

We do not believe that the success of this repeal movement would be any crushing blow to our agitation elsewhere. We can and will carry the Scott Act in nearly every county in this province, no matter what may be the outcome of the Halton contest. But we must not yield an inch of ground to the liquor-traffic. We will not surrender the first outpost that we have taken. Halton has done nobly. Her electors have bravely and successfully carried the banner of prohibition enactment and enforcement in Ontario; displaying a moral heroism and setting a grand example for which our whole province owes them a debt of gratitude that we can never repay; and now when their hour of trial has come again, and when as before they are rising to the importance of their duty with the same courageous spirit, they ought to meet with the fervent sympathy and the practical assistance that they so richly deserve. We do not believe that the combined wealth of the whiskey-power of America can buy this loyal little county. We look for another glorious victory for the cause of truth and right. The Scott Act has never been repealed and Halton will not begin. But we want to see this majority so crushing that the liquor-traffic will feel its utter weakness and abandon the cruel and traitorous efforts that it has thus far been putting forth in this county to prevent the enforcement of law and the carrying out of the expressed wishes of the people.

The liquor traffic, even when sanctioned by law, is an outrage upon society and a curse to any community, but where this traffic is protected by law, temperance men respect that law, and in loyalty submit to what they feel is wrong. The Scott Act is a protection to society and a blessing to the community, but when it is law, the liquor sellers disloyally attempt to resist its enforcement, and prevent its accomplishing the good it would otherwise accomplish. Now they have the audacity to point to the result of their own evil deeds, and say that this is proof that law against these evil deeds is bad. The heartless incendiary claims immunity and protection for his destructive occupation, because he says that our engines cannot extinguish the flames as fast as he can kindle them. The liquor-traffic has resisted and defied the law, and therefore claims legal sanction and support. Is the law of this land so weak a thing that it must accept terms from the whisky business, that offers it a bribe in the shape of a license-fee, saying, "We will do as we like at any rate; you had better take this and let us alone?"

The Scott Act has done much good in Halton, although, with liquor sold in every adjoining county, it had terrible odds against it. It would have done far more had it not been for the wicked and dishonorable antagonism of the men who now demand its repeal; and every fact that they can adduce to show that the law has been violated is simply an argument against the vile system that they seek to license and perpetuate. We look to Halton to stand true to her past noble record, and we have no doubt that her electors will refuse to submit to the dictation of these who demand that laws should be so framed that they can be enriched by the ruin of their neighbors.

PROHIBITION IN IOWA.

Everything that goes to show how a newly adopted prohibitory law works is interesting. The *Chicago Current*, a high-class and trustworthy journal says:

"The industrial effect of the prohibitory enactments in Iowa is peculiar. The *Burlington Hawkeye* enumerates a number of odd results noticeable during the month of July, and not complained of previously. Through the closing of the saloons in interior towns the sale of cigars has been greatly restricted, and manufacturers in the city have turned off many hands. The free-lunch in rural Iowa has gone. This has affected the butchers seriously; the materials out of which the enticing morsel was once made being unsalable for any

other purpose. Angry hotel-keepers declare that they have to fill the gastronomical vacuum thus created—that their boarders are hungry past any previous record. Of course, the interests of the brewers and distillers have been completely sacrificed. It is to be regretted that, in order to protect the wives and children of Iowa against the miseries of intemperance, any number of honest workers should suffer. But honest workers will find employment quicker than harpies will be able to secure other communities on which to feed. If all the saloon-keepers of Iowa should in one week transfer their fields of effort to Missouri, it would do more for prohibition in Missouri than ten thousand sermons."

We should think it would. The *Current* it may be added is not a prohibitionist journal.

Selected Articles.

THE BARLEY QUESTION.

The brewers, and others of their school, seem more troubled of late than usual lest the passing of the Scott Act in a number of the counties of Ontario should interfere seriously with the farmers' prosperity by the reduction of the price of barley, which they predict must follow. If the farmers could feel assured that these men were really anxious for the furtherance of their interests, then they are deserving of the warmest thanks of the farmer for their philanthropic motives, but somehow it is not easy to persuade the able-bodied tillers of the soil that the men who rob the widows and the fatherless are really in earnest when they thus give expression to their concern.

Let us assume in the meantime that this concern is real—does it follow that it stands upon a correct basis? Is it true that the farmer will get more for his barley by selling it to the brewer, than by feeding it to his stock? We do not say as yet that we believe it is not, but we add fearlessly that it has never yet been *proved* true, nor do we believe that such can be shown by Mr. E. King Dodds himself. If that gentleman is ready for a tilt on this question, our columns are open, or if any of his associates are like-minded, we say, come on. If the results are disastrous to us, we shall try and hide them, as it would be by no means the first time that the world witnessed truth buried, awaiting a certain resurrection.

We sometimes think that our temperance friends allow themselves to be drawn down from the hill into the valley, where the enemy, with chariots of iron, may charge down upon them, without any sufficient reason for thus abandoning their vantage-ground. It is not for temperance men to show that feeding barley is more profitable than selling it to the brewer; it is for the anti-temperance men to show that it is *less so*, as they are the assailants in this part of the controversy. If they have ever done this, we have failed to see it. If they have, we say, proclaim it loudly through all the land, for such would certainly be against temperance men, so far as the financial argument is concerned, in the first view of it.

It does not follow that, because the brewer gives 75 cents per bushel for bright barley the farmer does not get 75 cents from the bushel of discolored barley fed to his stock, for which the brewer would give him but sixty-five; nor is anybody sure that the same farmer would not have realized more than 75 cents per bushel in the end, had he fed the bushel of bright barley, although possibly the return might not have come in during that year, only in part. Ye men, who try to hoodwink the unsuspecting farmer with your sophistries, and to win him with your much fair speech, he is not quite the simple man you take him to be. Although he may not state the case as you would, he can weigh evidence in the balances of deliberate judgment. In behalf of those of our guild, the farmers, we say, bring on the proof. Show to every one of us that the brewer gives the farmer more for his barley than the butcher, if such a thing can be shown. Any swaggering rowdy can wax deliriously eloquent in bluster, and any old gossip of the village can make assertions. You tell the farmer that the brewer gives him the highest prices for his barley—why not establish your assertions?

Our friend, Mr. John C. Snell, the President of the County of Peel Scott Act Association, in a letter to the *Peel Banner*, of January 20th, argues with much force and conclusiveness, that the growth of barley is, on the whole, less profitable to the farmer than many other grains. He says