

In the face of these facts, therefore, the accuracy that has been attained in forecasting is most gratifying.

Lately attempts have been made at long range weather forecasting, the object being to predict for a week or a month ahead just as we predict now for twenty-four or forty-eight hours. As weather phenomena become more perfectly understood and from the observations of years the law and reason of things and the order of atmospheric change become more clearly defined, it may be possible to attain a degree of efficiency in long range forecasting equal to that which now obtains in forecasting for a few hours or a day in advance. But there is little yet to indicate that such a stage has been reached. For the past year or so an American prognosticator has been guessing the sequence of weather change a month ahead, with some little success, it is true, but scarcely sufficiently so to be considered seriously.

We have been requested by a number of readers to publish these monthly forecasts, but at the present stage we believe our space can be better occupied with something else. If farmers would make what use they can of the forecasts published in every daily paper in the country or posted conspicuously in nearly every town and village reached by telephone or telegraph, or which may be received in any home where a telephone is installed, they might profit more than they do from what is recognized as a highly efficient public service. Certain are they to find such reports more reliable than the prognostications of these latter day prophets.

Taxation of Land Values—II

At no time in the history of the world has the absolute right of private property been conceded. It has been recognized that the land, the forests, the mines, the fisheries, and any other natural resources, belonged to the people as a whole. Including these various natural resources under the one general term land, it is easily seen that the land is the only source of wealth, and that all the various commodities which go to sustain human life are produced by the application of labor to land, transforming, transferring, or modifying the bounties of nature so as to adapt them to our needs. Everyone is, therefore, dependent, directly or indirectly, immediately or ultimately, upon the land; and, consequently, private property in land has been always granted with certain reservations, lest a few obtain what was intended for the many, and subject the latter to oppression. The other day I chanced to read some rules and regulations of the Land Office Department, issued in Quebec, Feb., 17th, 1789, from which I quote a short extract:

"And, to prevent individuals from monopolizing such spots as contain mines, minerals, fossils, and conveniences for mills and other singular advantages of a common and public nature, to the prejudice of the general interest of settlers, the Surveyor-General and his agents, or deputy surveyors in the different districts, shall, etc., etc."

But, while it has long been perceived that unrestricted private property in land is not consistent with equity, nor in the interests of the general public, it has always been difficult for the State to restrain the rapacity of individuals, and to devise and enforce such land laws as shall secure justice to each and all. The individual must be confirmed in his right of possession, so that he may reap where he has sown, but he must not be empowered to prevent others from sowing and reaping. That is the problem, and to its special solution those who are called "Single Taxers" have addressed themselves.

The "Single Taxer" argues that all products of industry should be exempted from taxation, so as to stimulate individual enterprise to the greatest possible extent; and he holds that the value of the land, which is a measure of the individual's opportunity, is the proper thing to tax. If a man has possession of land, there is thereby created for him the opportunity for producing wealth, and in this respect he has the advantage over his fellow men who have not access to land;

and, in so far as society confers this privilege upon him, he should help bear society's expenses. The "landed" have, indeed, a power over the very lives of the "landless," and must in justice give some compensation for this privilege.

This argument is confirmed by looking at the question from another point of view. In sparsely settled territory people live in a somewhat primitive fashion, and a revenue to supply social requirements is but little needed. But, as civilization becomes more complex, and people congregate into towns and cities, the need for a social fund becomes correspondingly greater. Compare, for example, the expenditures of a resident of Toronto with those of one of our prairie farmers living on the frontier of civilization, and it will be seen that there are a hundred ways in which the former has to pay for water, heating, lighting, cooking, transportation, education, amusement, etc., while the latter, by virtue of his isolated position, is exempt; and it is to be observed, also, that the value of the land in the thickly-populated centers is very great, while that of the more remote is correspondingly less. The presence of people, with their various needs and activities, their demand for food and clothing and all kinds of services, gives value to land; and at the same time the social requirements of these people increase in a corresponding ratio. Therefore, the same forces which create social needs also create land values, and it would seem that there is a natural connection between those land values that are created by the community and the needs of the same community. The "Single Taxer" would supply the public treasury by levying a tax upon those values which are created, not by any one or two individuals, but by the presence and combined activities of the whole population, and would free individual enterprise from all handicaps. Take for the community what belongs to the community, and leave to the individual what his own efforts have produced: This is the policy of the "Single Taxer"; and he aims to have men contribute to the public revenues, not in proportion to what they produce or accumulate, but in proportion to the natural opportunities they hold.

Some of the things to be gained by such a change in the incidence of taxation are worth mentioning. It would, for instance, greatly discourage, if not put a stop to, speculation in land. Large tracts of land, rich either in agricultural, mineral or forest resources, have been secured by shrewd individuals or corporations, and have been held idle until the labor and presence of neighboring settlers have caused their value to increase. Then the "owners" have disposed of the same at a "profit," and have pocketed the proceeds. For instance, the amount of money which the C. P. R. Co. has been and is getting from the sale of its Western lands is enormous. What services has the company rendered which entitle it to this money? Few, if any. The increase in value is mainly due to the combined efforts of adjoining settlers, the development of markets, and so forth. Likewise, those who secure in advance the title to prospective town sites along new lines of railway are enabled to collect a perpetual tribute from the public, in the shape of ground rent; and it is a notorious fact that many of the great fortunes of millionaires have been due to former lucky purchases of land on the sites of some of our great cities. It is also a fact patent to everyone, that gambling in land values is extraordinarily prevalent all through the Canadian West. The "Single Taxer" holds it to be a public calamity that a few favored individuals should be enabled to put into their own pockets, in the shape of rent, the huge land values in our large cities, values which their individual efforts have had but an infinitesimal share in creating. These values belong to the public, and should be taken for social needs.—W. C. GOOP in *London Farmer's Advocate*.

* * *

Alfalfa, like corn and cotton, demands certain conditions of the soil and certain constituents in that soil. Every crop demands certain foods. All crops except alfalfa and the other legumes obtain practically all their food, including nitrogen, from the soil. The latter crops use nitrogen, but get it from the air. Alfalfa takes nitrogen from the soil only during the first few months of its growth and thereafter not only takes nitrogen from the soil, but also takes it from the air, which it stores in the soil, available for the next crop may follow. Other crops take nitrogen from the soil, but contribute none to the soil enrichment.—Coburn's "The Book of the Farm."

Where Should Alberta Plant Her Agricultural College?

Attention is drawn in your editorial columns of the 18th ult. to the agricultural college situation in Sunny Alberta, and it is to be regretted that the fact has to be noted that unanimity of opinion does not exist regarding that desirable and necessary institution. Unfortunately, the issue is beclouded by the agitation of those people whose interest is a selfish one and who have little if any thought for the success of the institution or for the profession of agriculture which it is designed to serve. Personally I can see no good and final reason for keeping the college miles apart from the University, *provided*—mark, I say provided the agricultural college is given complete autonomy. The only real danger at present to the college by being in close proximity to the university lies in the non-observance of that essential; it is a serious danger but one which can easily be avoided if the powers that be will only take the trouble at the start to safeguard for all time the college of agriculture against encroachment by the sister colleges of arts and science.

The University of Wisconsin is continually being used as an argument in favor of a close affiliation of college and university. As an ex-member of the faculty of the college of agriculture in that university I can state that the reason for the continued harmonious relations which existed in that institution, in marked contrast to the upheaval in so many other similar institutions in the United States was, *first*, the fact that the agricultural college at Madison enjoyed complete autonomy regarding its own affairs in the university and *second*, the head of the college and his chief coadjutors were admittedly the equals of the heads of the other college.

In the interests of agriculture we cannot, however, afford to shut our eyes to the fact the tendency does exist in universities and may arise in the prairie universities, to use the agricultural member as a lever with which to get money from the public chest. That they will not, depends largely on the breadth of their president, the heads of their colleges and of the leading public men in their province.

In Saskatchewan the location of the agricultural college is not an issue and the president of that university has spoken in a way that should breed confidence among the farmers that their college will always be fairly treated. Aid in settlement of this important question to Alberta might be had if a dean for the college of agriculture was chosen and appointed, and his opinion, after careful consideration of the various suitable, or said to be suitable, sites obtained.

The question should be kept out of the field of politics. So many things may happen to bias a particular person, or pressure may be brought to bear; it is no secret that the usefulness of one Canadian agricultural college has to some extent been limited by its unfortunate location, so that while discussion may provoke some feeling that is of little consequence. The importance of the question at issue is greater than that of the disputants.

There are certain essentials that should be striven for, viz: (a) The college should be located on land fairly representative of the whole province, so that results obtained from crop and soil experiments may be available to the greatest number of people. (b) The soil should be of a character that it may be possible to work it throughout the growing season. (c) The college should be located so that it may be easy of access by rail by a large section of the province and thus allow for farmers' excursions. (d) It should be as nearly as possible in the center of the English speaking population, so that it may be largely used from the beginning. It is a debatable question whether it is advisable to locate it in close proximity to an experimental farm directed from Eastern Canada; such proximity might be the cause of jealous rivalries or slavish imitation. In addition, as a college staff must do certain experimental work, it would be waste to duplicate experiments under exactly similar conditions. I trust that my words will be taken in the spirit in which they are written—for the benefit solely of Western agriculture.

"SASKATCHEWAN."