

HOW THE WEALTH WE FARMERS CREATE IS TAKEN FROM US

ARTICLE No. 10.

WHEN a few men once gain control of those things which the public cannot do without they have the public at their mercy. From that time forward they need not work. Yet they can grow wealthy while the public works hard—in many instances slaves—to make a living. They do this, as we explained last week, by advancing the prices of the necessities or services which the public must buy from them. In this way they are enabled to plunder the public yearly of millions of dollars which rightly belongs to the people at large.

There are a number of ways in which the public is thus robbed. It is accomplished by means of tariff laws, combines, excessive transportation charges, and by the control of natural resources such as timber limits, water powers and coal and iron mines. In due time we hope to have something to say about all of these. There is yet another means, however, which is the most serious of all. Its power is the most absolute. Yet it is the one about which we have hitherto heard the least. We refer especially to the ownership by a few people of land which the public at large must use. This land is the land in our towns and cities which of necessity form the trading centers for the communities which they serve. The following illustration will serve to show the power to squeeze the public which the ownership of such land gives.

HOW LAND VALUES ARE CREATED

Let us suppose an uninhabited island in the Pacific Ocean. As long as no one wants to live on that island its land has no value. Should one man discover it and settle on it, it would then have a value only to that one man. Should one hundred, or one thousand, or ten thousand men desire to live upon it its value would increase in proportion to the number of people so desiring to use it. Were they all to move away its value would immediately disappear. Thus it will be seen that the value of this land is not created by any one individual; instead, it is created by the community at large. Should 100 men be shipwrecked on it and later discover that it would not produce enough food to supply the requirements of more than 50, its land would immediately have the value of life itself to at least 50 of these men. This is the power which under such conditions the ownership of land conveys.

A SIMPLE ILLUSTRATION

Let us, however imagine that while this island is still uninhabited 10 men are shipwrecked upon it. They look it over and find that it is large and fertile and capable of supporting many people in comfort. They, therefore, decide to remain on it permanently. As there is plenty of land for all they divide it among themselves and call it theirs. Each man thereafter cultivates his own piece of land, and produces those things which he needs. Thus all are workers and each is able to live in comfort without there being any class distinctions among them.

Let us, further, suppose that 100 more men are shipwrecked and cast up on its shores. The 10 men, fearing what the 100 may want to do should they be permitted to remain, meet them and tell them to begone, as under our laws they have the right to do. The 100 reply that they have no where to go and no means of going. The ten retort that they can't help it, they must get off their own island. The 100 then plead to be allowed to remain, for a little while at least. Suddenly a bright idea strikes one of the 10 and they retire to think it over. Later they return to the 100 with this proposition: They tell them that they will allow them to remain on the island on one condition only: That is that they will agree to cultivate the land and give the 10 one-half of all they produce. The 100 grumble for a while, but finally consent. They do not own the land. The 10 do.

A GREAT TRANSFORMATION

Now notice what has happened: From that time on the 10 men need work no more. Instead they can live in idleness while the 100 work hard and give half of all they produce to the 10. Should the 100 produce the equivalent of \$100,000 of wealth in a year, \$50,000 of it, or \$5,000 each, on the average, would go to the 10, while the remaining \$50,000 would have to be divided among the 100, leaving them only \$500 each, on the average. Thus the 10ers would receive ten times as much wealth each year as the workers.

Suppose, however, that after a few years the 10 decide that the 100 are earning too much. Therefore they inform the 100 that times are hard, the cost of living has gone up and consequently they are going to be forced to charge them three-quarters, thereafter, of all they produce. If they do not like it they are informed once more that they can get off the earth. Of course the 100 do not like it. Naturally they object. But what can they do? They might strike, but having no means they must work or starve. Ultimately they accept. Thereafter out of each \$100,000 of wealth that is produced the 10 men receive \$75,000, or \$7,500 each, while the 100 retain only \$25,000, or \$250 each, it being barely enough to keep them, although they economize in every way possible. This illustration is a pretty true picture of conditions as they exist to-day in this Canada of ours.

THE LAND IN OUR CITIES

Every community has its natural centers. Each county has its county town, each province its capital. To these centers we farmers ship for distribution the produce we raise on our farms. From them we buy the manufactured articles that are made in them and which we require for our use. Thus the land in these towns and cities increases in value in proportion to the size of the community which they serve. Were the people in and around them to move away their value would quickly disappear. The more people settle in and near them the more rapidly their value increases.

Keen business men understand these facts. They have gained control of the land in our cities. Thus they appropriate for themselves these values which the community at large creates. Land in Toronto has been known to increase in value at the rate of \$1,000,000 an acre in less than two years. This money went into the hands of but a few people. During the past five years the 29% square miles of land in the city of Toronto has increased in value at the rate of \$20,000,000 a year. Land in other cities, such as Montreal, Ottawa, London, and Winnipeg, has increased in value in the same proportion. During the same period the value of the farm lands of Ontario has remained practically stationary. Thus we farmers during the past few years have helped to create hundreds of millions of dollars of wealth which has flowed into the pockets of a very limited number of people. Thus while we have worked hard on our farms we have been helping to create millionaires, and even multi-millionaires elsewhere. Do you wonder that we are sometimes called easy marks? That every possible effort is made by the financial interests to disorganize us through breaking up our farmers' organizations and dividing us on party lines? Is it not true that we organized, as the farmers in the west have done, in order that we may give these matters consideration, as they

are doing? Next week we hope to explain the means that are used by the land holders in our cities to squeeze from us farmers the wealth we create just as the 10 men on the island have been shown to have the power to squeeze their earnings out of the 100.

Shorthorn Breeders Will Give More Attention to Dairying

(Continued from page 3)

It seems to me, on the farm where mixed farming is practised, both in the west and in the east, and this is where the good old red white and roan will come into her own. No other breed can do what the Shorthorn can do, namely, pay her way handsomely in the pail, raise a lusty calf that can be fed off at a good price and she herself, when one of her daughters is able to fill her place in the herd better than she ever did, take on flesh rapidly when dry and go to the block a good carcass, while making profit for her fortunate owner. This is the kind of Shorthorn we must produce if we are to take full advantage of the opportunities which the future has in store for the breeders of this grand breed of cattle.

"We must have our minds fixed on the breeding of an average of general all round excellence rather than on the breeding of one phenomenal winner. Of course, we must expect the determined opposition of the breeders of special dairy cattle. We will not fail to heat from them that dairying is more profitable.

DAIRYING VS. BEEF PRODUCTION

"Is it more profitable than the mixture of dairying and beef production? I doubt it. It has been more profitable than mere beef production because the dairyman has been able to obtain a higher price for his product relatively to the cost of production, due to his better organization, more liberal government assistance, and to the fact that the public, owing to our conditions, have been able to obtain cheap beef produced on cheap land but never cheap dairy products produced on cheap land.

DAIRYING PROFITABLE

"It is an accepted fact that the dairyman, owing to the system of cooperative manufacture by which his raw material is converted into the finished product at actual cost, and his quasi-cooperative method of selling, which preserves at least the semblance of competition among the buyers, not only has a vast advantage over his beef growing brother on cost of production but obtains a much larger proportion of the price paid by the consumer than does the producer of beef.

"These two advantages have placed the dairy business on a profitable basis, though there appears to be still cause of complaint and room for great improvement in their selling organization. It is a question whether producers of beef or producers of the combination of beef and milk would not benefit correspondingly by an organization on somewhat similar and somewhat improved lines.

OF GREAT IMPORTANCE

"This question will have to be considered because conditions may arise where the very existence of the leaf growing business as a profitable undertaking at all will depend on its devotees being so organized as to be able to demand a greater share of the consumer's price: in such clear terms and with such force behind the demand that results will be certain.

BEEF VS. BUTTER

"I doubt very seriously whether a pound of prime beef can be produced at a less cost than can a pound of butter where all the conditions as to land value, cost of labor, interest on investment, and every other element entering into the

(Concluded on page 22)

Mr. Shipl

T.

I was very
Dairy of J
perience with
crops. There
singularly
ences of M
he has expe
and does
from the fir
ditions can
results obtai
a solution.

Does own
of a fertili
of available
fact that he
mention the
to the belie
further sub
ingham use
of crops, i.
DIVERSI

It is now a
requirements
more particu
the others.

one particula
bly give satis

To take an
the potash
crop of corn
half of the q
an average c
No brand o
give entirely
varying so w
as wheat and
long growing
its plant food
moisture in t
a gross feede
maturity wh
quires a liber
available form

In the exper
article, the '4
were compou
corn crop, wit
system of crop
was grown. V
Cottingham o
he will agree
the chief res
tory results.

Another poi
which I will r
stitute the cl
the quantity o
Belyea Bros.
(without any
acre. Mr. Cot
'mixed good'
from 20 to 30
application is
inadequately
Bros. and othe
out something
their crops, go
vestment, seem
tively that Mr.
sufficiently inad
which it was a

We would h
ingham that a
also utilizes 105
growth and im
plication had b
only have little