

a word adopted from the French. Some economists have Anglicised the word into undertake or enterpriser, and we often call a large entrepreneur who employs many wage-earners on his farm or in his store or factory, a captain of industry. Such a man, if noted for business ability and integrity, may run an enormous business with little or no wealth of his own.*

Combination of Functions.

Of course, a man may combine all four of these functions. Many Canadian farmers do. They own their own land, own the buildings, stock and implements, work with their hands just like a hired man on a farm and also run their business as entrepreneurs. They receive, therefore, the whole product of their labour, including rent, interest, wages and profits. This is, of course, received as a whole. The farmer does not consciously divide it into these component elements, though he may very likely (especially when he is thinking of retiring) calculate what the farm would rent for with or without its stock and implements—thatis, with or without its working capital. Also, his neighbor may employ a hired man who may be just as efficient a manual worker as himself, and by deducting this man's wage from his whole income he may be able to make an approximate calculation as to how much of his total income is to be assigned to each of the four functions which he discharges.

In the same way as we have imagined the farmer dividing up his income, it is possible for a nation such as Germany or England to calculate (very approximately, of course) how much of its incomes—its total annual product of wealth—goes in rents to landowners, how much in interest to capitalists, how much in wages to labourers, and

*Pierpont Morgan, the head of the so-called Money Trust, in his recent evidence before the Congressional Committee, said that he would prefer to lend a million dollars to a man with character and without securities, rather than to a man with securities and without character.