

the country at large? If then, the landholders in Canada have not a lawful right to what they own, what, we ask, constitutes a lawful right? But if it is a lawful possession, how can nationalization without compensation, be just or right? But further, suppose the farmer's health breaks down after his farm is cleared, or he wishes to leave the neighborhood, and the owner of the adjoining lot desires to add to what he has, and is willing to pay the price his neighbor asks for his farm, is he not at liberty to buy it? And if he continues by lawful purchase to add to his land till he is possessed of several thousands of acres, which unable to manage himself, he lets for fair and reasonable rent, is he thus doing anything wrong? But now he is a landlord, as well as a landowner, living on his rents. But what has he done that is unlawful—why should his possessions be taken from him more than from the first settler with his 100 acres?

Now it appears to us from the foregoing observations, we shall be able to see in what way, and how truly socialistic expectations in this connection, are deceptive, and in doing this, shall also find to some extent the difference between the freedom agriculturalists now enjoy, and the servitude socialism would impose upon them.

Socialists say "when we get the world into working order, in accordance with our theory, labor will be more equalized, and the hours of labor much fewer." This is a very promising statement, but experience has not yet proved it. We will see whether there is reasonable ground for such a hope in connection with the land.

Let us suppose socialistic theories to be in full force, and the State desirous to clear a large tract of hitherto unexplored forest and swamp land, such as there are many thousand acres of in this country. The land belongs to the State; but who is to clear it? Does there live one man who, without extra remuneration, would prefer to undertake the arduous work of clearing land to that of working on land already under cultivation? We may, I think, decide that none or almost none would volunteer their services. But then the Government must exercise force of some kind. It must either arbitrarily select such men as it thinks fit, or they must be chosen by lot, a species of conscription as cruel as that of Napoleon. Here then socialism again steps in to interfere with personal liberty. But now, suppose the requisite number of men "pressed" into the service, what are the probabilities as to the rate at which the work will be done. Faster than the settler and his stalwart sons who owned the hundred acre lot? Most assuredly not. We have no hesitation in asserting that the farmer and his sons would do twice the amount of work of an equal number of the Government men. But the farmer and his sons work early and late. We may therefore reasonably conclude that the latter would do at least three times the work of the former, who would not be working more than two-thirds the number of hours. Thus the same piece of work would take three times the num-

ber of men that it takes now to do it in the same time. But could the Government spare the requisite number of men to do this work with the necessary expedition? Or if they did spare them, would not the balance of agriculturalists working on the cultivated land be so few in number that they would have to work extra hours to get their work done in season? We think this would be a serious difficulty. Moreover, in order to obtain even a moderate amount of work per head, the number of overseers would have to be very great, and their powers so unlimited that the men would be little better than slaves minus the whips. We see then in this case at all events, how precarious is the hope of shortened hours of labor, and the encroachments such an order of things would make upon personal liberty. For we must bear in mind that even where there is an approximation to this, *e. g.* where a large number of men work on the streets or roads, under overseers, they are paid for what they do, they can take holidays when they will, and they are not compelled to do such work at all unless they like, and lastly they are generally the lowest class of society who have made *slaves of themselves* in various ways, whose last resort for daily bread, or daily whiskey, is found in this kind of work.

We have above used the terms "State and Government." It is necessary to have a clear notion of the modern idea of the State, and the problem which it sets itself to solve, so as to give the best possible satisfaction.

"The problem reserved for the modern State" says Schwegler "is to combine with the greatest possible omnipotence of the State the greatest possible freedom of the conscious individual will." (Hist. of Philosophy.)

We do not think there can be much improvement on this. A State which approaches this idea is sure of the respect of the people. It is powerful, has firm control over all, yet the reins of Government are scarcely felt, except by the law-breakers, who in such a state, are those who interfere with others in such a way as to destroy in some degree their freedom. Thus, a man would be at liberty to get intoxicated, but if in such a condition he assaulted another, then the State steps in for the protection of the latter.

Now how nearly does the theory of the Socialistic State approach this idea? The more we consider it, the more clearly do we perceive how opposed it is to it. True liberty in such a State there would be little or none. It would, being sole owner of property, as we have seen, have to regulate the various employments of its members. It would have to decide when they should work, and how long at a time. In virtue of the above it would have to decide to some extent where each man should live. In a developed form, it might find it necessary for economy's sake, to break up households, and to mass a number of families together in one large building. This would involve the loss of even such property as household furniture. We may further speculate with reason