

discovered this; they are still thinking in the manner of their fathers. The SLAVE OF THE FARM hangs most stubbornly to the idea that he is some kind of a freeholder or capitalist. All the farmer's organizations are founded upon this idea; his papers and his conversation betray this false, or rather old time, conception of his position in modern society. Ancient ideas die hard. There was a time when the holding of land meant all the difference between slave and freeman, between noble and chattel. The most severe punishment—almost as bad as death itself—was to be branded "outlaw" or "landless man" by the communal dwellers of early England. A landless man was a proscribed and hated wretch, every man's hand was against him, and who caught him foul might enslave him forever. Even as late as 1547 any person could make one of these poor unfortunates bondsman for all time by simply denouncing him as an idler, brand him, starve, whip and torture—even execute him. To be a landless man was indeed a terrible thing.

The early settlers of Canada knew this too; the possession of soil meant to them life. Composed of United Empire Loyalists, French Huguenots, expatriated Irish, and dispossessed Scottish Cottars and Clansmen, the social ideals of the peasant proprietor necessarily grew up amongst them, and are retained today by this new wave of immigrants, alas! to their utter confusion of thought upon matters pertaining to their economic status. The "back to the land" movement holds the imagination of the British worker because he knows the strength of the landed classes in his own country.

There is also another factor in explanation of the soil slave's viewpoint, which, my dear E., must always be kept in mind,—the topographical condition of the country. This plays an important part. The voice of the wide spreading prairie, the murmur of the whispering woods, the gurgle of the swift running creek or the majestic sweep of some giant river, the wide expanse