperous as a nation unless we constantly increase this national dole.

What constitutes the revenues of the English aristocracy? Why a dole of course. What else is it? What do aristocracies live on but doles, large doles, respectable doles, but nothing else but doles. How do governments get the money for doles? By taxation, of course. How do the aristocracies of England and the Continent of Europe get their revenues except by private taxation?

What have we in human society but universal mendicancy reaching from the bottom layer, where with whining voices and beseeching eyes they supplicate for little doles clear across to the top where aristocrats demand doles, and what is more get them. They own and run the dole-distributing machine. Do the aristocrats of Europe or America complain of the "demoralizing influence" of the doles and tolls they have taken through the centuries, and are still taking? Of course not. They look upon these doles with such favor that any suggestion that they should be lessened fills them with profound alarm.

It is only demoralizing—mark well the word—when it is given in small quantities to small and insignificant people who lack the education and discernment to see through the fraud of it all. There has never in the history of mankind been a privileged class who were not the recipients of a dole. Indeed, they prize their doles higher and defend them more jealously than anything else in the world.

The dole goes to the little fellow because he cannot find work. The dole goes to the big fellow, who as a class