

that "if three-fourths of the acreage devoted to barley during the last ten years had been given to meadow and pasture, and to peas and oats to be fed on the place, we farmers would to-day have as much money and vastly more productive land than we have." Can the anti-temperance party show us that, if the barley raised in Peel during the last ten years had been all fed on the place, farmers there to-day would not now have as much money and vastly more productive lands?

While we look upon Mr. Snell's production as having proved clearly that the growth of barley, in his neighborhood at least, has been less remunerative than that of certain other grains specified, we do not just fancy giving the argument such a turn. It seems like giving the enemy an advantage by way of concession, as though we feared there was some truth in their statement, and tried to get out of the difficulty by advocating the discontinuance of its growth. It is taking up a line of defence that we do not exactly need, building a rampart in the rear before we have been dislodged. As we are strongly inclined to believe that, if to-morrow the entire Dominion would wash her skirts from the stains of the polluting traffic, and wipe out from her borders with one fiat the one curse, so to speak, of all the nations, there would next year be raised nearly as much barley as this, if not quite as much. Our reason for thinking so is, that barley is already an important factor in the feeding of stock, which great industry is only in its beginnings. Of nearly a dozen of the foremost feeders of Ontario that we have interviewed during the last eighteen months, without exception they use it as a factor in their grain feed in fattening stock. In stall-feeding, Mr. Peter Rennie, of Fergus, makes free use of barley. Mr. John S. Armstrong, of Speedside, feeds parts of barley, peas and oats. The Messrs. J. and R. McQueen, of Elora, feed one-quarter of the grain of barley; the Messrs. J. and W. Watt, of Salem, one-third; Mr. George Leask, of Pinkerton, one-fourth, and Mr. James Hunter, of Alma, one-sixth. Mr. Henry Groff, of Elmira, also uses it freely, as do Mr. Jesse Snider, of Floradale, and Mr. Jacob M. Brubacher, of St. Jacobs. Mr. John Hope, of Bow Park, Brantford, steams a large vat of it every day for the working horses, and thinks it excellent for the purpose. It proves a most excellent feed for calves, ground in conjunction with oats. For sheep when fed along with oats, or with oilcake, it is first-class, and it also makes excellent feed for fowls. Many farmers feed it to their animals boiled, for its laxative effects upon digestion; and also for pigs, it forms a valuable addition to their feed. In stock-feeding the question is not, where can it be fed to advantage, so much as where can it not be so fed. Then it forms a most excellent grain on which to seed to grass, as it shades just enough, but not too much, and is harvested early, which gives the young seed time to grow. We never expect to see that day when barley shall not be in much demand with farmers. Many parts of Canada cannot grow corn well. Barley will supply its place. Other regions have the pea so devalued by the bug that barley is more profitable to feed, even bushel for bushel, and in those sections where oats may give a better return, it does not follow that it would be unwise to grow barley, as the true value of any grain for feeding can only be fully ascertained by its effects when fed with other grains. To render our meaning more plain, if turnips are fed to store cattle in large quantity without grain, the results are less profitable than when fed in smaller quantities with the addition of some meal. It is on the same principle that ground barley fed to calves is more valuable when fed in conjunction with ground oats, than if equal weights of either of these grains had been fed alone. As the feeding industry is but yet in its beginnings; it is only fair then to expect a very large increase in the quantities of this useful grain that shall be fed in coming years.

In view of these facts we are curious to know what line of proof those will adopt who are to show us that the brewer gives more to the farmer for his barley than the consumer of beef.

It is quite possible that a number of farmers may believe this specious cry. It is only in recent years that farmers believed it would pay better to feed any marketable grains at home. The evidence of this, however, is becoming so conclusive, that few now attempt to gainsay it, hence it is that the propagators of this plausible theory will find readiest access to the ear of the poorer classes of farmers.

Some men have upon principle given up the growth of barley, lest the semblance of the curse should be upon their garments. While we do not agree with these men as to the necessity of this course, we admire their fidelity to conscience. They demonstrate to the world what it can well

afford to witness anon, that all men are not liars. These isolated cases are those of men who have not learned the value of barley as a feeder.

Are the anti-temperance men really so concerned for the welfare of the farmer when the brewers subscribe \$1,000 each, and the distillers \$10,000, for the purpose of hiring those that may once have been men to tell the farmer that the success of the Scott Act will shrivel up their pockets in barley-growing sections? Would it really be a crime to suspect the sincerity of those men who drink the widow's tears and fatten on the ruin of their country?

Is the thought a criminal one that now and then forces to the surface the question, is there no gold dangling on the copy of the editor who dips his pen in the crucible of human anguish in the vain endeavor to prove that kind Providence, who sent us barley with the other grains, gave the latter for feeding purposes, but the former to be made into beer?

What a thousand pities that men will sell themselves for gold, thus to work iniquity! What an indelible stain on the banner of the nineteenth century that men (not men) are found to advocate upon public platforms the continuance of traffic in this thing of death!

How sad it seems that these parties, so blind to their own best interests, cannot see the "things that belong to their peace," ere the thunderings of that righteous retribution, the mutterings of which are already in the distance, burst over them with an avalanche of fury, that will cut off all hope of escape!

In the meantime, ye temperance workers, continue to acquit yourselves like men. The air is filled with hope. The signs are most propitious. The giant is already shorn of his great strength. The stone has left the sling that will crush his helmet, when he may be slain with his own sword, seeing that we come against him in the "name of the Lord of Hosts," and whatever else may not survive his fall, we may rest assured that the beautiful braided fields of barley will continue to wave in undiminished acreage amid the evening breezes, as though the monster had never been.

## PROHIBITION IN KANSAS.

### IT DOES PROHIBIT.

"Six months ago there were open saloons in Topeka, Lawrence, Emporia, Newton, Wichita, and many other cities, where you will not find one to-day. More saloons have been closed in the last three months than during any similar period since the law first went into effect. It is true there was a reaction after the election of Governor Glick. The liquor-sellers imagined it was a victory over prohibition, and grew bold and defiant. But they reckoned without their host," just as your correspondent has done. He claims that the amendment does not owe its existence to a strong, healthy, public sentiment, but to the carelessness of easy-going, experimenting citizens. Perhaps he can tell us how it happened that the whole Republican ticket, nominated on a strong prohibition platform, was elected, with the single exception of its candidate for Governor, by twenty-five to thirty thousand majority; and why the Legislature a majority of whom were chosen at the same time—refused by a large majority to re-submit that amendment to the people? The fact is, the great body of the people of Kansas are more strongly in favor of the amendment to-day than they have ever been. The *Atchison Champion*, one of the most influential papers in the State, and not a champion of prohibition, said recently, "There are scores of prohibitionists now where there was one two years ago." It says there is a growing respect for law, and disgust and alarm at the utter disregard by liquor-dealers of any restriction of the traffic. A Law-and-Order-League has been organized in that city, officered by some of its leading business men, who declare that they can no longer bear the disgrace which the lawlessness of these men is bringing upon their city. Prosecutions have been commenced, and forty-five saloon-keepers indicted. The *Atchison Globe*, a strong anti-prohibition paper, said recently, "A sense of duty compels us to remark that, notwithstanding our earnest opposition, the cause of prohibition is gaining ground every day."

No one who reads the reports of the success that has attended efforts to enforce the law, in all parts of the State save in a few cities like Leavenworth, Atchison, and Abilene, can doubt the truth of the above statements. Prosecutions are most frequent, and convictions usually follow. In Douglas County thirteen offenders were tried in the District Court last year, and every one convicted. In the justices' courts there were five convictions and two disagreements. At the last term of court sixteen saloon-keepers pleaded guilty on forty counts, and were fined \$4,200 and costs, and closed out because it didn't pay! The Secretary of the State Temperance Union reports that of four hundred and sixty cases tried in district courts, there have been three hundred and fifty-one convictions—or seven-ninths of the cases; in justices' courts five hundred and twelve cases and three hundred and seven-