

The remedy is obvious and easy. An Act of the Legislature should be adopted, recognizing the lessor and lessee as practically partners, and defining the principles upon which their respective shares of the receipts shall be divided. First and foremost, all considerations of selling value, real or assumed, present or prospective, should be ruled out of court with the professional or amateur expert and all his works and ways. Productive capacity should alone be taken into account. After allowance made for all expenses of maintenance—which might justly include a sinking fund to provide for renewal of the building—the remainder should be divided between lessor and lessee, according to their respective interests. In framing such a measure, other matters of detail would present themselves for consideration; but with these as the main outlines, a great, practical and much-needed reform in arbitration methods would have been accomplished, and one which would add in no small measure to the *prestige* of the Ontario Government for abolishing legalized abuses.

It must be remembered that many of the worst cases of injustice suffered by lessees have not resulted from the disposition on the part of the arbitrators to inflict a deliberate wrong or show undue partiality to the landlord, but simply because they felt themselves bound by precedent to follow a certain line of action and admit as a basis for their decision principles and circumstances which ought not properly to have entered into the case. With an Act on the statute-book, clearly defining their duties and the rules that should govern them, future arbitrators will labor under no such difficulty, and the healthy influence of public opinion may be depended upon to prevent any undue leaning to the side of the landowner in the face of an explicit enactment defining his interests.

The reform is one for which public sentiment is fully ripe. There have been loud and repeated protests against the injustice of the renewal awards by which so many of our citizens have been ruined. The burden of heavy rents is felt by a widely extended circle beyond the parties immediately affected. At a time when public-spirited citizens are desirous of bringing Toronto prominently before the people of this Continent as a growing business and industrial centre and a desirable place of residence, with the view of attracting hither capital, and manufactures, and men of enterprise, the reputation which is given to our City abroad by the course of those property-owners who have secured exorbitant ground rents, and thus practically taken a mortgage upon the industry and thrift of the future population, is calculated to thwart and counteract such laudable efforts. It militates in every way against the future prosperity of the City, and tends to perpetuate the period of stagnation through which we are at