

There can be no question that the man who can afford to build a fourteen-storey structure multiplies the size of his land by fourteen. From an earning standpoint he multiplies it by eight or ten, as against the earning power of a one-storey building. The increment becomes eight or ten times as large. A great deal of the increment is earned by the investment of his capital, but a great deal of it is unearned and a great deal of it is adventitious, owing its value to central situation, traffic and the very same influences which add "unearned increment" to the land. A sky-scraper which produces a splendid income on Hastings or Granville streets would be worse than valueless on the top of Grouse Mountain. If anyone imagines that the capitalist earns nothing but interest on the cost of his bricks and mortar, let him put up for a week at a west-end hotel, or rent a suite of rooms in a fashionable apartment block. Why should not the unearned increment pay in the one case as in the other?

One of the great advantages claimed for the exemption of "improvements" is that it ensures a compact city. This is evidently the view of the building inspector. "The most prominent feature in connection with the building returns of Vancouver," he says, "is shown when the area covered is compared with other cities. From returns at hand I find per square mile of area,