

notice further on. They were mostly intended to improve the condition of the spiritual life, that of the present day aims at the improvement of the material earthly condition. We see then that the difference between socialism past and present is very great. The present may perhaps be called a new species of an old genus.

One of the great difficulties met with in discussing socialism is the fact that in its modern form it has never been put into practice. Theories look extremely beautiful and promising on paper, or in the mouth of the lecturer. There is no problem under the sun which in theory could not be easily solved. When the theory comes to be put in practice, numerous unlooked for factors spring up which prove a source of great perplexity. The problem looked a very simple equation with two unknown quantities, but in addition to the "x" and "y" there are numerous other letters which refuse to be ignored, and bring confusion instead of solution.

We are inclined to think this is the case with all the modern theories of Socialism. If it were a matter of disposing of the lives of 10,000 horses, of various sizes, the matter would be simple. They would all live alike on oats, hay and water, and work an equal number of hours. The heavy, large-boned animals would do the draught and agricultural work; the lighter, correspondingly lighter work. But when it comes to the disposition of human beings, a factor of unknown dimensions, not taken into account, opposes itself, viz.: The Personality of Mankind, his sense of Free-Will and Liberty. True it is that a school of philosophy holds the belief that man is a creature of necessity, and has no free-will at all; but we think it will be very long before he is brought to believe it, and, at all events, until the exact laws of his necessity are discovered, it will be impossible to act on the belief with safety, or accuracy.

We shall endeavor to discover to some extent, what the effect of Socialism would be upon this sense of Individuality and Personal Liberty.

The object of Socialism is to abolish all private capital, and to transfer it to the Government, which would be the sole employer of labor, and would be, to a very great extent, the absolute master of all the inhabitants of the country governed by it, and would allot to them their various occupations, hours of labor, etc. Even under the most absolute monarch the people have more rights than they would have under such a form of Government.

In order to make the production of the country equalize the consumption, would it not be necessary to secure control over the choice of occupation which each has at present. Under the existing state of things, the demand regulates the supply, and if too many men engage themselves in any given occupation, the consequent fall in the remuneration it affords, and the equivalent rise in some other industry, very quickly balances the scales.

But in a Socialistic state this natural law, which allows of freedom to the greatest extent, would not exist, and free choice from occupations equally remunerated, would, in all probability, leave many branches of industry without the necessary hands, hence the necessity for the regulation of each man's work by the State.

In the eyes of the socialist property is the root of all evil. More particularly does he inveigh against the possession of land. So great a sinner is the landowner, that it is proposed not only to wrest that from him which he at present holds under protection of the State, but even to allow him no compensation whatever for it.

To effect this is the object of those socialists who are particularly interested in what is called "The Nationalization of the land." One cannot help auguring ill in the future from men who hold such peculiar ideas of justice, and right.

This scheme of Land Nationalization applies not only to the wealthy landowner, but also to the settler who after years of honest toil, has cleared the forest, drained the swamp, and made of a dreary wilderness, a fertile garden, and reasonably expects to reap the fruits which have cost him so much to produce.

Let the Land Nationalizer take a visit to our Canadian backwoods, and see the various steps to be taken before the dense woods, and marshes can be made to yield an average crop, and let him consider that this is the way in which the whole continent has been cleared and made a great feeder of the world, and then ask him if he can really think that it would be right, would be no interference of his personal liberty, to strip from the settler, the homestead, which he regards as the fairest spot on earth, because to a certain degree, it has been created by him, in the sweat of his brow,—and to make him a day-labourer on his own farm.

Without entering deeply into the question of property, let us briefly review the way in which land owners have become the most important part of the population of Canada, and the greatest factor in its prosperity. We start from the time when Canada became a British possession, and under British rule. The State then found itself the possessor of a vast territory of millions of acres of forest, lake and swamp. Virgin soil of unsurpassed fertility they knew was there, but how to get at it, how to make it productive, was the question. Manifestly the easiest and quickest way was to offer the land as it was in lots, to all who would undertake to cultivate it. And so, from the old world, came the enterprising pioneer, took possession of his lot, overcame all obstacles that stood in his way, and quickly repaid the Government for its gift. In what way could possession be more lawfully gained. If these uncultivated acres did not belong to the State, whose were they? Whose would the land be if it were nationalized? And if it belonged to the State what hindered them from granting it to those who would make it remunerative both to themselves and