

Quid pro quo? We are in fact in that case taxing a certain amount of personalty, that is the amount expended on the vacant land and thereby converted into Realty. However I do not intend to advocate the assessment of land alone, exclusive of the improvements, for many reasons, principally because it would have the effect of imposing too heavy a burden on the working classes, for it must be borne in mind that Henry George's plan of raising revenues from the land only, while it might benefit that class in England where not one in a million owns any land, would work exactly in the opposite way here where nearly all own land; but I do contend that admitting the absence of equivalent value which the one person (viz., the \$20,000 house owner) suffers if the other (viz., the \$1,000 house owner) receives equivalent value, we should not go to the further injustice of saying to the owner of the \$20,000 house "we admit that you pay twenty times as much as your neighbour for roads, sidewalks, street lamps, schools, police and fire protection, but you own \$100,000 of personal property, and you must pay on that as well as your house." There appears rank injustice in this. What benefit is the expenditure of this money to personal property. All these expenditures must, I think, be looked on as either for the personal protection and comfort of the individual or the improvement of Real Estate, by which I mean making Real Estate of some value or more value to the owner. It has been urged that owners of personal property are largely benefited by the expenditure of the City money. That merchants and manufacturers with large stocks of goods require more police and fire protection than ordinary citizens. It is only these two items that are claimed in this way, and they only amount to the sum of \$53,000 or thereabouts. Certainly merchants and manufacturers who hold a large amount of tangible personal property are benefited by this expenditure, but do they not pay handsomely for it. To begin with, such persons almost invariably employ private watchmen, and having already, in common with other citizens, paid their full share of these expenses on their dwelling, they certainly pay quite enough on their business premises to cover the extra benefit they derive from these items of expenditure. Next take the schools. How does this affect personal property? It is an expenditure for the benefit of individuals. Why is the owner of a large amount of personal property to be assessed for schools? Does he get any value whatever for his money? He has already as an individual paid his share of this tax on his dwelling, which entitles him to all the privileges of sending his children to the schools. Possibly he pays a further large sum for his business premises, and the only way many of these charges can be defended is that if the land was not occupied by business premises it might be covered by dwellings which would be occupied by persons who would pay taxes. This is a mere theory, because it is quite clear that if it was not for the employment of personal property and the occupation of the buildings for that purpose, a large amount of the Real Estate would remain vacant and be utterly unremunerative.

I will now discuss item 34, Water Works Expenditure, \$63,052.08. An attempt is made in this case to give a *Quid pro Quo*. It is not altogether a success in that way, as the water rates are based solely on the assessed value of the property into which the water is introduced, and in no way whatever (except in isolated cases) on the quantity used. When I say it is not a success I mean in an equitable point of view. A person occupying a house worth a \$1,000, and paying \$9.75 a year, may and probably does use fifty times as much water as another person who occupies an office worth \$2,500, and pays \$18.75 a year. The Street Watering is also, I believe, not based in any way upon the area watered and consequently on the amount of water used, but on the assessed value of the property in front of which the watering is done. Still there is some fairness. Only those who use the water or are able to use the water pay for it. Real Estate near which the water pipes do not pass does not pay anything. Those who have not the water introduced only pay half rates. In the Abstract of Receipts it appears that the sum of \$113,146.40 was received from water rates and street watering rates. This \$113,146.40 is paid entirely on Real Estate. How is that? Why should not personalty be assessed? If anyone residing in a house is assessed on that house for good roads, sidewalks, schools, gas, fire and police protection, and then has to pay on all his personal property for the same thing, why in the name of common sense should not his personalty pay for the water? Would not this be quite as equitable as to assess his personal property for the other items. It is not necessary to go through all the items of expenditure, as many of them are of small amount and referable to the same principle as those which I have