

the almost general prevalence of noxious weeds, and the utter disregard shown by many of the residents towards attempting to keep down the weeds. It is hardly necessary to say anything to emphasize the disadvantage of bad roads. Any one who has ever attempted to drive any distance when the roads are bad, will comprehend the situation. Those who have not, simply cannot grasp the significance of these words at all. A farmer from a district near the city, said to the writer the other day, that he had noticed in the papers that the Winnipeg people were going to spend some money to advertise to get settlers for the district. He added, that if they would turn their efforts toward securing good roads, the settlers would soon come.

The weed question is also more of a factor in this matter than many people imagine. Most of the old farms in the district are overrun with weeds. The provincial law regarding noxious weeds has always been a dead letter in this district. Absolutely no effective work has been done to enforce the law. The Commercial has stated these facts over and over again during many years. Farmers who have tried to clean their farms, have become discouraged by the neglect of their neighbors, and some have actually been driven out of the district by the weed nuisance. The writer has learned of a number of parties who have left the district on this account. In the matter of weeds, there is little use in an individual farmer trying to clean his land, while his neighbors allow the weeds to seed and blow all over the surrounding territory.

There is much room for work on the part of those who would seek to secure settlers for the vacant lands of the Winnipeg district, and while they are devising plans with this object in view, they might just take the question of roads and weeds into consideration with a view to bringing pressure in the right quarter to secure improvement of these conditions.

PROHIBITION FOR MANITOBA.

One of the numerous conventions held in Winnipeg last week consisted of a gathering of prohibitionists, a feature of which was the usual delegation, which waited on the provincial government in the interest of the cause. From the standpoint of the prohibitionist, the interview with the new provincial premier was a most satisfactory one. Premier Macdonald promised in the most decisive manner, to carry out the platform of the party now in power, to the fullest extent. It will be remembered that in the recent election campaign, both the parties promised to carry out restrictive or prohibitory legislation to the

fullest extent within the power of the province. In the case of the party of the late government, it seems to be the opinion of some prohibitionists that the government had been playing with them, as during the years which have elapsed since the plebiscite was carried in Manitoba, nothing has been done to put prohibitive measures into effect. However, the temperance people have a new government to deal with now, and from the satisfactory nature of their first interview with the new premier, they seem to have good reason to believe that something will be done in the cause which they advocate. Anti-election pledges, as politics go, are not always, it is true, to be taken literally. In this case, however, the personal pledges of the premier, since the elections, have been so unequivocal that it would seem the new government really does intend to carry out the programme in regard to temperance legislation.

This leads us to consider what the government can do. It is evidently clearly within the power of the provincial government to prohibit the sale of liquors in broken bulk or for consumption on the premises. Regarding the sale of liquors in original packages, the powers of the province are not defined. Eminent authorities differ on this point. The province has the power, however, to restrict, if not to prohibit, the sale of liquors in a wholesale way, by means of the license system, which is within the authority of the provincial government. The province cannot prohibit the manufacture of liquors, nor the sale of liquors by a manufacturer, but, as would appear from the recent test case in Ontario, the province can compel the manufacturer to take out a license.

The action of the government, in view of the pledges just made, will be awaited with keen interest, by a large section of the population. The effect of putting into effect the prohibitory powers of the province, would be to abolish the treating system, providing, of course, that the law is enforced. On the other hand there would probably be an increase in the number of so-called wholesale dealers, unless very restrictive measures were adopted to limit the number of whole sale dealers, by means of the licensing power of the government. There might also be an increase in the number of manufacturers, in the direction of small local breweries. The question of hotels being allowed to supply liquor to guests, is also a matter which would no doubt receive special consideration, in connection with the creation of prohibitive or restrictive laws.

GOVERNMENT TWINE.

When the farmers come to deal with the government, they find that busi-

ness is done on a different basis than is their dealings with the regular trade. The blinder twine question is a sample of this. The Dominion government operates a blinder twine factory at Kingston, Ontario, with the special object, so it has been said, of enabling the farmers to get their requirements of blinder twine supplied at factory prices. But how is this worked? The farmers have the preferred privilege of buying twine for spot cash, up to the first of March, after which date the product of the government factory will probably be sold in bulk to some party, firm or company, to be handled in the regular way. There are two points to be noted in this arrangement. First, the farmer must pay spot cash, which is quite different from the usual long credit plan on which he buys almost everything from the retail dealers. No fault, however, can be found with the government for adopting this plan. It is in fact the only basis on which they could work. Some years ago the government sold twine on credit for one season, direct to the farmers, and we believe a number of their accounts are still unpaid. The second condition, namely, that the twine will only be held until the first of March, is also reasonable from the point of view of the government. The object is to get rid of the twine, and it would be difficult to dispose of the twine in bulk after that date. At the same time, the farmer must pay cash for government twine and take delivery six months before he requires the article. He also in this case runs the risk of having to carry the twine over, in case of his crop turning out a failure. When the farmer comes to pay cash for his twine six months before he wants it, pays cash for freight thereon, figures the cost of interest and insurance, and possibility of crop failure, he will be wise to buy from the local dealer and will probably be money in pocket by so doing. The same rule will apply to most other things which the consumer thinks it an advantage to send away for.

ENCOURAGE THE EXPERIMENTS.

The Commercial has on two or three occasions pointed out the great injury done to Manitoba and the territories by the introduction and enforcement of the laws against the importation of nursery stock from the United States. During the past few years a great desire has been shown on the part of Manitoba farmers and gardeners to experiment with nursery stock, with the object mainly of securing fruits that would stand our severe climate. It is the general opinion of those who have had experience in these matters, that it is a waste of time and money to experiment with Ontario