

LAS VEGAS AGE

SOUTHERN NEVADA'S LEADING NEWSPAPER

The Age Building, 411 Fremont Street, Las Vegas, Nevada

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
Entered in the Postoffice at Las Vegas as Second Class Matter
Subscription Rates — \$2.50 Per Year

CHARLES P. SQUIRES Editor and Publisher
JAMES W. SQUIRES Managing Editor

THESE "TAXPAYERS"

What our "Taxpayers' association" needs is a governess — or someone who at least can keep the disgruntled few in line — and in harmony as to their wants.

The "Taxpayers' association" now advertises that they want "water meters for Las Vegas." This statement kind of smells like there is something rotten in our "association."

Water meters — one thing that the people of this city DO NOT WANT. We certainly can't cry about the water rate we pay today. What we could use is MORE WATER.

The "association" wants "power for Las Vegas." We HAVE power — let's find some use for it.

WATER SYSTEM

While we are on the topic of water, the fire this week in the southern part of the city brings clearly to mind that the city water system should be extended to include this fast-growing section of the city. If it had not been for the prompt action of the fire department, many homes would have been destroyed. Under present conditions it is impossible to throw a stream of water that will do any good in case of fire.

ELECTRIC RATES

Several days ago one of our neighbors stated that he could not afford electric cooking, heating, etc. He had us pretty well worried until we received our first full month's statement from the power company — \$11.65 for electric heat, cooking, large refrigerator, lighting, hot water twenty-four hours a day, and other electrical conveniences. Electricity is so much cheaper in Las Vegas than any other fuel that we will all soon be enjoying its advantages. With the added use of electricity for domestic purposes we will undoubtedly see reductions in the already low rates.

FREIGHT SERVICE

The Union Pacific railroad has, during the past week, had a committee in Las Vegas trying to find out why the railroad company does not get the Las Vegas freight business.

It is a simple matter. Give the people of Las Vegas — as well as other communities — one-half the service given by the truck lines, and the railroad will get 90 per cent of the business. A telephone order to Los Angeles at three in the afternoon and the next morning at eight we will have the merchandise at our door — by truck. By rail we are lucky if the shipment is at the freight office within four days — then we have to get a truck to get the shipment.

We all know that the railroad — Union Pacific — pays the great portion of our taxes. Give us at least a LITTLE service and you can depend on most of the business.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Labor took another punch on the chin this week when the restaurant workers union became a thing of the past.

Sooner or later the few unions that are left in Las Vegas will come to the realization that the owner of a business

STILL HAS SOMETHING TO SAY ABOUT HIS BUSINESS. If organized labor does not make a change in its management and operations in Las Vegas, a worker will soon have to PROVE THAT HE IS NOT A MEMBER OF ANY UNION TO GET A JOB.

The unions have only themselves to blame for the conditions they now face.

Race Meet Ends A Great Success

The fall race meet which had its final exciting session in the presence of a record crowd last Sunday, proved a complete success as to entertainment and came within \$200 of paying all expenses, according to the report of John F. Cahlan of the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

At the meeting of the Chamber of Commerce Tuesday noon, the proposal to continue a racing card each Sunday for the next month or until

the horses move to the Phoenix February meet, was brought up for discussion.

About sixty horses, it is said, plan to remain here during the next month, and some of the owners would be glad to participate in weekly racing cards if the public desires. However, no action was taken on the proposal.

FHA DOES NOT LEND

The Federal Housing administration lends no money. It insures loans made by private financial institutions operating under provisions of the National Housing act.

Farm Compulsion Threat

By ELIOT JONES

Professor of Transportation and Public Utilities,
Stanford University

Our present agricultural policy has three principal features: (1) enormous subsidies to farmers; (2) huge loans on staple agricultural products; and (3) far-reaching control of farm operations, moving in the direction of a regimented agriculture.



With respect to subsidies, the annual payments by the federal government to farmers have increased enormously. In the boom year 1929 Congress appropriated \$500,000,000 as a revolving fund for the Federal Farm Board; and though the Board eventually lost this money, largely as the result of unsound loans, it made it last four years. During the early years of the present administration the farmers received as much annually from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and other sources as they had received from the Federal Farm Board in four years. And during the present fiscal year, though farm income is much above depression levels, our agricultural policy will cost the Treasury about a billion dollars, which is more than the total yearly expenditures of the federal government for all purposes in the prewar period.

The relation between these huge expenditures and the problem of balancing the budget is obvious.

The second principal feature of our agricultural policy is the loan system. The loans on staple agricultural products are intended to promote storage and to support prices, but they tend to bring large stocks of agricultural products into the hands of the government. These loans, it should be realized, are not ordinary loans, but essentially sale contracts with permission to the seller to repurchase. Suppose the loan rate on cotton is nine cents a pound. If the price rises to ten cents, the farmer can pay the government nine cents a pound, and sell his cotton at ten cents. If the

price falls to eight cents, he can keep the nine cents a pound he has borrowed, and the government keeps the cotton (worth only eight cents a pound).

The inevitable result of this system, if the loan rate is set too high is that the government is left "holding the sack"; and at the present time the government has large stocks of certain agricultural products, the price of which fell below the loan rate. To cut down its losses the government is then tempted to take measures to reduce the next year's crop, and thus to increase prices. This burdens consumers, restricts exports, and encourages the use of substitutes when available.

The third, and worst, feature of our agricultural policy is its tendency to destroy farmer independence. The endeavor to regulate output leads to acreage allotments, production restraints, and marketing quotas, and thus to bureaucratic regimentation. Said Secretary Wallace in 1934: "If we finally go all the way toward nationalism, it may be necessary to have compulsory control of marketing, licensing of plowed land, and base and surplus quotas for every farmer for every product for each month in the year."

In making these remarks the Secretary was warning the country against the danger of regimentation, but despite his clear recognition of the danger, his policies since that date have carried the country a long way in that direction. Moreover, unless the farmers rebel in clear and unmistakable language we are going to move even farther in that direction. Though Secretary Wallace characterized the 1938 agricultural act as "a new charter of economic freedom" for farmers, Wallace's Farmer, of which he is "editor on leave of absence," in its April 23 issue said that if the present voluntary AAA program does not work with respect to corn, farmers will get something that will. "And that something — judging by the experience of dairymen in the east and cotton farmers in the south — will be ironclad compulsion imposed by the majority upon the minority."

And what is ironclad compulsion but bureaucratic regimentation?