

would have been had not land speculation kept vast areas of good farm lands out of use. Beneficial as the crop will be to some producers, it will not yield the benefits it would, if privileged trusts and railroad monopolies had first been deprived of power to legally rob the farmers. Great as the market for the crop may be, it is not equal to the market that would have been, had land monopoly and unjust tax systems, through restriction of industry and enterprise, not put multitudes of would-be consumers into the ranks of the unemployed or underpaid. In potential industry that is blocked and in potential markets that are prohibited lies that part of the price of economic injustice, far greater than the vast toll actually paid by Labor to Privilege.

S. D.



### Cause and Effect.

From the East comes the cry for jobs; from the West comes the call for men. Men in the East lack food; grain in the West wastes in the field for lack of labor to harvest it. Truly, there is not much method in our madness. But both of these are effects of the same cause. Business lags in the East because exhausted by the toll of monopoly; and the grain fields of the West lack men because of the toll of this same monopoly. The farms of the grain states, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota and the Dakotas, are steadily growing in size. Everything has been done to make small farms less profitable than large ones; and labor that might have been kept in the rural districts has drifted to the cities; while immigrants who might have found their way West remain in the East. This is one of the fields to be covered by the Department of Labor. Much doubtless will be done by the department because of its sane management, but it cannot realize the full fruition of its hopes until the state enacts laws in favor of industry instead of exploitation.

S. C.



### Progressive Farmers of Washington.

The State Grange of Washington seems as advanced and progressive as is the Grain Growers' Association of Canada, judging from the annual address of its Master, C. B. Kegley, delivered on June 2. The address shows that the Grange is actively at work for removal of the defects in the parcel post laws, for Government Ownership of Telegraphs and Telephones, for Presidential Primaries, for the Gateway Amendment and for Conservation of Natural Resources. In speaking of the Panama tolls question, the Master shows

the fallacy of the claim that exemption of coastwise shipping would benefit the farmers of the northwest. The great bulk of shipments will go to foreign ports "if the development of the canal is what we have a right to expect," and "free tolls for the coastwise trade would increase the tolls of the ships engaged in this trade and handicap us to that extent." He suggests as a measure that would benefit the farmer "making the entire canal zone a free port area" and "in addition to this, if we reformed our navigation laws and threw our coastwise trade open to the ships of all nations, we would smash our shipping monopoly and at once bring ocean freights down to where they belong." This is by no means the only evidence that sentiment on the Pacific Coast has been much misrepresented by those who claim it to be in favor of the subsidy policy. Many influential papers of California have during the controversy expressed opposition to this grab. Mr. Kegley apparently voices the sentiment of his State Grange in expressing himself so clearly.



Concerning natural resources the Master speaks in a common sense way, in which uninformed standpat politicians consider it unsafe to address farmers. "The government should hold onto what has not yet passed into private hands," he says, "and operate them either direct or under short-time leases. Those that have passed into private hands should be taxed to the full limit of their monopoly value."



Such an expression from the head of a great and growing farmers' organization must sound startling enough to the back-number politician, but there is even more. Mr. Kegley refers to the Grange's "declaration for free trade for all as well as for the farmer," and asks where the revenue is to come from to replace tariff taxes and internal revenue taxes. "It must be," he says, "some form or forms of direct taxation, either collected direct by the Federal government or assessed against the States on some equitable basis. Shall it be by increasing the income tax, the corporation tax, the inheritance tax, taxes on real estate, or, by what our single tax friends say, is the most just of all taxes, a tax on land values. And furthermore, if it is desirable to raise Federal revenue by the taxation of land values, should there be any exemptions? If so, what should the exemption be? The suggestion has been made that all land values below \$2,000 should be exempt from Federal taxation. That, of