

Yours truly,
RYERSON M. CHRISTIE.

ECONOMY IS GOOD BUT KNOWLEDGE IS BETTER

Editor Herald.

Sir—The address of Sir Henry Drayton, of the Leithbridge Board of Trade banquet, Feb. 23, while very interesting and entertaining, as would be expected from a man of his position and eminence, was somewhat of a disappointment. To stress economy in this age of prolific production is nothing more or less than a joke.

The speaker confined his remarks to economy in government expenditure and did not touch on the wide field of business or private economy. Statistics in regard to what might be saved by not using soap, which, in the aggregate, must be enormous, were not available. The importance of economy in the expenditure of public funds has been stressed continually. We have been told the present depression was brought on by reckless spending, both public and private, and the only hope of a return to good times is through saving and economy, although the speaker was not responsible for any such preposterous statement.

When one considers the subject of economy from every angle and considers to what degree saving may go by the elimination of local governing bodies, and include municipal and provincial, why not also include the huge expense incurred at Ottawa and consider a board or commission in the Mother Country to take on the whole show?

Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini have paved the way to economy. The good book says "There is a saving that tendeth to poverty." The people of Canada, have not as yet reached the point where they are willing to surrender their rights of self-government to save a few millions of dollars. Economy is commendable but the value of democracy cannot be estimated in dollars and cents.

The speaker drew attention to the fact that all outlay by our governments, either cash or credit, must eventually be collected in taxes from the producing classes and necessarily detract from their standard of living. This statement is undoubtedly true if we assume our present system of taxation, which the speaker did not criticize, is to continue. The item of outlay for education at present was compared with that expended in the past, showing an enormous increase. It would seem the speaker, and generally public, has not taken advantage of the knowledge available at present in our institutions of learning.

The recognized authorities in the science of political economy assure us there is one source of revenue available that may be collected without fear or possibility of its being added to the cost of goods or be shifted to producers in any line of production.

I respectfully advise Sir Henry Drayton, or any who wish this information to refer to Adam Smith, John Stewart Mill or Ricardo, who all agree that a tax on land values or special privilege cannot be added to cost of production and will not be paid by consumers in cost of goods. I agree with the speaker that if we are not expecting to take advantage of this knowledge we may as well

defeat the expense and save the money expended in education. In an address on economy in public affairs may appeal to the general public, who are ignorant of any better way of securing public revenue, to one who understands the science of taxation, it is like listening to a lecture on the use of the scythe or reaper as a measure of efficiency in harvesting grain. We have adopted better methods in every branch of production. Is there to be no advance in taxation methods? Must we continue to discourage production and consumption by taxation and economize in the use of necessities and luxuries that science has made available? Economy is good but knowledge is better.

Yours respectfully,

FRED PEASE.

THE ORIGINAL "GENTILES"

Editor Herald:

After reading the article, "Moses and Aristotle On Usury," it appears that the author of the above has been greatly misinformed regarding the interpretation of the Laws of Moses re the money-lending act of that era. Your interpreter states that Moses forbid the Hebrews, in the 23rd chapter of Deuteronomy, to take interest on money lent one another, though they might take it on money lent to Gentiles. The word Gentile as is universally understood means Christian, at least this is the meaning the Jewish race adopted. Therefore as Christianity was not in existence in the times of Moses, the answer is that Moses did not refer to the Gentiles, but to the idol worshippers who were the only opposition to the Hebrew faith.

Thanking you, and trusting this letter will be published in your worthy paper, I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

H. EDWIN FITTERMAN
Winnipeg, Man.