

drink; but it would do little good with things as they are.

The birds, the Temperance people, and the bees toil to fit the earth for man. The landlord gets it all.

BOLTON HALL.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE INDUSTRIAL OUTLOOK.

Bloomington, Ill., November 4, 1914.

The Bell Telephone Company asks its local managers over the country to interview a banker, a real estate man and a manufacturer as to the prospects for 1915. The question was courteously submitted to The Daily Bulletin, and the reply led unavoidably to the Singletax argument. We might have added if we thought it would be understood that if the producer received wages anything like the equivalent of what he produces, and exchange would be unhampered, there could be no over production and there could be no panics. A fair wage system is the only cure and only Singletax can bring it about. Appended is the letter:

Prospects for 1915 from a newspaper viewpoint seem to be encouraging. When the outlook is threatening there is an impulse to keep up by lowering prices; when the outlook is bright no such pressure is felt. The newspapers just now are agitating a raise from the penny paper to the two-cent paper. And this can not be said to be induced by higher cost of materials.

We of this territory can speak only of the general index. We are not in a factory field and we therefore escape the vibrations of a money market. A rich agricultural community, and this the richest in the world, is the last to feel adverse influences. It is natural to believe that the heavy destruction of wealth anywhere must effect the whole network of exchange. Whatever may be the formative after condition, the first effect will be a greatly increased demand for our foodstuffs and even manufactured goods.

There is lots of land held out of use in this country, but even then agriculture and manufacturing seem to show an abundance rather than a scarcity of production, and the chief excuse for trusts was to control agricultural output and dismantle factories in order that the demand would so far exceed the supply as to justify high prices. The war will do naturally what the Trusts did through combination, that is, drain away that so-called surplus production which left uninterfered with makes high prices impossible. It would seem, according to this reasoning, that 1915 will be the boom year in the United States.

T. A. BRALEY.
J. F. O'DONNELL.



LAND TAXATION IN NEW ZEALAND.

Wellington, N. Z., September 15.

The war is absorbing all public interest at the present time. But we are taking advantage of the opportunity to demand the abolition of all customs taxes on food and on the necessaries of life generally.

Hon. James Allen, Minister for Finance, gave in his budget speech some figures re unimproved values. He showed that our total unimproved values increased from £161,324,000 in 1908-9 to £212,936,000 in 1913-14, or by £51,612,000; while in the same

period "taxable land values" all above the £500 exemption limit, increased from £106,198,550 to £140,448,406—i. e., by £34,249,856; and the land tax increased from £604,900 to £767,451—i. e., by £162,551. This 34 millions sterling all went to the 40,889 land taxpayers; but out of the 34 millions no less than £25,747,558 went to the 6,148 payers of graduated land tax, the amount assessed to graduated land tax increasing in the five years from £58,437,718 to £84,185,276.

The land tax exemption being £500, the graduated tax commencing at £5,000, and the total number of landowners being estimated at 150,000 and the unimproved value in private lands at £170,000,000, we arrive, in round figures, at the following highly interesting table:

Holdings.	No. of owners.	Unimproved value.	Average U. V.	Land tax at 2d. in £.
Up to £500 u. v.	110,000	£30,000,000	£ 273	£ 2-5-6
£500 to £5,000	34,000	56,000,000	1,647	13-8-3
Totals up to £5,000.	144,000	£86,000,000
Over £5,000 u. v.	6,000	84,000,000	£14,000	£116

Mr. Allen's figures, therefore, back up the contention that, even with no exemption for the additional tax, by far the great majority of the landholders themselves stand to gain by our Cost of Living Plebiscite proposals, adding 2d in the £ to the land tax, reducing customs taxes by the amount of the revenue so raised. Up to £500 u. v. the average landholder will pay £2-5-6 under the 2d. land tax, while gaining on the average £10 a year by the reduction of customs taxes. And the low average (£1,647 only) of the holdings between £500 and £5,000 u. v., shows that the great bulk of the 34,000 between those limits must come under £1,000 u. v., and therefore stand to gain, not to lose, by the change.

It will be noted that while on a 5 per cent basis (5 per cent on £34,249,856) the power of the land monopolists to levy rent tribute on the people has increased, as compared with 1908-9, by £1,712,492 a year, the land tax has increased by only £162,551. Thus for every £10 the people pay the land monopolists in increased rent tribute the land monopolists pay the people in increased land tax less than £1. So we need make no bones about drawing from the land monopolists by an increased land tax whatever we may require to abolish the food taxes, reduce the taxes on other necessaries, and meet the cost of the war.

We have fairly got our teeth into this business and we mean to hang on to it for all we are worth. Otherwise the land monopolists will go practically scot free as per usual, and the workers will have to foot the war bill.

We have been writing Sir J. G. Ward on this matter, but so far have failed to get him to make a definite pronouncement on our side.

ARTHUR WITHY.



A birthday is not worth celebrating unless the life that began on that day is a life that has honorably faced its earthly responsibilities, and grown with the years into something finer and more useful than it was at its birth.—Youth's Companion.