

these three polling places amounted to 116, and may be fairly left out of the reckoning, as being rather an expression of kindly feeling towards the Brain Bros. than of dissatisfaction with the Act. The verdict of the rest of the county may then be arrived at as follows:—

Majority all over against Repeal	180
" in Milton and Oakville for Repeal.....	120
" in Norval, Drumquin and Ligny for Repeal.....	116
Majority in remainder of county	416

INDIAN WHEAT.

The Anti temperance advocates are harping loudly upon the fact that it has been proved that wheat can be profitably grown in India. They say that because of the cheapness of labor in that country, wheat will be produced at so low a price that Canadian grain cannot at all compete with it in the English market, and wheat-raising in Canada for export purposes will be a profitless business. They attempt to argue from this that barley must in the future be more than ever a staple crop, and consequently farmers should vote against the Scott Act, lest they also lose a market for their barley when it is no longer wanted for making beer.

It is not necessary to go over the whole ground of the barley question in considering this point. Canadian farmers can manage their own business better than the travelling agents of the brewers can do it for them, and they are much better informed than some of these would-be advisers imagine. They know that foreign competition affects the market for other cereals as well as the market for wheat. They know something about the distances and difficulties that will always exist to make the carriage of Indian wheat costly even if it were stored in Indian ports. But the difficulty of getting it to these ports is greater still. Sir James Caird, in a recent volume entitled "*India, the Land and the People*," say that "India can never become a dangerous rival of Canada and the United States in the European wheat market until her 10,000 miles of railway have been completed, and her transportation rates reduced one half."

Our farmers know well that it is the beer market and not the barley market that the brewers are anxious to conserve. These brewers use comparatively little of our barley crop, and pay for that no more than what they have to pay. They are so regardless of the barley that they sometimes neglect to use as much of it as their business is supposed to demand. We learn from an Iowa paper that a brewer in that state who has been compelled to give up brewing, is offering to sell recipes by which beer can be made at home for \$1.50 per barrel. The recipe cannot call for much barley, if the beer is so cheaply produced. The brewer can make his beer without the farmer's barley, and the farmer can raise and sell his barley without the brewer's beer. The growing of Indian wheat can never make Canadian farmers dependent upon the brewers. Their case would be a pitiable one if it did.

THE BARLEY QUESTION FROM A HIGHER STAND-POINT

The Barley Question has been thoroughly discussed from a financial stand-point, in fact this is the only stand-point from which the Anti-Scott men can discuss it. We have sometimes felt as if an injustice was being done to our farmers in this; there are many of them who would not for a moment entertain the idea of voting simply for the benefit of their own pockets, if that benefit involved injury and suffering to others. This opinion was correct. To-day there are thousands of farmers indignantly repelling the imputation of sordid motives with which these Anti-Scott advocates are so gratuitously insulting them. We are pleased to be able to record the indignant

protest of one of those farmers. Mr. J. C. Snell, of Edmonton, in Peel county has written to the *Brampton Times* a letter in which he compl. tly exposes the sophistries of the brewers' agents, and then proceeds as follows:—

"I come now to consider the charge of inconsistency brought against myself and other farmers who grow barley and yet support the Scott Act. It seems to me that this charge is absurd on the face of it. Barley was grown before beer was made, and will be grown after the the word "brewer" ceases to appear on the census rolls. Shall we stop growing corn and rye because Gooderham makes whiskey of them? Is the manufacturer of dynamite inconsistent because he advocates a law prohibiting the storage of it near human habitations, the carriage of it in passenger trains, or the sale of it except under the most stringent regulations, and for well-defined uses? Or is the manufacturer of gunpowder inconsistent because he supports an Act which prohibits and punishes the carrying of loaded revolvers except in cases of necessity? We grow barley because it is a useful and necessary grain, provided by our Creator for the food of man and beast, and we believe we discharge our duty to our God and to our fellowmen when we vote for the Scott Act, and thus do all that we can to prevent its being diverted from natural to artificial, from good to evil purposes.

But we farmers believe that we have souls as well as bodies, and hearts as well as pockets, and that with us as with others, "It is not all of life to live, nor of death to die." We believe that we are better than "dumb, driven cattle," whose highest ambition is a warm stall and a well-filled manger, and hence, notwithstanding the teachings of ex King Dods, that "the most sensitive nerve in our whole organization is that which radiates from the breeches' pocket," we sometimes rise above the muck-worm, and think of things higher and nobler than dollars and cents. We have sons, we have daughters, we have brothers, we have neighbors. What do the liquor-sellers take us for, when they set up the barley market against our families, and tell us that for so many cents a bushel we should be willing to sell our children and our friends to the drunkard's grave and the drunkard's hell? I have tried to speak kindly and temperately when discussing this question, but my blood boils when hirelings appeal to the lowest passions of our natures, and ask us to set the love of money against the dearest, holiest feelings of the human heart—the love of our families, the love of our neighbors, the love of God himself. I have no quarrel with those who oppose the Scott Act because they conscientiously believe the principle of prohibition to be wrong, or even with those who (in spite of Gooderham's \$10,000 subscription to the Anti-Scott fund) believe that the Act does not decrease the consumption of liquor, but I do say most deliberately that the farmer, or the merchant, or the politician who believes that the adoption of the Act in this county will save one of his own or of his neighbor's children, from the ruin of soul and body, and yet for the sake of the barley market or of the hotel-keepers' custom, or of "popularity," casts his vote against it, should speak gently and tenderly of Judas, who sold his master for thirty pieces of silver, "for he who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" Let every Christian man who believes the Scott Act to be a step in the right direction, ponder well the words of the Lord—"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me." "He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad?" Let every true citizen vote for the good of his country; every lover of his fellowmen for the good of his neighbor; and every Christian for the good of God's cause, and the temperance men need not fear the result.

Selected Articles.

COMPENSATION TO LIQUOR SELLERS.

From the *Brantford Times* we clip the following thoughtful article on the subject:

"Does justice demand that when the liquor traffic is prohibited, those engaged in it shall be compensated for the loss of that part of their business. Some of our friends appear to think so, and adduce, as an illustration in point, the example of the British Parliament in voting £20,000,000 sterling to compensate the planters of the West Indies when slavery was