

in the company's cars. The railway company have the power, under subsection 4 of section 544, of feeding and watering the cattle if the owner makes default, and they can charge the owner with the expense of the necessary care. There is no reason, therefore, why, in this case, the railway company should not have fed and watered their cattle, even if the owner were in fault.

"The case seems to me to require a fine which will be a deterrent."

"The code seems to allow a period of 28 hours during which the cattle can be without care, and not until that time elapses does any liability arise under the code. That is apparently the law. But 28 hours appears to be much too long a time to allow. Perhaps there may be some explanation why 28 hours are named. One would think 8 hours were enough to go without food or water, but the code says 28 hours. As I have only to carry out the law as I find it, all I can do is to call attention to the state of the legislation."

"NOT THE MEN FOR GALWAY."

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

I was very much interested and pleased with your editorial in the 16th of April issue of "The Farmer's Advocate," on the automobile question, but cannot agree with you when you say there should be a portion of the week when it should be safe to drive on the rural roads. Why should we be kept off the roads a portion of the week? Who has a right to the use of the road if it is not the people who made them, cleared the timber off them, dug out the stumps, graded and drained and gravelled them, and why should we resign our right to travel them in peace and safety every day in the week, and to whom? I understand there were a little over 1,600 permits granted to autoists last year. Of that number, about 1,000 were to American, and the other 600 would likely be to rich men in the cities, not one of whom contributed one cent or one hour's labor to the making of these roads. The talk of regulating the traffic is all bosh; it can not be regulated. Nine out of ten horses will be frightened by the smell of the thing, if nothing else; and as to horses getting used to them, that might hold good if a man kept the same horse for all time. You know, the majority of farmers are raising horses for sale, as well as their own use. It is usual to break the young horses, and when used two or three years, to sell them, and replace with another young one. These young horses never see an automobile until they are taken on the road. So it's a continual repetition of the scare and runaway, and the whole farming community is to put up with this, because a few rich Americans, and a few rich men in our own cities, want to enjoy the sport of running down and frightening the country yokel and his wife off the road, and I think, Mr. Editor, these same country yokels well deserve to be run off the roads if they don't take the matter in hand now the local elections are about coming off. Let them attend the nominating meeting. Let them try to forget for a few weeks that they call themselves Grits and Tories. Let them nominate men, and vote for them, who will go to Toronto and do just as the Legislature of Prince Edward Island has done; that is, prohibit the running of automobiles on the roads altogether.

The Weekly Sun said the Grange put up a valiant fight before the Legislative Committee. They asked for one day and a half in the week (Saturday and part of Sunday), when they and their wives might travel the roads in safety, one day and a half. O, the poor bodies! Who did they profess to represent? Was it the auto men? It certainly was not the farmers, for I would stake my all that if a vote was taken to-morrow, ninety-five per cent. of the people would vote to abolish them altogether. It was plainly to be seen, the dominating spirit of the old master, Jabel Robinson, had left the scene. Another thing I might say, the growing feeling among the people, and their willingness to tax themselves to make the main road first-class, has largely disappeared, and what else could be expected, when the roadmakers have to travel the back roads themselves? It is not likely they will do any-thing to make a road they seldom travel. The idea advanced that the farmers will soon be using the automobile is not at all likely. One reason is, they could only use them part of the year. Another is, they can't afford it; it takes them all they can do to pay the high rates imposed in the shape of high tariff, made in favor of these people who are investing in automobiles and such like; the money taken from the people in the shape of subsidies, and the result of protective duties. So there is not much chance for us to get and run an auto if we wished. When we have to find the where-withal for the other fellow to run one, we can't possibly afford to run two. I think if the Opposition in the local Legislature had taken up this question, and made it the main plank in their platform, it would have put them much nearer the goal at which they are aiming than all their heroics on the three-fifths clause and the power question, but they evidently are not the men for Galway.

R. J. HINE.
Elgin Co., Ont.

A GREAT BOOK OF WORDS.

No farm home is complete in these days without a good dictionary of the English language. It is needed nearly every day. Especially useful for the young folks who attend school. A copy, postpaid, of the Twentieth Century Dictionary may be obtained, post free, by sending us two new subscribers to "The Farmer's Advocate," accompanied by \$3.00.

AN ANSWER TO CAPTAIN KIMMINS.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

It is well that our people should be aroused by this most vital question, military drill in schools. Captain A. E. Kimmins has written what to most of us appears to be the letter of a level-headed man; still, I cannot agree with him. However (unless we arrive at conscription), this is a free country, and we are all entitled to our own opinions.

It was the editorial in "The Farmer's Advocate" of January 2nd, 1908, that prompted me to write my first article, from which has arisen this discussion. If you will allow me, I will quote a paragraph from that editorial, which runs as follows:

"In North America, the surest way to bring on war is to prepare for it by raising the military spirit; the surest way to avoid war is to turn the people's thoughts and aims towards the arts and triumphs of peace."

It is claimed that if boys are trained in the arts of war that it will cure them of soldiering. In that case, if a boy loves farming, will a course at an agricultural college "cure" his desire for a rural life?

The editorial says that this new phase of militarism is a "sorry exhibition of the Gospel of Peace." We know that military training is in direct opposition to the teachings of the Prince of Peace, but like many others, perhaps the Captain thinks that in "the present state of society" Christianity is impracticable in a Christian land?

Captain Kimmins says that history repeats itself. This is true to a certain degree, yet no two events are exactly alike. It is to be hoped that the history of Pennsylvania, under the governorship of William Penn, will repeat itself. It is an old story, but it will bear repeating, especially if contrasted with the history of Virginia.

It will be remembered that Charles II. owed William Penn £16,000. After waiting several years for payment, William suggested to the "Merry Monarch" that he should be given a tract of land in America. The king readily granted the request, but Penn was determined to treat the natives with absolute justice, and not being satisfied with the title from Charles, he bought the land over again from the Indians. In 1682, Penn, fearless and unarmed, met the red chiefs near Philadelphia, where the great treaty was interpreted to the natives, in which Penn said: "We are met on the broad pathway of good faith and good-will, so that no advantage is to be taken on either side, but all to be openness, brotherhood and love." The Indians then promised "to live in love with the English as long as the sun and moon shall last." It was not until forty years after this treaty that a white man killed an Indian, and it was seventy-two years after before an Indian killed a white man, but William Penn was then dead. If he and all his colonists could keep the peace totally unarmed in a territory almost as large as England among "savages," surely it is not impossible for this history to be repeated in a Christian land! While Pennsylvania prospered in building and commerce, Virginia, under Captain Smith, was waging bloody wars, which time after time almost exterminated the colony.

No, we are not yet armed to the teeth, but unless the present attitude of indifference and militarism is suppressed, we shall be in time.

Captain Kimmins refers to the battles of Lundy's Lane and Queenston Heights, but who was it before the war of 1812-1815 that provoked the Americans by overhauling their ships for British deserters? It is to be hoped that the history of H. M. S. Leopard, with its high-handed action in capturing the Chesapeake, will not be repeated. However, as the British Government apologized immediately, we will let the matter drop. My point is that these disputes could be settled by arbitration. We have arrived at a time when English-speaking nations no longer settle private troubles by duel, and the time is coming when international disputes will also be settled by courts of law, which will be much less costly and more satisfactory than sacrificing our young men and our homes.

General Sheridan said, "War will eliminate itself. By the next centennial arbitration will rule the world." Napoleon said, "The more I study the world, the more I am convinced of the inability of brute force to create anything durable."

The Captain suggests a possible invasion. Does he fear the "Yellow Peril"? A great peril exists in the yellow press. We know that China and Japan are making gigantic improvements in their armies. With the latest-patterned armaments they would be no mean foe, and should they contemplate an invasion of our country in return for the insults English-speaking people have showered upon them, we would (even if every man in Canada were a trained soldier) stand a poor chance against their overwhelming numbers. Therefore, we had better turn our attention a little more to the peace question.

Longfellow says:—

"Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need for arsenals nor forts."

What are we doing in the schools (and churches) to "redeem the human mind from error"? How much money do we in Canada spend in promoting peace?

Two countries in South America have led off the world in an object lesson of peace and arbitration. I refer to the Republics of Chili and Argentina. It would be well for us to follow their example, and put an end to military drill in schools. After seventy years of

quarreling over the boundary line, Chili and Argentina decided to fight it out. They increased their armaments, ordered European battleships of the latest pattern, and spent enormous sums of money, until the people were weighed down with taxes. Just as the war cloud was about to break, the peace party succeeded in inducing both Governments to submit the controversy to King Edward, whose decision was accepted and a war averted.

The result of this treaty was that the land forces were reduced, the heavy ordnance taken off the warships, several of which were turned over to the commercial fleets. With the money saved by this disarmament, good roads were constructed. Chili turned an arsenal into a manual-training school, and improved her harbors, and the Trans-Andean Railway united the two nations by its completion. More than this, a statue of the Christ was cast from cannon taken from the fortress at Buenos Ayres. In 1904 this statue was erected on the boundary line on the lofty Andes, and the dedication was attended by a friendly gathering of representatives from both nations. On the tablet at the base of the statue is this inscription:—

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentinians and Chilians break the peace to which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

If we in Canada do not erect such monuments on our coasts and boundaries, we can at least work for the peace pledges between other nations, our best means of defence, thus preventing the feared invasions.

King's Co., N. S.

EUNICE WATTS.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENCES.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

It is the boast of our "War Department" that it has raised the amount for our national military defence equipment at the rate of nearly one million dollars a year, or almost 1,000 per cent. during the last ten years.

Now, I look upon this condition of affairs not with pride, but with dread alarm. Canada, the youngest of all the nations; born anew, in this enlightened Christian twentieth century; in this present world-wide peace movement, to begin such strenuous exertions of militarism is to sell our noble heritage for a mess of pottage. It is a fatal misnomer to call and to think these works, built of rotting wood and crumbling clay—these guns, with these "red-coats" behind them—"Canada's Defences."

Red coats are well chosen for our soldiery. They give a brave appearance to many a coward—for they often fail to prove themselves brave in the test who show such brazen front in times of peace. The militia are made up largely of those who have shirked their social and financial responsibilities, if they had any, in search of a soft job. It takes greater courage to meet and master the multiplicity of home duties than to shoulder a gun and go off to the drill, and even to march to battle and die in the excitement of carnage. He is the true hero who stands, calm and serene, uncompromising and unflinching, at the post where God has stationed him, though he may live in obscurity, and die without having heard the plaudits of man. The truly brave seldom have their fame trumpeted over the earth. Canada's impregnable defences are her peace-loving, God-fearing, honest and industrious army of toilers. Work creates commerce, and commerce is rapidly welding the adamant chain of international peace, binding indissolubly all nations of the earth into one universal and everlasting brotherhood.

Then why all these preparations for war? Your ramparts and your red-coats are menaces rather to our national peace, both externally and internally. No nation would molest Canada unarmed, but Canada armed would provoke quarrels and invite attack, and not the law of right but the law of might would prevail.

One instance internally. See how the country is disturbed by the Moir tragedy. We do not acquit Moir, or palliate his awful crime. But is he alone to blame? The nation taught him the art of war, put into his hands the gun, and said, "Go, kill." The nation most likely taught him to drink—at least it sold him drink that crazed his mind. The result—he shot Sergeant Lloyd. Was not the nation as much the murderer of Lloyd as was Moir? Moir escaped, but the "War Department" down at Ottawa is virtually, it seems to me, an equal accomplice with Moir in the crime. If you want to hang something, go hang that. And I believe it is time we did. Let us change our tactics. Let us do away with the "Minister of Militia"—I mean with the Department—and create a new department, say a "Minister of Peace." Thus, instead of having a man who considers it his work and his duty to create disturbances and make enemies of nations who would otherwise be our friends, we would have a man who would be ever watchful for the country's highest welfare; would earnestly strive after, promote and insure her peace abroad, and her prosperity at home.

If we only knew it, we are a nation of peace-lovers, and if the question of armament were put to a plebiscite there would never be another cent of our money devoted towards the maintenance of a militia, a navy, the so-called defences, or for any warlike or military display. The many armories proposed for building would never lift their useless, gloomy and fatal walls, to be so many festering plague-spots of debauchery and crime, desecrating this "fair Canada of ours." The eight million dollars, which has made us wonder why