The Ingersoll Chronicle.

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1884.

MR. Cook the newly elected member for South Oxford, was introduced to the Speaker by Messrs Hardy and Freeman, the representatives of the adjoining ridings, and took his seat on the Ministerial side amid the applause of the Government benches.

THE question of adopting the Scott Act will be submitted to the decision of the people of the county of Oxford on Thursday next, 20th March. The voting will of course be by ballot. We have from time to time allowed writers on each side the privilege of discussing the question through these columns, and this week there is a flood of Scott Act literature. As this is the last issue before the election our readers will pardon us for devoting so much space to this subject this week.

We publish the amendments to the Crooks' Act elsewhere. All the amendments suggested are in the direction of increased stringency, designed to lessen the members of drinking places in the country, the undoubted evils that flow from excessive drinking, and to improve the character of hotels. One of the most important clauses in the bill embodying these amendments is that which gives to every sub-division in any municipality the opportunity of making the Crooks' Act a local prohibitory measure. The words of the clause are : No license shall be granted to any applicant for premises not then under license if a majority of the duly qualified parliamentry electors of the sub-division petition against it. This clause will give the people of every neighbourhood the power of expressing their opinion and of suppressing hotels if they wish. Under it, especially in rural municipalities, the number of hotels may be greatly decreased. This is a privilege which all temperance workers will duly appreciate.

Too much Party Spirit.

From the Globe.

Suggestions to the effect that party spirit ought to be dropped in the management of Ontario local affairs are being thrown out every now and then. These deserve to be duly pondered and resolutely acted upon, while the ease with which this can be accomphished is as encouraging as it is evident..

For many years past Ontario has had a premier and ministers who have carefully husbanded the resourses of the province; vigorously and consistently stood up for provincial rights ; sedulously avoided the very appearance of a scandal ; and wisely and vigorously administered all of our local affairs. During all these years the disbursements have been on a scale so economically prudent that the opposition has never been able to object to anything but the most insignificant items of expenditure, and in most instances has not even carried its objections the length of a vote;

We are far within the mark when we say that for years past there has not been one per cent. of the proposed expenditure which has not passed without objection, almost without remark.

Mr. Mowat's personal character is above suspicion. The most embittered partisanship has never dared to call this in question. His soundness and reliability as a constitutional lawyer are universally acknowledged. He is emphatically a "safe" man, who has about him no rash compromising impulsiveness, and at the same time no unreasoning and antiquated conservatism. With such a tried and trustworthy premier, legislators of Ontario could have no better opportunity for giving practical recognition to all but universal feeling throughout the province that partyism ought to have a rest, than by Mr. Mowat's administration a cordial and discriminating support. The administration of affairs could not be in safer hands.

There are able and moderate men to the left of the Speaker's chair. There is not the slightest reason why everything proposed by one side should be contradicted and condemned by the other. If, accordingly the members of the opposition wish to raise themselves in the estimation of the general public, and really to benefit the province, they can in no way accomplish this more effectually than by sinking partisanship; cutting themselves adrift from Dominion politics and combinations; cordially assisting to perfect such measures as come before the house, unitedly rallying to the maintenance of the local rights of this great province.

WHY ?

SIR,—From letters which have appeared in your paper, and also from reports of meetings held in favour of the passage of the Scott Act in this county, I learn that one of the reasons they give for seeking to pass it is that it is working so well in the county of Halton, and improving the morality of all its residents. Now, if this is correct why is it that they do not attempt to carry it in Wellington, Peel and Wentworth, the counties immediately surrounding it, and whose ratepayers must see the beneficial results arising from its passage which they claim. In my opinion the reason they do not try it in these counties is that they know perfectly well that it is not working to the best interests of the ratepayers of that county, and that the intelligent and unprejudiced voters of these adjoining counties would give a very large majority against them if they should attempt to pass the Scott Act in these counties. Now what do we find : that they not only do not try it in any of the adjoining counties, but also miss the county of Brant and come to Oxford. If it is working so well in Halton, situated as it is, surrounded by three counties where there is a strict license law in existence, how much better it should work if two or more counties adjoining each other should pass it. I therefore trust that the ratepayers of this county will by their votes tell these gentlemen who are endeavoring to force this act upon us to pass it first in the counties adjoining this new paradise, the county of Halton.

Yours truly,
OBSERVER.

SCOTT ACT IN HALTON.

We have been requested to publish the following which explain themselves :—

Glenwilliams, Ont., July 23rd, 1883.
George Williams Esq., Ingersoll.

DEAR SIR :—Your opponents are misrepresenting the working of the act, we consider it a grand success considering the strong opposition to it. There is very little whiskey drinking done, I think the treating system is stopped, the hotels are very quiet, can see a marked difference in going into other counties (especially on holidays those days in our county are very quite and peaceable). As regards farmers coming in to trade do not see any difference, but think it an improvement in town trade, as parties who formerly spent their money in drink now pay their accounts, could get plenty of businessmen to testify to these remarks, our Inspector was an anti-scott man and did not do much for the act, but we have another appointed and hear the hotel keepers have now resolved not to tamper with the law any more.

Hoping you will be successful in carrying the act. I am yours respectfully,
JOS. WILLIAMS.

Georgetown, July 23rd, 1883.
Mr. George Williams:

In reply to your questions would say we never expected the law to be kept inviolate, but it has accomplished a good work, to say no liquor is drank in the county would not be true, the cry that more whiskey is drank than before the act is not true, the parties to cry that are those that are opposed to the act and in full sympathy with the liquor traffic and most of them are parties that want the act to be a failure, they prophesied a failure when it was carried over their heads, they are trying to make it a failure and whiskey men cry "see what drunkenness," and when asked where, they say if you seen what I see you would know it is not on the streets to be seen as much as it used to be, there is next to no Magistrate courts, there has been only two or three cases since the act came in force in Georgetown, as to business being driven away from the County it is all bosh, business if anything is better than it was, we consider we have been pretty successful in enforcing the law taking all things into consideration, you know every effort is put forth by the liquor interest to make the law a failure, the appointment of Mr. Black as an officer to enforce the act, by the Government last Thursday was a hard one on the hotel keepers. He is a terror to evil doers. I wish you all success.

Yours in love,
G. H. KENNEDY.

ONTARIO LIQUOR LAWS.

Improvements to be Made on the Crooks Act.

A Bill to improve the license laws has been introduced in the Assembly by Mr. Hardy. The following is a summary of its chief provisions :

The Board of License Commissioners is authorized to limit the number of houses not required to have the full accommodations required for taverns, as follows : In cities of less than 15,000 population to not more than three; cities of between 15,000 and 30,000, not more than five ; cities of over 30,000, not more than ten ; towns of less than 5,000, not more than two, and over, 6,000, not more than three.

Applications for special licenses must be filed before the first of April.

Notices of the meetings of License Boards to grant licenses shall be advertised in the local papers at least fourteen days before the meeting. The Inspector shall publish in a paper in his district the name of every new applicant for a new license. A record of applications shall be open to inspection at the Inspector's office.

PETITIONS AGAINST LICENSES.

Ten or more electors of any polling subdivision may object by petition to the granting of any license within such subdivision for substantial reasons. Any persons petitioned against may be heard by himself or agent, and a municipality may appoint a person to appear in a similar manner before the Commissioners. At least three days' notice must be given to an applicant of any charge against his character. The Board may consider an objection to an application, but shall notify the applicant, and upon his request adjourn their hearing of the application. When the decision of the Commissioners is not unanimous or where the persons concerned petition and allege new facts for consideration, the Board may rehear the case,

LOCAL PROHIBITION.

An important clause of the Act provides : No license shall be granted to any applicant for premises not then under license if a majority of the parliamentary electors of the sub-division petition against it, on any grounds. In case of dispute as to whether the number of electors who have signed such petition compose a majority of the duly qualified parliamentary electors, or in case of dispute as to whether any persons who have signed the petition are duly qualified voters the Inspector shall make inquiries, and may take evidence upon oath, and determine the question in dispute, and certify to the Board. On the hearing application the Board may summon witnesses and examine on oath. The hearing shall be public, but the Board may consider their decision with closed doors.

ABOLITION OF GROCERY LICENSES.

The gradual abolition of grocery licenses is provided for by enacting that no shop licenses shall be granted to any who is not now a holder of one. If any other commodity than tobacco, temperance drinks, taps, etc., are sold in such shop in addition to liquor the license shall be void.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

In any unlicensed house no liquors shall be consumed by any person other than members of the family or employees.

The sale of liquors is prohibited on polling days in parliamentary or municipal elections, or when the Canada Temperance Act is being voted upon.

For selling within prohibited hours, for the first offence the penalty shall be a fine of twenty to forty dollars and costs, or fifteen days' imprisonment with hard labor ; for second offence, forty to eighty dollars, or twenty days ; for third offence eighty to one hundred dollars, or fifty days ; and for the fourth or subsequent offence, one to three months' imprisonment, with hard labor.

A conviction by a justice or police magistrate shall be without appeal except in certain cases mentioned. An appeal shall be to the Judge of the County Court without a jury. The person convicted, shall remain in custody pending the hearing of the appeal or give two securities in two hundred dollars each to appear before the County Judge, to abide by his decision and pay costs as ordered.

Provision is made for an inspector's appeal from the County Judge to the Court of Appeal, in case a magistrate's conviction has been quashed.

Section 90 of License Act is amended so that the child or master of one in the habit of drinking to excess, as well as the parent &c., may give notice or cause the Inspector to give notice to any persons licensed to sell liquor not to give or sell liquor to the person with such drinking habit. The penalty on the liquor seller who sells the drunkard liquor within twelve months thereafter is fixed at $50, and the person giving the notice may recover not less than twenty nor more than five hundred dollars for personal wrongs.

A penalty of $20 is provided against hotel keepers refusing lodging, meals, &c., without valid reason for such refusal.

Any liquor seller receiving goods in pawn, forfeits such goods, costs of prosecution, and is liable to a penalty not exceeding $20.

Permitting drunkenness or disorderly conduct on licensed premises, selling or giving intoxicating liquors to drunken persons, or permitting bad characters to meet on premises, or allowing gambling or any unlawful game to take place is punishable by a fine not exceeding $50.

Fifty dollars a day is the maximum fine for permiting internal communication bottween any licensed and unlicensed premises.

Allowing liquor to be supplied to any persons under 16 years of age, not a resident of the premises or a guest, lodger, or traveller, shall entail a penalty not exceeding $20 for every such offence.

If a licensee takes or allows liquor to be taken off his premises to be sold for his benefit, he will be liable to the same penalties as if the liquor had been drunk on his own premises.

In case of a purchaser drinking or allowing others to drink on the premises where liquor is bought, the seller, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than $20 for the first offence, $50 for second.

The purchaser who drinks or causes any one to drink on the premises to which a shop or wholesale license is granted is liable to a penalty of $20.

A third conviction for Sunday selling operates as a forfeiture of license, and a disqualification for obtaining a license within two years thereafter.

Any unlicensed place where sign, bar, bottles, or casks are displayed in such a manner as to intimate that liquor is sold or that there is more liquor on the premises than is reasonably required by the residents is to be regarded as a place where liquors are unlawfully sold.

Every person other than the defendant, summoned or examined as a witness in any prosecution under the Act, is bound to answer all questions pertinent to the issue, even though these should implicate himself.

A defendant in a prosecution shall be compelled to give evidence as a witness.

Vote against the Scott Act if you don't want to lose $7,777.42 paid for license.—*Adv.*

THE reason why "Nonsuch Washing Compound" should be used in preference to all other washing preparations. First, It is perfectly harmless. Second, It saves more than half the labour. Third, It is the cheapest in the market. Many more could be given but this should be sufficient. For sale by all grocers. 84

Vote against the Scott Act if you are an honest man, and do as you would wish to be done by.—*Adv.*

OYSTERS by the can, quart or dish at Vance's. 71.

FINE confectionery at Beck's for Christmas. 80

Vote against the Scott Act if you don't want to encourage intemperance.—*Adv.*

A large assortment of vases and toilet sets at the China Tea House. 80.

ALL kinds of canned goods guaranteed good at Beck's. 80.

Vote against the Scott Act. It allows the County to be flooded with liquor from other Counties. No prohibition in that. Any quantity can be manufactured in the County.—*Adv.*

The place to go for something nice is to the China Tea House. 80.

Vote against the Scott Act if you don't want to force the people into jug drinking and sly drinking, which is the very worst type.—*Adv.*

SCOTT ACT AND TAXATION.

As the time is rapidily approaching when we shall be called upon to decide whether we will adopt the Scott Act or not, it may be well for us to carefully consider some of the consequences of the proposed change. I think I am not exaggerating when I say that not more than one or two out of each thousand inhabitants of this County have read the Scott Act as it is written in the statute book. Both the advocates and the opponents have given us certain extracts from that enactment—those which suit their purpose—still it is scarcely just and right for men to use their franchise in favor of any radical change from the present system, no matter in what branch it may be, without thoroughly understanding and agreeing with that change. Violent partisans on both side omit or enlarge whatever suits their peculiar views, and since men cannot think alike would it be wise to take the opinion of either for our guidance? A leap in the dark is proverbially dangerous.

There are one or two changes that will evidently result from the proposed change. Every man must know that we shall lose the revenue which we derive at present from the hotels, and this is no small item, as we shall find to our cost if it be taken out of our pockets instead of the hotel keepers. We get $2,065.10 from the different hotels and liquor stores. This extra tax upon the $1,162,025 of assessable property in this town would give an extra tax of 2 mills on each dollar of assessable property. Add that to the nineteen mills we paid last year and we have the enormous tax of 2 cents and 1½ mills per dollar.

This leads to another consideration. The greater the encumbrance upon property, other things being equal, so much lower becomes the value of that property, hence if we put an extra encumbrance or tax of 2 mills to each dollar of taxable property, we depreciate the value of that property in proportion. To make this clear, suppose I own a house worth $1,000 which I rent for $100 per year, the tax upon this is say $20, taking from the $80 left me the element of insurance and I have left 7 per cent. as the return of the property. Now if my taxes be raised to $30 without a corresponding increase in value of the property I shall get but $60 from the property or 6 per cent. upon the money invested in it, and as the value of property is estimated according to the return it yields, my property has depreciated one sixth in its value on account of the extra tax. I will not mention the inconvenience to farmers in not having stables for their horses when they come to town, they experienced that once before ; nor the special depreciation in the value of hotel property, the owners may tell you the injustice that would be done them by the passage of the Act. RATEPAYER.

SCOTT ACT—HALTON SPEAKS.

We, the undersigned, hearing that the people of the County of Oxford have been publicly informed through a Scott Act advocate from the County of Halton, that the Act is a success here, and that liquor could not be obtained at a Bar in this County, and that business had improved and crime lessened to a great extent, have no hesitation in saying that such is far from being the case, or correct in any particular. Whiskey drinking is carried on as much as ever, if not more, in hotels and other places, and liquor is found in private houses where, under the Crooks Act, it was never kept, and business has not improved, but on the contrary, decreased since the Act came in force, and our jail contains as many criminals as at any period of its history, excepting during the time railroads were being built through the County.

We hope and expect that we can be relieved from the tyranny of the Act when its term expires by a large majority, as the people have had their eyes opened to its utter inefficiency and great injustice :—

Signed,
Dougald McNair, of McNair & McNair, Carriage Manufacturers.
John C. Bell, express and baggage agent.
James Waletie, blacksmith.
John Hunter, builder and contractor.
W. H. Long, merchant.
David Hamburg, carpenter.
J. M. Field, pump maker.
Geo. Lavery, proprietor of bus.
Wm. Panton, County Clerk.
Joseph Johnson, merchant.
R. Jones, harness maker.
F. Sanderson, keeper of Temperance Syndicate House.
Wm. Sloan, Sr., watchmaker.
W. B. Oakman, butcher.
J. P. Ropen, merchant.
W. H. McNab, hardware merchant.
Alexander Duff, barber.
Chas. Nuces, Cordelier Janies.
Campbell & Wareton, Canadian Champion.
D. W. Campbell, County Treasurer.
Thomas Metcalf, milkman.
W. H. Dandie, painter.
George Smith, Mayor of Milton.
Andrew Jock, merchant.
W. Hobbs, (Councilman), miller.
J. Sheppard, tailor.
John Lyon, post master.
James Barber, gentleman.
Victor Chisholm, barrister.
Jos. Brothers, (Councilman), manufacturer.
John Duncan, grain merchant.
B. J. Moffatt, shoemaker.
W. J. Stearn, tinsmith.
Henry Watson, druggist.
J. W. Fraser, watchmaker.
Thomas Wilson, shoe manufacturer.
Wm. Suebin, shoemaker.
Thomas Campbell, merchant tailor.
D. Butcher, merchant.
R. L. Hempstreet, merchant.
F. J. Jones, Town Clerk.
Duncan Dewar, Insurance agent.
P. M. McKay, merchant.
John Lawson, merchant.
Chas. Jones, cabinet maker.
J. H. Farrell, barber.
S. Hamont, (Councilman) miller.
James Lindsay, lumber merchant and stair factory.
N. McKenzie, of Hunter & McKenzie.
Isaac Cartner, merchant.
Patrick McDermott, tinsmith.
H. H. Freeman, hardware.
Stimson Bradley, chief constable.
J. H. Beemer, resident Milton.

SCOTT ACT.

Mr. Editor, I am glad that with your accustomed liberality you have opened your columns for the discussion of the Scott Act. Your correspondent "Farmer" of last week had the same article in the Sentinel Review of Woodstock, and seems to flatter himself that he has mashed the readers of that paper so they will believe anything, and now proceeds to put your readers through the same ordeal, is he foolish enough to think any one believes him, just take the following assertions he makes and see how much truth is in the whole: We are an exceedingly temperate people. The Scott Act has nothing in it to help the poor drunkard. We compelled the hotel keepers to expend large sums. That a farmer cannot make cider and sell it under the Scott Act. That hotel keepers will not be responsible for coats, whips and robes left in their charge. He is so heavily taxed for model school, etc., that if in addition he loses his share of the license fees the tax will be so heavy he had better give up his farm than pay it, says nothing about being taxed for prisons and asylums. Now we will not go through the whole of his "Farmer's" ideas, but just take a look at the picture he gives of himself, see him a rich farmer, large farm and orchard, member of church, goes to Halton while there feels aching void for his accustomed glass inquires and learns some one has liquor goes to the man informs him he is no old toper, no minister or temperance fanatic, he is all right just wants a pint to put in camphor, thus he induces the man to break the law, then comes home and proclaims it all over the county the Scott Act is a failure in Halton business has gone to the dogs. No wonder he is ashamed to give his name for fear his minister or any one he respects sees it. Now sir the farmers of Oxford instead of being led by such chaff as your correspondent Farmer will roll up such majority for the Scott Act on the 20th of March as will make him and his friends never think of repeal. R, WILLIAMSON.

Vote against the Scott Act and uphold Provincial rights and the Mowat Government.—*Adv.*

R. VANCE keeps the finest of honey, both comb and extracted. 86

ORANGES and oysters cheap. Oranges 25 cents per dozen at Beck's fruit store. Sign big lamp. 80.

Vote against the Scott Act if you don't want to sink the property of hotel keepers and gain nothing by it.—*Adv.*

ZOPESA at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

MRS. Pinkham's Medicine at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

Vote against the Scott Act, as it will prevent the farmers from selling cider.—*Adv.*

Sulphur and Iron Bitters at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

PECTORIA, for Coughs and Colds, at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

WARNER'S SAFE CURE at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

GERMAN Syrup at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

BROWETT'S Baking Powder, fresh and pure, at Browett's Drug Store, Ingersoll. 77

A LARGE and varied stock of napkin rings and finger bowls at the China Tea House. 80

A MERCHANT'S LETTER.

What a Temperance Man of Woodstock Says.

DEAR SIR,—There has been a great deal said and written by the Scott Act party in this county as to the efficiency and success of the Scott Act in Halton principally, if not wholly, by a class of men who I consider are not by any means competent judges in this matter. Simply because as a rule they are men who do not frequent hotels or other places where liquor is sold and even if they did the proprietors of these houses are not likely to leave themselves open for a charge of violation of the Act by disposing of liquor in their presence, because they know the Scott Act men almost to a man.

I resided in Milton, the county town of Halton, for about five years,—nine months' of that time after the Act came into force, and although I have been until recently identified with the temperance workers and am still a strong advocate of temperance, I was opposed to the passing of the Act there on principle, and from what I know of the Scott Act I have no hesitation whatever in saying it has done more injury to the temperance cause and to augment the sale of liquor in Halton than can really be conceived of. Since I became a resident of Woodstock I have visited Milton and other towns in the county on business almost weekly and it is sold just as openly as under the Crooks Act, and in places where under that Act it was not sold, as the licensed dealer was a check on the illicit traffic, but now everyone is alike in that respect. I say conscientiously and emphatically that I don't know of even one man of my acquaintance in the whole county that the law has kept from using liquor to even a less extent than under the Crooks Act, but I do, on the contrary, know many who are using more. It is simply nonsense of Scott Act advocates to say that liquor cannot be found at bars in Halton. It is a misleading statement and intended to misrepresent matters. What is the difference between getting it at what is called a bar or in a back room. Depend upon it, back-room drinking is the worst, but at the same time there are dozens of these men selling it over the bars as before.

There are forty-two hotels in the county, and every one of them is open and doing business as if there was no Scott Act, and pay no license to do it, as they formerly did. The three temperance houses that were opened when the Act came in force have all succumbed except the one in Oakville and in Milton which has been a losing speculation all along, and the temperance people will admit that themselves.

It must be evident to a discerning eye that these forty-two men at least have not lived for nearly two years on fresh air, and as an evidence that should bear me out in this argument, the three hotel keepers in Milton have purchased a piano each since the Act came into force. And you don't get these expensive pieces of furniture in Halton for singing a Scotch song. Put these things together, my fellow ratepayers, and I think you will come to the conclusion with me that liquor is sold in Halton, and if they do they should pay for the license as under the Crooks Act and not add to our taxes, which are already high enough, and you can rest assured that liquor will be sold here just as it is there, unless the Government will agree to place an Inspector at everybody's door. Some of the hotel keepers and others have been fined but that don't scare them a bit, because only one man to my knowledge has been fined to the amount his licenes would have cost. The hotel keeper and others of course violate the law by selling liquor, but he is not to be blamed altogether. The way the matter stands in Halton is simply this : 1,402 of the ratepayers said by their votes that they did not want the Scott Act, and 1,483 said they did, and the result is that one-half of the people of Halton are at bitter enmity with the other half, and the minority seem to think that their liberty and privilege has been imposed upon, and are resenting the encroachment in every direction. The Act has undoubtedly spread discord broadcast over the riding to an alarming extent. This state of things is likely to exist till May, 1885, when the Act can be repealed, and it is the opinion and desire of the best men in the county that it will. I feel confident that the Act would not have been carried in Halton had the people not been persuaded that three constituencies surrounding them voted on the Act at the same time would have accepted it, because many of our ratepayers had faith in a combination of counties being of some good, but the result was that all rejected it except Halton. It is very evident that the people of Ontario are satisfied with the Crooks Act, from the have-not fact that the Scott Act has been rejected everywhere but in Halton. The temperance cause has been progressing very favourably of late years, and lager beer has become the leading beverage among the young men ; whereas but a few years ago it was very difficult, and where you send the Scott Act or any local prohibitory law, you send back the whiskey, as beers are too bulky and not so easily got out of the way should a detective be hovering around.

Consequently, my experience is that young men are drinking whiskey instead of beer in Halton, and not only is it driven in among the young, but a host of other evils, such as billiards, pool and card playing are introduced into several hotels that the by-laws of the towns kept out of these places, but now they are all private houses.

I could relate instances of the evils that are following in the trail of the Scott Act that would fill every column of your esteemed paper and the half would not be told. It was not my intention to have said a word publicly on this subject but for two reasons, namely : I considered I would be doing an injustice to my fellow ratepayers here to withhold what I know of the Act in Halton, as they were only hearing one side of the story, and were likely to be guided by what they did hear, as we did in Halton, and also because it was utterly impossible for me to remain silent when I knew the statements were being made in favor of the Act that were both misleading and misrepresenting ; and I care not who reads it or who hears it, it is every word true, which I am in a position to prove. I am not afraid to pronounce the Scott Act as one of the most retrogade steps that could be taken to advance the temperance cause. I say to the temperance party in the county to go on and preach or talk temperance as much as you can, but visit Halton before you talk Scott Act.

JOHN HEAD.

Woodstock, March 5, 1884.

THE SCOTT ACT.

Strictures on a Farmer's Ideas.

DEAR SIR :—Someone, signing himself "Farmer," has seen fit to address you a few of his ideas on the subject of Scott Act. It has never been my habit to notice articles on that subject of which the author himself was ashamed, but this "Farmer" has not confined himself to truth, and, as in the heat of this campaign his misrepresentations might be credited, I would desire to correct some of his erroneous impressions. But before dealing with the principal things he says of public import, I would correct an error of a private nature into which he has fallen. With great modesty he concludes his letter as follows :—"As my minister is strangely in favour of the Scott Act, and not wishing to quarrel with him, allow me to sign myself Farmer." Now, I do not think "Farmer" should measure our corn by his bushel, and conclude that because his mind is so narrowly constructed that he must quarrel with everyone with whom he does not agree, that all the ministers do the same thing. Ministers have learned to respect the opinions of others, consequently they know how to agree to differ on important subjects, and remain good friends still. Besides, if "Farmer" is a member of my church I would like to know his name, for I think a little godly conversation, followed by some earnest prayer, might have a beneficial effect upon him.

But to his letter. In the first paragraph he would make us believe that the Methodist Conference unconditionally endorses the present license law. Let me quote from the resolutions he mentioned, that yonr readers may know the exact position of that body. On page 207, of the General Conference Journal I find, "Although we cannot accept as righteous, absolutely, any license law, yet if we must tolerate some one as the tentative regulator of an evil till we can have it removed, we must regard the "Crook's Act" the best instrument for this suppression the Province of Ontario ever had. * * * We are favoured to have in the Statute Book of the Dominion such a permissive bill as the Scott Act, more especially as its constitutionality has been affirmed by the Privy Council of England. This Conference believes the "Canada Temperance Act of 1878" to be better fitted to secure the suppression of the liquor traffic within the Dominion of Canada than any other enactment that has ever been in operation within the country." Sir, could "Farmer" have read these sentences when he gave your readers to understand that the Methodist Conference coincided with his opinion that the present law "is the most perfect temperance law passed by any government in the world?"

Could "Farmer" ever have mingled with the crowds around and in several of the hotels in Ingersoll, and yet have the impression that "our people are exceedingly temperate?" I grant there are many temperance people in our county, but anyone with eyes open to surroundings must say there are more than "a few who indulge two freely," unless there are reasons best known to himself, why he should not see them. I grant there are a few in Maine who indulged too freely, but by far a less proportion to the aggregate population than in Oxford.

"Farmer" claims the present law provides ample means to prohibit the liquor dealers supplying liquor to drunkards, and says "there is nothing to help the poor drunkard in the Scott Act." I would like to know if the rendering of the traffic illegal and placing heavy fines on the violators ; the removal of the retail liquor business altogether is not a more effectual help for the drunkard than the privilege to prohibit the hotel keepers selling to them. A request very seldom observed, for everyone knows the wife of the drunkard for many reasons, seldom brings the vendor to trial. To prove "Farmer" believes the Scott Act an efficient help to drunkards let me quote from the paragraph in which he talks about Halton. He says, "of course the old topers are not considered safe to be around getting it by the glass, * * they might squeal," thus showing that where the Act is in force the topers cannot get liquor from the dealers. As to their purchasing it from other counties in large quantities my experience with Halton,—of which county I am a native, and having been engaged in business there of a public nature, am well acquainted with the entire county—is that there is very little of that kind of thing done. In fact, though receiving two newspapers, and from one to two letters every week from that county, nearly all of which speak of the Scott Act, I have only heard of one such case since the Act came in force.

"Farmer" speaks of the great injustice done there engaged in the trade by taking away their license and thus, as he says, "destroying their property." But I do not see why it should be destroyed. Because a bar, and a few shelves, with a beer pump and a dozen or so of bottles and barrels are removed, surely the whole property is not destroyed! He seems to forget the injustice done to many others who have not only been ruined from a business view, but also intellectually, morally, physically, and spiritually. By urging a continuance of the license law, "can he feel he is following the Golden Rule to do as he would wish others to do to him? In quoting the questions from "Farmer," I feel that by far the greater number is included in the word "others" than all the hotel keepers in the county.

"Farmer" says that liquor is sold in Halton in a large number of places besides hotels. It is strange if that be truth that out of over 70 charges of violation during the the first year of Scott Act in Halton, only one was against an individual who did not occupy a hotel, and this person once did run a hotel. I would ask "Farmer" to produce proof, and not ask us to believe unproved and meaningless assertions. The next sentence of his letter, too, should be proved, wherein he claims "people who did not keep liquor in their private houses under the Crooks Act are now taking it home in large quantities, and the wives and families are drinking as well as the men." I call for proof, for with my wide acquaintance in Halton, I have never found such to be the case.

I want to place beside this sentence of "Farmer's" in which he says, "on close enquiry I find the village property of all description has decreased to a terrible extent and business has gone, you might say to the dogs," the statements of last week's Acton *Free Press*, that sixteen families this week moved into our village; Beauhornois' tannery, which has been completely refitted, is about commencing operations ; W. H. Storey & Son are getting in the brick for their large new building ; and the last named firm is runing day and night over 100 hands to supply their orders. Also this testimony, "We, the undersigned residents and business men of Acton, Halton Co., hereby certify that our experience and observations clearly prove that the Scott Act which has been in force here since May 1st, 1882, has in no way injured business in our municipality. Also that we honestly and conscientously believe that the amount of drinking has been greatly reduced in this municipality since the Act came into force." This statement is signed by seventeen of the leading business men of the village and should carry more weight than the unproved statement of "Farmer" who dares not utter his thoughts over his own name, but seeks to skulk behind an assumed cognomen, from thence to thrust his untruthful ideas before a thoughtful community. I can vruch for the integrity and honesty of every man who signed the above quoted statements ; I wish I could say the same of "Farmer."

We ministers, of course, must come in for a share of his inwendoes, but being engaged in many good works, in them all opposed by evil, we have become accustomed to such foundationless declarations.

Sir, could "Farmer," and every reader of your valuable paper, and every elector in Oxford county, realize how anxiously every drunkard's wife is praying for success of the Act on the 20th of March ; how the mothers of young men are fervently hoping that the vote will adopt an Act that will effectually break up the treating system, and how the friends of moderate drinkers are trusting that on voting day the liquor traffic will be made illegal, knowing these will not violate that law, I feel certain they all, even "Farmer" himself, would put their mark on the ballot paper beside the words, "For the petition."

In conclusion, I would ask that each elector would put this crucial test to his action in this matter, "vote as you pray and pray as you vote." Being confident that the Divine Blessing rests neither upon the traffic, its advocates, nor its supporters, I would urge that none would use their franchise "for an occasion to the flesh," but in the name of all things holy and pure and righteous, vote out this enormous evil from our county on the 20th inst.

Yours faithfully,
T. A. MOORE.

Salford, 10th March, 1884.

A GREAT SHEEP RANCH.

How Eighty Thousand Sheep are Herded and Sheared.

The little schooner Santa Rosa arrived in San Francisco from Santa Barbara a few days ago. She comes to that place twice a year to secure provisions, clothing, lumber, etc., for use on the Santa Rosa Island, being owned by the great sheep raiser, A. P. Moore, who owns the island and the 80,000 sheep that exist upon it.

The island is thirty miles south of Santa Barbara, and is 24 miles in length and 16 in breadth, and contains about 74,000 acres of land, which are admirably adapted to sheep-raising.

Last year Moore clipped 1,014 sacks of wool from these sheep, each sack containing an average of 410 pounds of wool, making a total of 415,740 pounds, which he sold at twenty-seven cents a pound, bringing him in $112,349.80, or a clear profit of over $80,000. This is said to be a low yield, so it is evident that sheep raising there, when taken into consideration that shearing takes place twice a year, and that a profit is made of the sales of the mutton, etc., is very profitable. The island is divided into four quarters by fences running clear across it at right angles, and the sheep have not to be herded like those ranging about the foothills.

Four men are employed regularly the year round to keep the ranch in order and to look after the sheep, and during shearing time fifty or more shearers are employed. These men secure forty or fifty days work, and the average number of sheep sheared a day is about ninety, for which five cents a clip is paid, and thus $4.50 a day is made by each man, or something over $200 for the season, or over $400 for ninety days out of the year.

Although the shearing of ninety sheep a day is the average, a great many will go as high as 110, and one man has been known to shear 125. Of course every man tries to shear as many as he can, and owing to haste frequently the animals are severely cut by the sharp shears. If the wound is serious the sheep immediately has his throat cut, and is turned into mutton and disposed of to the butchers, and the shearer, if he is in the habit of frequently inflicting such wounds, is immediately discharged. In the shearing of those 80,000 sheep a hundred or more are injured to such an extent as to necessitate their being killed, but the wool and meat are of course turned into profit.—*San Francisco Call.*

DR. LOW'S PLEASANT WORM SYRUP.—An agreeable, safe and effectual remedy to remove all kinds of worms. 91i

SELF-COCKING PISTOLS.

Weapons that Can Shoot Quickly Preferred to All Others.

"Self-cocking pistols are now preferred," a dealer in small arms said. "There was a time when no one would carry a self-cocking weapon, and many manufacturers who had patterns of such weapons stopped making them. One reason was that they often failed to explode the cartridge at first fire. Nobody cares to have a pistol that he can't rely on."

"Why are they so much sought for now?"

"The manufacture of pistols has improved immensely during the last half a dozen years. Just compare the old self-cocking pepper-box revolver, which had almost the size and was more clumsy than a Gatling gun, to the latest self-cocking pistol, which has a double action, so that for quick shooting all the chambers may be discharged without taking your finger from the trigger, and for target practice the hammer may be raised in the ordinary way. The great difficulty in the old self-cocking pistol was the spring which threw down the hammer. After a little time it would lose much of its strength. Self-cocking pistols have been appreciated in France for a long time. The French pistols, however, are clumsy, and are cumbersome to carry in the pocket. They are almost sure to go off at first fire, because the cartridges are made with a piece of copper wire, like a nipple, which comes in contact with the fulminate. The hammer strikes the wire, and it only takes a light blow to explode the cartridge."

"Are the modern American self-cocking pistols sure?"

"Oh, yes. Since the invention of the central-fire cartridges there has been no difficulty in making the springs strong enough. The self-cocking pistols which use the old rim-fire cartridge are sure, too, for they are constructed so that the hammer has a full fall, and they have well-tempered springs."

"Are not self-cocking pistols dangerous, being more liable to go off in one's pocket?"

"I don't think so. There is a guard around the trigger which prevents it from being struck. In fact, I don't recollect any instance of a self-cocking pistol going off in any one's pocket. You can discharge all the chambers of a five-shooting self-cocking pistol in a trifle over three seconds. When you have to raise the hammer with your thumb each time it takes a good deal longer, and in a moment of excitement your thumb is very liable to slip."

West India Duels.

Dueling in the West Indies, except upon Hayti and the islands under Spanish rule, used to prevail to a great extent, although the custom is pretty nearly died out; and "pistols and coffee" are not called for at the present day, either by quarrelsome youth or "old stagers," with that same reckless demeanor they used to be in the days of yore. Upon the small French islands, particularly, the "code of honor" was held in high esteem, both by foreigners and "estated gentlemen," some thirty, forty and fifty years ago ; and it was no uncommon thing in those times to witness two or more duels a month, on an average—only a few of which, however, were attended by fatal consequences. Many a hostile meeting has been precipitated by the wine cup at the "Cirque," the famous club house of Basseterre (the capital of Guadaloupe), a resort of French army and navy officers, and by resident planters and merchants of wealth and respectability. There was then no law in force against dueling, so the custom was practiced without municipal restraint or fear of legal consequences. It was generally understood throughout select society upon St. Martin that every gentleman must have emphasized his polite breeding either by having been "called out," or of having challenged his man, unless his social life and business transactions had been phenomenally serene and satisfactory. There was an air of perfect refinement and absence of cruelty, however, in the deportment of St. Martin duellists, and the bowie-knife, rifle or double-barreled shot-gun was seldom ever used as a weapon—the invitations were generally "pistols and coffee," and the terms "ten paces and balls thirty-two to the pound." —*Alta California.*

Dancing

At about fourteen years of age the body attains a considerable increase of weight, in consequence of the quick growth that takes place. We often remark that lanky girls of this age shoot up apace ; and their greater weight is not always attended with a proportionate acquisition of strength. They are apt to be rather weak and ungainly in their movements ; and the weakness often shows itself in the foot, by a yielding of the plantar arch. Moreover, many boys and girls are, at this age, turned out into the world to earn a livelihood, and are obliged to be a good deal upon their feet, and perhaps in addition, have to carry weights. Thus errand boys, butchers and bakers' boys, and young nursery-maids, are frequent sufferers in this way. The constrained positions in dancing, also, if enforced too much or continued too long so as to tire the feet, sometimes lead to the same result. On the other hand, moderate exercise of this kind is calculated to strengthen the foot and also the whole frame, and contributes much to improve the carriage—*Prof. G. M. Humphry.*

Rouge.

Cleanliness, and the civil beauty of the body was ever esteemed to proceed from a modesty of behaviour, and a due reverence in the first place towards God, whose creatures we are ; then towards society, wherein we live ; then towards ourselves, who are no gods no less, nay much more to revere. But adulterate decoration by painting and ceruse, is well worthy the imperfections which attend it, being neither fine enough to deceive nor handsome enough to please, nor wholesome to use. We read of Jezebel that she painted her face ; but there is no such report of Esther or Judith.—*Lord Bacon.*

—The double-ripper is the toy pistol of the winter season. Beware of it when it is overloaded.

A FINE lot of silverware of every description