

passage of such laws has been that it would protect and raise the price of the product in which they are most interested. It is probably not necessary for me to say that I am opposed to all such legislation. It is vicious and contrary to the principles of a free government. Fairchild, in his *Moral Philosophy*, says: "A tyranny is a government which is administered for the pleasure or advantage of a class or a few in opposition to the interests of the manv." This is true of any law, whether it help a rich corporation or a so-called "granger."

The tendency to take narrow views of such legislation is so great that many find it hard to resist it. Two elements make themselves prominent. Our selfish interests so press themselves on our brain fiber that we find it hard to resist the temptation to ask that the legislation be so framed as to help our industry. Then, again, egotism is so prominent in our natures that we are apt to think that nothing is just as it should be until we have had a hand in making it. The result is we can see no good in a Bill framed by others, first, because it does not help "our folks," and second, because we had no hand in making it. As John Stuart Mill suggests, we are apt to want men to act as we think they should, because of our personal feelings in the matter, and not because it will promote the public good.

The necessity for pure food legislation is hardly a matter for discussion. Every man of ordinary intelligence, who has given the subject a moment's thought, knows that adulteration and false branding is rampant everywhere. Butter is adulterated, flour is adulterated, sugar is adulterated, tea and coffee are adulterated, honey, thrown out of the comb, is adulterated, snices are adulterated, syrups are adulterated, drugs and medicines are adulterated. In fact, almost everything we eat and drink is adulterated. Sometimes even the adulterant is adulterated. Chicory is a good illustration of this, for the man who buys it to adulterate coffee is not certain that he himself is not being woefully imposed upon by having some adulterant of the adulterant foisted upon him. In this case he gets beaten at his own game. Here is a list of the articles which are said to be used to adulterate chicory. (Before I give the list let me remark that this Government has laid a duty on chicory so the people of Nebraska can afford to raise chicory): "Roasted beans, pear, carrots, parsnips, acorns,

horse-chestnuts, tan-bark, logwood and even the livers of animals." And so it comes to pass,

"Larger fleas have lesser fleas upon their backs o' bits 'em,
And these, again, have smaller fleas, and so ad infinitum."

Adulteration is open, flagrant, bold, and often "defiant." It is the crowning crime and shame of the 19th century, and a matter beside which in importance all others pale into insignificance. It is more than expansion or anti-expansion; it is more than free silver or the gold standard; nay, it is more than any other question which confronts the American people to-day, for it is sapping the moral foundations of justice and equity, and teaching men and women, who are otherwise disposed to be fair, to wink at deception and dishonesty. Surely, it is time to call a halt.

I am a firm believer in the rights of the individual, and insist that none of his natural rights be curtailed or arbitrarily taken away in the supposed interest of society, but I am equally firm in the conviction that no man has a right to defraud and deceive his fellow men in the name of liberty. Cooley said, "It was the peculiar excellency of the common law of England that it recognized the worth, and sought especially to protect the rights and privileges of the individual man. Arbitrary power and uncontrolled authority were not recognized in its principles." Legislators should ever have these foundation principles in mind, and should see to it that no individual right is infringed upon by the laws which they enact. So long as an article is not injurious to human health and happiness, the laws of the land should in no way interfere with its manufacture. The simple fact that the production of an article lowers the price of or cheapens another article is not a sufficient reason for throwing legislative restrictions about it. We were told a few years ago that a "cheap coat" made a "cheap man," but surely this is not true of food products. The masses are interested in cheap foods, and the only thing that I insist upon is that they be sold for what they are, and be not branded with a "lie."

Much of the so-called pure-food legislation of the past has simply been a little "pap" thrown by the cheap-John politicians to the so-called "grangers" to catch votes, and the result has been that in many of the States some very foolish laws have been enacted, professedly in the interest of pure food, but actually in