

intoxicating liquor, or any mixed liquor capable of being used as a beverage and a part of which is spirituous or otherwise intoxicating, in violation of the second part of this Act, shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty of not less than fifty dollars for the first offence, and not less than one hundred dollars for the second offence and to be imprisoned for a term not exceeding two months for the third and for every subsequent offence."

THE MC'CARTHY ACT PENALTIES.

"Any person who sells or barter liquors of any kind, without the license therefor by law required, shall, for the first offence, on conviction thereof, incur a penalty of not less than twenty dollars and costs, and not more than fifty dollars and costs; and for a second or any subsequent offence, or conviction thereof, such persons shall be imprisoned in the common gaol of the county or place in which the offence was committed to be kept at hard labor for a period not exceeding three calendar months."

If our friends, the Antis, prefer the latter penalties, and the courts they have a right to them, we shall not object. We regret the present delay, but it will not be for long; and whatever the decision may be it cannot impair the potency of the Scott Act as an agency for suppressing the liquor traffic.

WELL DONE, LONDON.

It has been stated not infrequently that London, Ont., is rather behind in temperance sentiment, but some late occurrences in this Western metropolis may well make the capital of Ontario hang her head in shame. In striking contrast to the action of our Industrial Exhibition directors stands out the manly conduct of the Board of Managers of the Western Fair.

It appears that notwithstanding the provision of the Ontario License Act forbidding the sale of liquor upon all exhibition grounds, certain parties holding booths or stands for the sale of refreshments on the main grounds had applied for and obtained from the Dominion License Commissioners licenses to sell intoxicating liquors in the said booths. A special meeting of the Western Fair Board was called, and the following resolution, moved by Mr. J. Watson and seconded by Mr. S. Crawford, was carried unanimously:—

"That Mr. Watson be instructed to take an agreement from all persons who have taken or hold booths or stands that such persons shall not sell therein or permit to be sold therein any intoxicating drinks, and to embody such penalty for a breach thereof as he thinks proper, and in other respects to take such an agreement as in his opinion will best secure the freedom of the grounds from the sale of such drinks."

And in order to make this action of the Board still more definite and permanent, Mr. Watson at the same meeting gave the following notice of motion:—

"Notice is hereby given that I will move at the next meeting of this Board that the following rule be added to the rules of the Association. That no wine, beer, or spirituous liquor, or liquor or spirits of any kind whatever, shall be allowed to be sold on the grounds, and that no person who has purchased, or may hereafter purchase a booth or stand or other place for the sale of refreshments, or for any other purpose whatever, shall be allowed or permitted therein to sell any intoxicating drinks."

Selected Articles

THE LIQUOR QUESTION AND THE GREAT FAIR.

That the directors of the Toronto Exhibition made a great mistake in seeking to become tavern-keepers and to turn what they would call an

honest penny for the next ten days is becoming more and more manifest. It was bad morality, and what many may think a great deal worse, bad policy.

The position taken by the Ontario Legislature to preserve all public parks and exhibitions from the contamination and injury invariably caused by the sale of intoxicating liquors is undoubtedly the correct one. Without at all touching the question of total prohibition, it is evident that there are some places and times which ought to be kept sacred from the contamination of the liquor traffic. It would be thought monstrous to have school-masters licensed to sell spirits, porter, and ales, and a whiskey booth in a college quadrangle would be justly looked on as an outrage. In the same way not a single person of any sense would ever advocate the establishment of a saloon in the Horticultural Gardens or away up in the Queen's Park. Such are places for the innocent enjoyment and relaxation of all classes, and therefore it is felt at once by saint and sinner, by prohibitionist and anti-prohibitionist, that the introduction or the tolerance of the sale of intoxicating liquors there would be out of the question. Why? Because universal experience has shown that wherever in public places such things find a position, decency of speech and propriety of behavior to a greater or less extent take their departure. To a certain extent this was the case last year at the Exhibition. It was the one blot in the whole thing. It acted as a great blister to draw all the thirsty and disreputable souls on the ground to a focus. The really respectable shunned it as a plague spot, and with reason. We don't care who are responsible for the miserable movement, which is alike unnecessary and degrading. They deserve so far public condemnation, and they will get it. Of course the meddling perversity of the Dominion authorities in interfering with that over which they have really no legitimate jurisdiction is also so far to blame, for without such intervention the outrage could not have been perpetrated. The tavern-keepers may not be blame-worthy in this connection. We rather think the very reverse, for the institution of such a gigantic saloon with its six sham beds on the Exhibition Grounds will tell against their business. But they certainly have been short-sighted and suicidal in their perverse opposition to the enactment and thorough working of a stringent license law. Had they gone loyally into that work by doing their best to make such a law a success they would have disarmed much hostility to their occupation. This, however, they have not done. On the contrary, they have taken advantage of every quirk and every ambiguity to neutralize the efforts of those who were anxious to have a thoroughly good and efficiently administered license system in general operation, and what is the result? This, that a large and ever growing part of the community are beginning to say that such half measures as license are of no use, and that therefore prohibition pure and simple is the only thing to be sought for, and the only one likely to be successful.—*Globe*.

IS PROHIBITION A FAILURE?

The *Maine Farmer* lately had a powerful editorial article on the above subject, brought out in answer to a statement in a Boston paper that prohibition is a failure. We should like to give it entire but have space for only a few extracts:

Of all the States where the prohibition of the infamous rum traffic has gained a foothold, the most thorough and continuous test has undoubtedly been made in the State of Maine. Whoever pronounces it a failure here, must be as blind as a bat or so warped by interest or prejudice that he is unable to give a just and equitable verdict. Twice has this direct question been submitted to the people, and twice have they emphatically pronounced in its favor. The voice of the people on this question will again be heard in September, and it will be "heard around the world," endorsing the principle of constitutional prohibition. No political party in Maine dare put itself on record against the prohibitory law; no legislature dare repeal it.

This law has enabled seven-eighths of the towns of Maine to relieve themselves of rum-selling. They have never been able to do so under any other law. It has clearly been found here in Maine that legislation based on the prohibitory principle is more effective in mitigating the evils of the dram-shop, than that based on the license and regulative ideas. It should