

and the stench from a diseased hog is very great, so great that the disease is supposed by veterinary authorities to be carried, under favorable circumstances, the distance of one mile, and impart the disease to hogs at that distance.

There are at the time of writing about 120 farms under quarantine, having about 600 diseased hogs on them. We would suggest that wagons with water-tight boxes be immediately constructed with a block and pulley attached, so as to raise the hogs into the top of the wagon, the hogs to be then killed and dropped into the wagon; and as the wagon is filled, the hogs to be taken to some spot and burned; that no hog be allowed to go on any farm where the disease exists for one year, and all manure to be at once removed and plowed under or burned. The cost of this would be a mere nothing in comparison to the prospective loss of our reputation for having the most healthy stock. Further, we would suggest that extra precaution should be taken to prevent hogs from being kept within a certain distance of railroads that carry American hogs, or the prevention of their importation or passage through our country. The health of our stock is the greatest thing to be regarded; this is where legislation may do good to the farmers. The farmers' interests should be regarded before the interests of the railroad companies, when the health of our stock and our markets are likely to be affected. The precautions now being taken, although rather late, will, we believe, prevent any danger to our export stock, and in a short time we hope to report that in this small spot where the disease exists it is entirely stamped out.

Government Expenditure for Agricultural Purposes.

It being the settled policy both in the Dominion and the Provincial Government to expend public moneys for agricultural purposes, we have been accused of criticising these expenditures without first proving that they are unnecessary or unjust. Mr. W. H. Lynch, in his defence of the course pursued by the Government in distributing his dairy pamphlets at the public expense, pertinently puts the case in the following words:

"I would suggest that, when attacking such measures, you prove logically that the measures are evil, and that the personal connection exists. The question of Government interference with private economies is one that ought to be treated broadly. It is a question for fair discussion. Taking the Government policy as it is, I think the real question is not whether the Government should interfere in the amelioration of industries, that being a settled policy, but what is most deserving of Government aid. From the farmer's point of view, I think it is not in place to complain of the expenditure of a few thousand dollars to promote agriculture, while millions are being expended on railroads, etc. The farmer may reasonably demand that such small sums be expended properly."

We have merely pointed out, it is true, that the sanguine expectations of the farmers have not been realized, and that the effects of many agricultural expenditures have been demoralizing. We have not yet suggested how these appropriations should be turned to the best interests of the farmers; for this would be an acknowledgment that agricultural expenditures are justifiable. In order to treat this question

logically, we would be forced to discuss the principles of taxation, which is a political issue. We have no desire to get into a wrangle with politicians, and we have therefore considered that we could best serve the interests of the farmers by restricting ourselves to problems pertaining to agriculture proper. We presumed the farmer was aware that both parties were bidding for his vote, and that, if he was a loyal citizen, desiring that truth only should prevail, he would not draw his inspiration from the sophistries of either political party, but would diligently and scrupulously study the merits of the question, and then take such action as would be conducive to his best interests. We have not space to discuss a question in full, upon which many volumes have been written; but as we are driven into the issue, we shall consider it briefly from the farmer's standpoint alone, leaving other organs to fight the battle for their own adherents.

The true function of government is the protection of life and property, and as taxes are indirectly imposed for the support of government, each citizen should contribute in proportion to the amount of security which he enjoys. Now, if more money be exacted from the people than is necessary for legitimate requirements, the surplus must either remain in the treasury in trust for the people, or it must revert to them. If it reverts, then it should go back into the pockets of each citizen in proportion to the total amount exacted. From this view a surplus cannot be defended; but the practical difficulty still remains that parties cannot agree as to what sums should be regarded as a surplus—or a deficit, as the case may be.

This is the real issue which divides our political parties, and as business is always business, an illustrative example may be given in the case of two farmers of conflicting trains of thought. Farmer A. is a man of "economy." He detests laying out money; his policy is to save it at any expense. He will not extend his operations because he cannot do so without laying out money; he will not keep down the weeds, drain his land or keep good stock, for all this requires hard cash which he is hoarding up for his banker. Farmer B. goes to the opposite extreme. He rushes into every speculation in order to win awe and the applause of his neighbors, and secure the highest offices and honors in their gift. In political business, unfortunately, there is no farmer C. Farmer C. is a calculator. He never has a surplus. He keeps books. Instead of depositing his immense profits at five per cent., or squandering it in luxury, or speculative undertakings, which may lead to bankruptcy, he estimates that he can make twenty per cent. by investing in drainage or other legitimate enterprises, and he never feels embarrassed when the tax-gatherer or other creditor knocks at his door. It is needless to explain that farmer A. is a low, and farmer B. a high, taxationist. Farmer C. is the critic. He is independent. He soliloquizes thus:

"It's just half a century ago. I remember the time well. I was a poor, penniless settler—the first in this county. How cordially I used to greet every coming pioneer. We were all jolly good neighbors then, for in point of wealth we were all born and brought up equal. How we struggled, not to get ahead of one an-

other, but to keep away the wolf from our doors! We had no free soil to tread upon, but the air we breathed was pure and free. Our hearts were stout, and our arms strong. Speculators claimed our lands, and well do I remember seeing them driving our cows and our oxen to the auction block when we fell behind with our installments. These wolves were too many and too strong for us to drive away. They looked like dear lambs when they first came to us to bargain away their titles. We did not pray to our paternal government to protect us. These wolves have gone away with our forests, but a worse species has come in their place. The first brood only exacted its pound of flesh; the second preys upon our vitals as well. If we had received encouragement then, there might be an excuse for asking us to encourage other native industries now. We have proved that farming is fit to survive; let the pioneers and the champions of other industries follow our example. How many years of encouragement do they ask and need? But they say we are not taxed for their protection, that the price of our articles of consumption is not increased by high taxation, that home competition brings down prices lower than ever. If so, then they are championing our interests only, and battling against their own. What on earth can tariff encouragement mean, if prices are not increased thereby? Why all this clamoring for a high tariff to keep out foreign commodities, if the prices of home-made articles rule lower? If we are to be prevented from getting cheap goods on account of foreigners slaughtering our markets, then who is to indemnify us when our crops are slaughtered by storms and bugs? One form of indemnity is said to be that we get a home-market for our farm products. Then the same authorities boast of the enormity of our agricultural exports, so that according to this manner of reasoning the height of our prosperity will be attained when we shall have immigrants enough to consume our surplus agricultural products, and when, at the same time, all these surplus products shall be consumed by hungry millions abroad. What does it concern us where our consumers are? We are most concerned in the number of consumers, not in their location; and by placing them at our doors we lose a large number which would otherwise have been engaged in the transportation of commodities, and in the construction of vehicles of transport. The time is now past when the price of any appreciable quantity of our products is ruled by local markets. The representatives of our industries combine for their own aggrandizement, and if they demand high taxation that fact is to me proof positive that, in their minds, somebody else has to foot the bill. When they demand that commodities shall not be manufactured where they can be most cheaply produced, then this fact is to me proof positive that the demon of monopoly stalks abroad. And yet I emphatically deny that protection, in the long run, protects. Encouragement, in the long run, does not encourage. Yes, it does: it encourages tyranny in its basest forms. It debases the will and the self dependent spirit of a free people. It creates multitudes of dupes and lobbyists to be played upon by a corrupt government at the expense of the people, alternated with the government being tyrannized over by corporations of the very people whom it has debauched. As to the claim that light agricultural expenditures are justifiable because they in part indemnify us for the millions squandered in building up soulless corporations, there should be no uncertain sound. What we receive are definite sums spent in definite projects; what we pay in the form of encouragement bounties is unascertainable and so fixed for the purpose of blinding us as to the enormity of the exactions. Whether encouragement encourages or not, I have only to do with the fact its promoters believe it does, and if we are justifiable in claiming an indemnity, it is on this ground. Moreover, I am convinced that agricultural expenditures have not encouraged, and whether they have done so for not, I shall vociferate against them with equally certain tone.