

VOL. XXXV

a ure

ade, pro his G. rce. 3.0

lde ohn

in

tors

0 Mil

wn. heir hul ex. D

thi

1908

hou

nher

this

sio

for

and

and

sters

in a

law.

shire

lsey.

Bri

ther

Peter

own

owns

W

and

d &

and

Hore

owed acoln bited

Son,

rson

up to bught

omp-Son,

ition

ibita

prize

and

ester

from

Sons,

bitors

filler,

the

ell & ibert, ed in

o far arseys

s, the

, Fen-

nd re

the in-

The

of

PETERBORO, ONT., SEPTEMBER 7, 1916

How Production and Prosperity are Hindered

High Priced Land and Wrong Methods of Taxation Retard the Farmer's Progress

N addressing several meetings of the organized farmers of Ontario lately I put this question:

"Can any farmer in this meeting stand up and truthfully say that he received a reasonable wage for his labor and the labor of his wife and family, and at the same time gets a reasonable interest on his investment?" I found no man who could make such a claim, and I venture this statement. that few of our western farmers can truthfully make the claim. Of course there will be excep-

How Progress is Hindered.

Let us examine for a moment how monopolized land prevents progress. The monopolization of land means high priced land, and I claim that the higher the prices of land the poorer the country is as a whole, and the lower the price of land the richer the country will be as a whole, for the following reasons:

It surely must be patent to-any reasonable man that it does cost more to produce a bushel of wheat from \$50 land than it costs from land at \$10 per acre. One hundred acres of land at \$50 an acre creates an overhead expense of the annual interest charge on \$5,000. One hundred acr s of land at \$10 per acre creates an overhead expense of the interest on \$1,000, just 20 per cent. of the overhead expense on the same land at the higher price

I also claim that our land at \$10 an acre will produce more than the same land will produce at \$50 per acre. We will suppose that a man with limited means, say \$2,500, starts on a farm. If he buys 100 acres of land at \$50 an acre he has just sufficient to pay 50 per cent. of the purchase price, and therefore is compelled to mortgage for the other 50 per cent. He is then left with a mortgage hanging over his head and without working capital, which is an absolute necessity to enable him to operate his farm. A heavy handicap is therefore placed on production and prosperity. But if he could buy that same land at \$10 an acre, he could pay the full purchase price and have no mortgage hanging over his head, and still have sufficient capital in hand to enable him to work that land, therefore increasing production and prosperity.

High priced land means successful mortgage companies, much of whose stock is held in foreign countries, and by this means much of the profit that should go to the producer finds its way into the coffers of foreign millionaires. One of the causes of scarcity of money in the country is high priced land, and this is also one of the causes of high priced money. The money we get by mortgaging our land we cannot keep for the purpose it had been intended for, for much of it goes to meet higher rates of interest and to pay for the commodities we are compelled to

By JOHN KENNEDY, Vice-President, Grain Growers' Grain Co., Winnipeg.

purchase at easily one-third more than their actual value. These conditions will continue just as long as the present insane methods of taxation continue.

Wrong Methods of Taxation

The present system of collecting taxes, to my mind, is the direct cause of high priced land, because it enables the owners of the land to take in the form of rent, or speculative prices, all the land can possibly give up, less a bare living, for the labor put upon it by those who work the land. The present methods of taxation operate in this way:

First, the portion collected by direct and visible means is somewhat less than one-third the amount collected from the taxpayer. The other two-thirds or more is collected by an indirect or invisible means, that is, manipulated in a way to deceive the taxpayer. It works out like this: A



Selecting a Sire

severe test of any sire to be called upon to stamp his excellence on the off-spring of females which, even though they be uniform in type, are gathered from differ ent sources and represent different lines of breeding. Only an impressive animal, strong where the females are weak and with un usually good ancestry, can be relied upon to meet such requirements, and as is commonly said, he should first be selected and then purchased.

The use of an unproved sire is somewhat of an experiment, and the greatest danger lles in falling to recognize and admit that such a one is not leaving offspring as good as they might reasonably be expected to be. The best values are sometimes offered in successful sires owned by men who insist on changing to avoid inbreeding, or to avoid keeping two males. If a well preserved though aged male that has proved good is obtainable, no objections can be raised to justify passing over such a one for the most ng young and untested individual .----Marshall.

farmer's visible tax will be about \$75, and his invisible tax about \$300 a year. If he is a good farmer, and is raising a family, his purchases during the year will not be much less than \$1,000. When he buys all the clothes that are necessary to go to church in, and all that are necessary to go to the field in, together with all the implements needed, and the groceries consumed during the year, they will not be any less than \$1,000. Therefore, out of the \$300 or more indirect taxation through our protection or tariff system, \$200 goes to keep up protected interests and about \$100 or less reaches the public treasury. The above statement that only one-third or less reaches the public treasury has never been denied by political economists. If that \$100 or less that reaches the public treasury were collected by the same means as the \$75, the farmer would pay only \$175 per year, whereas he now pays about \$375 per year. Is it not plain, therefore, that the present method of collecting taxes is wrong? Then, let us abolish the invisible means of collecting taxes, and let us have only visible means of collecting them.

No. 35

Of course, the protected interests will kick, and what else should we expect? They claim we are interfering with their vested rights. Strange as it may seem, we will to-day find many farmers and others who help those protected interests in their unjust claims, but I do not believe that the great plain people, if all the facts were properly placed before them, would continue to help vested interests to take the shirts off their own backs.

Direct Legislation First.

How are we to accomplish the reform? In my opinion, it can only be accomplished by first getting direct legislation in force in all the provinces. By it we will show public opinion and public sentiment to be so strong that no political party on Parliament Hill can refuse to listen to a demand for justice to all our people. We can and we must break down the power of vested interests, and put an end to the present insane invstible methods of collecting taxes. If the interests need assistance, then in the name of all that is good, let us subsidize them by giving them a bonus of so much every year. We will then know to a cent just what they are costing us.

It is surely abundantly evident that neither of the present political parties will touch such a necessary reform. They recognize that the protected interests, controlling nearly all capital, are more powerful at present than the great plain people. But surely the day has come when there is abundance of evidence to show the great plain people that in order to get justice we must secure it for ourselves. We surely do not expect an angel to come down f.om heaven and do the