

these men a longer lease of their lucrative employment. It is not for the interest of our cause to hold back our work to enable them to carry on their mischief-making in as many counties as possible.

Furthermore, we want immediate prohibitory legislation of a character even more thorough-going than the Scott Act, and towards this end we want to have the vote of the province of Ontario before our House of Commons at its next session. Let the battle be pushed, let the conflict be sharp and short, we know it will be decisive, and again we urge our friends to complete it as speedily as possible.

### THE EXHIBITION LICENSE.

One of the worst outrages that has been yet inflicted on a long-suffering community by liquor influence has just been perpetrated by a majority of the Toronto Board of Dominion License Commissioners in conjunction with a majority of the Board of Directors of the Toronto Industrial Exhibition Association. Many of our readers will remember what occurred last year. In spite of the earnest protest of the better class of the community the Ontario Board of Commissioners granted a license to take effect upon the Exhibition grounds, although it was clearly shown that the intention of the Ontario License Act was that no such license should be granted. The Exhibition Directors used this license for the purpose of sanctioning sixteen distinct bars upon the grounds, in all of which bars strong drink was openly sold. The case was laid before our Ontario Legislature, which at once passed a bill specifically prohibiting the re-issue of any license to take effect upon the said grounds.

This year there is a conflict between the claimants of licensing power, and pending the decision of this controversy a compromise has been effected, by which the rival Boards can act without much clashing or interference with each other.

The Exhibition Directors have now applied for, and there has been granted to them the transfer to their grounds of a license issued by the Dominion Board of Commissioners. The whole thing is utterly illegal and disgraceful. In spite of public protest these directors have stooped from the honorable position that they were elected to occupy, and placed themselves in the position of common liquor-sellers. They are attempting to over-ride a statute of our Provincial Parliament, and run sixteen grog-shops in defiance of a law that says they shall not have even one. Two of the Dominion License Commissioners have so far forgotten themselves, as also to become parties to the disreputable transaction. They have taken advantage of an arrangement that is practically a truce with the Ontario Government to defy that government and disgrace the exhibition of which our citizens are so proud, by turning it into an illegal beer garden. The license transferred from Mrs. Mead to Mr. Hill, and then from the Island to the exhibition grounds is a tavern license, and it is transferred to premises that have not the accommodation that a tavern is required by law to have. Under the sanction of this unlawful transfer we shall probably have sixteen saloons in full blast upon the grounds whereon the law says no liquor shall be sold.

We trust that no time will be lost by the Ontario License authorities in doing, in regard to this matter, what is plainly their duty, notwithstanding any arrangement or understanding that may exist between them and the Dominion officials. No understanding could ever have contemplated such a flagrant outrage as this; and we trust that Commissioners and Directors will be taught by a sharp and summary lesson, that they cannot defy the law and insult the public, with impunity. If the proper officials will not do this there are surely public-spirited citizens who will take upon themselves the duty that they employ officers to perform, and themselves prosecute these offenders. Public opinion is roused and will not be trifled with.

There is a lesson here too for our temperance men. While it is our duty to see that law is enforced, we have also a duty in relation to its enactment, and we now ought to see plainly the uselessness of spending our time and energies in tinkering with license laws, for which it seems impossible to secure respect. The time has come for something stronger, better, more consistent and more effective. The right, practical method of dealing with this treacherous, contemptible, unholy, drinking business is not that of hampering and limitation, but that of utter extermination.

### Selected Articles

#### FACTS ABOUT THE BARLEY ARGUMENT.

A contemporary, some days since, in commenting on the Scott Act agitation throughout the Province, made the statement that if the question was left entirely to the farmers of the country to decide there would be no doubt about the Act carrying the Dominion over. Every observant person, we believe, will concur in this opinion. In the larger towns and cities there are various circumstances and influences that operate against an unprejudiced judgment on a question of this nature. Everyone knows the uncertainty of towns and cities on even political questions where strong party lines are drawn; but in the country these influences carry little weight. And that in the present contest this fact is fully realized by the opponents of the Scott Act, is plainly shown in the desperate attempts being made to "throw dust in the eyes of the farmers" by the so-called barley argument. In previous prohibitory contests who ever heard of this barley question? It is trotted out to-day as the last hope of a losing cause. Let us face the question intelligently. The farmers are a most intelligent part of the community, and are prepared to weigh this question intelligently. In fact this is "just where the shoe pinches." A little calm consideration will effectually settle the question. The price of barley, as of any other product, is fixed in the markets by the heavy buyers—that is, by the large general demand, and not by the lighter buyers, or limited special demand. The heavy buyers of barley are not our Canadian brewers. Canada put on the market in 1883, 11,140,737 bushels of barley. Of this, the brewers took only 1,003,904, and there remained about 10,136,833. What became of it? The foreign market absorbed it all; for we find that there was exported in barley, 8,817,216 bushels, and in malt, 1,319,617 bushels; a total of 10,136,833 bushels of barley. So that the brewers bought less than one-eleventh of the farmers' barley in 1883. Now any one can see that the heavy buyers—the exporters—fix the price of barley, and that this price would not be in the least disturbed if the brewers were to refuse to buy any, for the exporters would quickly take it for the foreign market, and at the usual rates. It is absurd to say that the brewers, who purchase but one bushel in every eleven put upon the market, rule the market prices.

The following table shows the amount of malt used, its equivalent in bushels of barley, and the malt liquor produced for home consumption for the years named:—

Year	Barley expt'd in Grain. Bush.	Barley expt'd in Malt. Bush.	Barley used by Brewers. Bush.	Beer made. Imp. Gall.
1868.....	4,055,872	28,478	630,048	6,194,738
1869.....	4,630,069	31,854	608,754	6,336,290
1870.....	6,663,877	154,809	568,426	6,075,451
1871.....	4,832,997	181,246	658,535	7,047,580
1872.....	5,606,343	243,494	725,224	7,964,441
1873.....	4,346,923	283,156	841,938	9,217,102
1874.....	6,663,877	174,773	760,391	8,976,268
1875.....	5,419,054	130,587	796,805	9,653,225
1876.....	10,168,176	281,204	843,806	9,319,190
1877.....	6,345,697	322,630	777,230	9,115,258
1878.....	7,267,399	532,461	763,105	8,578,078
1879.....	5,383,922	512,024	699,453	8,848,205
1880.....	7,239,562	1,032,733	733,868	9,201,213
1881.....	8,811,278	630,657	788,777	9,931,176
1882.....	11,588,446	1,124,159	965,999	12,036,979
1883.....	8,817,216	1,319,617	1,003,904	12,757,444
Total.....	107,840,708	6,983,883	12,166,263	
Average per year	6,740,044		760,301	