

On Wednesday night a meeting was held at Uthoff, and here the antis adopted still more aggressive tactics. They first contested the Rev. Mr. Harris' right to open the meeting with prayer, but the rev. gentleman stuck to his post and insisted upon it in spite of half an hour's opposition and eventually carried his point, after which Mr. Nicholson was appointed chairman on the nomination of Mr. C. Moore, who was evidently determined to run the meeting. Mr. Burgess then delivered his address. Mr. Moore created a scene by threatening Mr. Burgess because he referred to him as a liquor seller.

Mr. Cosh again spoke for an hour and a quarter, going over similar ground as on Tuesday. Immediately on concluding his speech, he and Mr. Moore left the room, and immediately a band of rough young fellows marched into the crowded place, with shrieks and yells and unearthly sounds made by using a large old circular saw on a long pole as a gong, and which was rattled with small axes. Others followed with cowbells, and other extemporized instruments of musical torture. Mr. Burgess' attempt to speak was drowned by repetitions of the noise, and, the meeting being broken up, he and the Rev. Mr. Harris were serenaded for a quarter of a mile or so by music which made night hideous. Some little disposition was shown to actual mischief by stone-throwing. Mr. Burgess says that one large stone fell at his feet, but fortunately no harm was done. There is some talk of prosecuting the ringleaders, with a view to get at the authors of the disgraceful scene.—*Globe*.

Selected Articles.

THE SCOTT ACT.

No free-minded individual can come out too early or state his position too clearly in favor of prohibition if he has at heart the good of the people of this Dominion or of his locality. We have already stated that we believe there is no room for neutrality on the subject of prohibition as compared to a license system. We believe that we have as good a license law as we would be likely to have for years to come; but even with it, the social evils of intemperance are of great magnitude—of such magnitude, in fact, that none can fail to observe them. There are those, however, who, not having studied the matter from our standpoint, are undecided as to whether the Scott Act would have the effect of diminishing those evils or not. A careful study of the Act itself will be useful, and a fitting opportunity is afforded, now that it is intended to organize for the submission of the measure to the voters of this county. There are others, though, who, regardless of the welfare of the community, attempt to argue that the system of licensing is more beneficent to the cause of temperance than the Scott Act would be. To this there is but one answer, after the least investigation is made. We now have in this Province the best license law ever framed, according to universal testimony. We cannot look for any change in this law that will tend to reduce the traffic in alcoholic beverages. If a higher price is placed upon the privilege of dealing in intoxicants, have we any proof that there will be a diminution in the amount of drinking? No. There may not be so many places for the sale of liquor. Some hotels or saloons whose keepers have less money than their neighbors would doubtless fail to take out licenses; but that will not in any sense affect the amount of money that the people will spend for drink: rather will it increase the amount spent. If one high priced license comes into existence in place of two low priced ones, does the reader suppose that the man who pay for the one will be lacking in plans to make his high priced license pay? not by any means. It has been the experience of all cities where the high license has been tried that finely finished, gilded and more attractive saloons took the places of the less gaudy drinking place. High and low priced liquor was sold at the same bar; the business turned into a channel of monopoly; the same amount of intoxicants was drunk. One or two took in the money that was before taken in by half-a-dozen places under low licenses. More adulterations were made in the liquor; the better and the lower classes of society—for there is a distinction in all classes of drinkers—met at the same monopolistic carnival, and the results were naturally worse than they would be if the trade were carried on in a less centralized manner. There is no use in endeavoring to apply the condition of affairs in some American cities to the Province of Ontario. The city of Chicago alone, for instance, is under the curse of a larger liquor traffic than the whole Province of Ontario. Crime holds high carnival, night and day, as a direct result of the unrestrained sale of liquor. It is

therefore no wonder that temperance men hail with gladness a rise in the price of license there, and the consequent decrease in the number of saloons. But Ontario is not Chicago—let us be thankful for that. Our Dominion Government has already said that when this country is ready for prohibition, we should have it. The best prohibitive measure we have ever had the opportunity of testing is within our grasp, and shall we not give it a trial? Some will bring up the Dunkin Act in comparison. The Scott Act was passed in lieu of the Dunkin Act for the very purpose of remedying the deficiencies of the latter. It does it, too. There are few cases of exception where it does not. If you are not satisfied of this, obtain a copy of each Act, and compare them. Do not take for granted the statements of any man, whether he be a professed temperance ally or not, on this subject. It is one of too great importance to pass by without forming your own opinion on a clear, unbiased basis. We are more and more convinced, on studying the question of prohibition and license (high or low), that from the results already accomplished by the Scott Act, it is incomparably superior to the Dunkin Act, and its adoption in this whole Province—aye, in this whole Dominion—would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. At any rate, the duty of the temperance people is to press forward and obtain the adoption of the Act, and, also to obtain any amendments that may be advisable for the welfare of society: such amendments will not be obtained unless the people show their determination to first try the Act. Let the forces of this county and district combine and move forward.—*Carleton Place Herald*.

HIGH LICENSE.

"We are at a point where it is proposed to restrain liquor selling by compelling the liquor merchants to pay a high license of say, \$500 or \$1,000. This will have a tendency, it is said, to close up the small grogeries, and the money obtained from the few able to pay high license will help to support the poorhouses filled by the wives of men ruined by dissipation, don't you see it? It will help to build the jails where men are incarcerated who violate the law while drunk, don't you see? It will help support the Court of Oyer and Terminer, where they are tried for committing crimes to which they are driven by intoxication, don't you see? [Laughter.] How any intelligent man or woman can be so hoodwinked by this argument, which is the surrender of all that the temperance movement has been striving for during the past sixty years, is a source of amazement to me. The result of high license is to make rum selling and rum-drinking respectable, by closing the low grogeries and allowing a few gilded saloons to sell all the liquor. It is a proposition to close the rash on the body politic and gather together all the poison and all the pus into a few great carbuncles. [Laughter.] High license is the monopoly of abomination. Legalized rum-selling has made the ground of England, Ireland and America hollow with the catacombs of slaughtered drunkards.

"High license is a violation of the first principle of our government—equal rights. It allows one man who can pay \$500 or \$1,000 to sell sweetened dynamite [laughter] and denies the right to the man who can pay only \$100 or nothing at all. I plead for equal rights. High license allows a few men who sell extract of log-wood, strychnine and the blue vitriol and denies to others even the right to strike a lucifer match. It isn't fair. Why don't you apply the same principal to other trades? Why not license bakers and butchers and shut up the small shops and allow only a few large establishments which are able to pay for the high license to sell bread and meat? 'Oh,' it is said, 'that is different; selling bread and meat doesn't injure anybody.' Ah, my friends, you have surrendered the whole subject. If it is right to sell liquor all men should have an equal right to deal in it. If it is wrong, then a license fee of \$500 or \$1,000 is simply a bribe to the government. [Loud applause.]

"But it is said that we can't get prohibition and that it is better to take what we can get. Some say half a loaf is better than no bread at all. Yes, provided the half a loaf is not poisoned. A half a pound of butter is better than no butter at all, provided it isn't oleomargarine. [Laughter.] A midnight express train speeds across a bridge, one-half of which has been swept away by storm and flood; the train rolls over into the torrent below and 200 souls are landed into eternity. Is half a bridge better than no bridge at all?