

editorials is as truly a laborer as the man who sets the type. One gets a salary and the other wages, but I do not see much difference; I never found one dollar of salary to go further than one dollar of wages.

Q.—We like to be specific and know what words mean and in what sense we use them. A.—True.

Q.—Do these buildings cost more than they formerly cost, irrespective of the land? A.—I do not know; I do not suppose they do.

Q.—You do not know. A.—I do not know.

Q.—You think that people who build houses and own them do not receive excessive interest on the money they have invested? A.—If you look at the matter of interest, I think they receive excessive interest. To me it is merely justifying one form of monopoly by another.

Q.—If it was a fact that owners of property for renting were receiving excessive interest would you not think other capitalists would come in and share those profits? A.—I should think so; and as a matter of fact they are doing so in Toronto. There has been a great rush in the direction of property speculation.

Q.—If a portion of the real value in the land were taken from the present owners would you propose that they would be compensated for the loss? A.—If there is any compensation to be made it should go to those who have been suffering from landlordism for a long time.

Q.—If a man bought a property yesterday and that property should be depreciated to any extent by a change in the law to-day, do you think he should bear the loss? A.—I think it would be a case of hardship; but such is inevitable in all social reform. It was a case of hardship when the slaveholder was deprived of his slaves.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Do you know what he got for them? A.—I know that in connection with liberating slaves in the British West Indies there was compensation made. There was however no compensation to American slaveholders. But at the same time I look at it this way; it was far better that emancipation was received even without compensation, than that slavery should be continued.

By Mr. FREED :—

Q.—To what extent would you carry this nationalization of the land? A.—My idea is that it will come gradually. I do not think it will come so suddenly as to cause any particular hardship to individuals.

Q.—To what extent would you have the confiscation of land carried—to the total value of the land? A.—My theory is, that the Government or the community, it does not much matter which, should be the recognized owners of the land, or at least should have the right of appropriating the yearly value of the land. At the same time I do not think it will come all at once, but gradually, by shifting the burdens of taxation from those objects on which it is at present and placing them on the land, putting a little on at a time, and by degrees shifting the whole burden of taxation to the land, and as it is seen that public objects can be accomplished and a large fund obtained for many objects now otherwise unobtainable, the process will be carried a little further.

Q.—It will be like the man who cut off the dog's tail an inch a day? A.—That is about it.

By the CHAIRMAN :—

Q.—Have you sufficient confidence in the Government to give them the management of all the property in the Dominion? A.—Virtually the Government of to-day has at present the right of taxation.

Q.—Suppose your plan were carried out, have you such confidence in the Government as to believe that everything would be carried out honestly and without corruption? A.—I think when public opinion becomes sufficiently enlightened to make this reform it will also be sufficiently enlightened to prevent such Government corruption as might prevent its working.