

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

course, would exempt the farmer. Is it just? These are grave questions that we must face and settle."



When the Grange members discuss this question thoroughly, they will realize that no exemption is necessary to make adoption of the single-tax beneficial to the farmer. The Washington State Grange is fortunate in having so progressive an official as Master Kegley to lead in its deliberations. The fact that he has for some years headed the organization shows that advanced as his position seems to be, he is not ahead of the rank and file in his views. The interests of the farmers of Washington will be well and intelligently looked after by such a Grange. S. D.



Jug-Handled Tax Reform.

Not exactly frank is the explanation by the Ohio Journal of Commerce of the plutocratic tax reform amendment that it is pushing. This amendment has one good feature in that it authorizes classification of property for taxation. But this good feature is more than offset by another one limiting to one per cent the tax rate for local purposes. The object of this limitation is declared to be to "make the Singletax impossible." Another object—not so frankly expressed—is that it will cripple the activities of progressive cities like Cleveland and Toledo, where municipal ownership movements are too strong to suit plutocratic interests. In its issue of June 26 the Journal of Commerce offers the following explanation.

The people of Ohio are not ready to exempt any considerable property from taxation, but they are anxious to have a lower tax rate put upon some classes of personalty. The proposed amendment will permit a low rate, and when a low rate is fixed for personal property farm implements and factory machinery will be in the same class; if not, it will be because manufacturers and farmers will be asleep on the job.

But will stocks, bonds and money in bank be put in the same class with farming implements and other personal property? The Journal of Commerce sheds no light on that subject. The object of classification is to accord different treatment for taxation purposes to different kinds of property. Exemption of intangible personal property, stocks, bonds, etc., will be easy under this amendment. These constitute beyond doubt the "some classes of personalty" mentioned by the Journal of Commerce. The people of Ohio are anxious to have a lower tax rate upon these, says the Journal of Commerce. Perhaps. But if they

are not anxious to exempt other forms of personalty, why was the clause put in designed to make such exemption impossible? Is it not fear lest, after all, the people may want to go further in the exempting process than the Journal of Commerce likes?



Exemption of intangible personalty is a commendable move in the right direction. But, if in taking it, an obstruction is to be erected to exemption of other property, equally entitled to freedom from taxation, or existing obstructions are to be left intact, then there will be more injustice than justice in the move. If owners of stocks and bonds want relief from unjust taxation, they should resort to no tricky devices to confine such relief to themselves, leaving others equally deserving to continued suffering. Those who want justice for themselves should not erect barriers to prevent others from getting it. S. D.



Why They Should "Kick."

The Virginian of Richmond, Va., asks in its issue of June 20: "If the immensely rich squeezed their wealth from the masses, as many people seem to think, the liberal spending of it now will get it back into circulation again whether it be in donations to libraries, colleges, soup houses or what not. Why should the masses kick?" The masses ought to kick, whether they do so or not, because they should be allowed to retain and dispose of their own money themselves. If legalized robbery can be justly upheld on the plea that the booty is used for philanthropic purposes, then illegal robbery can be justified the same way. The masses know best how they prefer to have their money spent. They have a right to kick when a philanthropically inclined person takes it from them, even though the taking be in a legal way and for philanthropic purposes. S. D.



From the Under Side.

The old problem of why crime prevention should be successful in inverse proportion to the severity of the punishment, seems to be in a fair way of solution. The fact was long ago recognized that drastic punishment did not prevent crime. When English law named more than a hundred offenses punishable with death, including sheep-stealing, and debt was a jailable offense, the hang man was busy, and the debtors' prisons were full to overflowing. Vindictiveness marked all relations between law and offenders. Society,