

saw fit to do so, wooden barns, in which to store their grain, hay and other commodities, gathered from said lands.

This ordinance resulted from information given to His Majesty that the cultivation of land in Canada had not made that progress expected from the protection and facilities accorded to the inhabitants; that the harvest in some years was not so abundant as to furnish the means of subsistence to its own people, and that the diminution was owing to the subdivision of holdings among the members of a family into such small parcels that it was impossible for the *habitans* to gather therefrom enough for their own support.

The French chain in use at that period contained 45 links, each a foot long, French measure. Four such chains, or 180 links, made the side of a square arpent, consequently one square arpent contained 16 such chains. A French foot=12.816 inches; 6 French feet=1 toise; 3 French toises=1 perche; 10 French perche=1 arpent, which is equal to 192.24 English feet.

The English league is 15840 English feet. The French league of Canada is 15120 French feet or 16148.16 English feet. The difference between the French lieue and the English league is 308.16 English feet, or 288 $\frac{4}{5}$ French feet.

There is a difference of quantity, by no means inconsiderable, between the acre in use under the French regime on both sides of the River Detroit, and the common English or American acre. To ascertain this difference exactly it is necessary to contrast the French square measure with the square measure used by the Americans and Canadians.

If the London foot be divided into one thousand equal parts, it will require sixty-eight of these parts to be added to make the foot of London equal to *le pied royal de Paris*.

Eighteen Parisian feet constitute la perche; ten perches square, that is to say, one hundred square perches, constitute l'arpent.

In Normandie twenty-two feet compose la perche. Forty square perches compose la vergée. Four vergées compose l'acre. The Norman series, excepting as to length of the foot and perch, was introduced into England by William the First, and from England has been transferred to America.

The Paris arpent must not be confounded with the Norman acre. By the French acre, as used by the inhabitants of Quebec and Sandwich, is always understood the arpent of Paris, and never the Norman acre.

The American acre is nearly thirteen poles square, that is to say, exactly one hundred and sixty square poles, the pole containing sixteen feet six inches.

The French acre of Sandwich, etc., is a square the side of which is one hundred and eighty Paris feet, equal to one hundred and ninety-two London feet and three inches nearly.

The American acre gives a square the side of which is two hundred and eight feet, eight inches and a half with a small fraction.

The difference of the side of a square containing one French acre, and the side of a square containing one American acre, is sixteen feet five inches, and about sixty-four hundredth parts of an inch, nearly one pole. The difference of the contents of a French acre and an American acre is eight thousand nine hundred and fifty-six square feet and a fraction of four-fifths of a foot, that is to say, more than

one-fifth part of an acre. The common practice of the country is to consider the French foot as equal to thirteen English inches, and the side of a French acre to be, therefore, one hundred and ninety-five English feet, making thus an error of two feet nine inches.

The farms, with respect to size, may be comprehended in four classes: The first class contains farms of eighty French acres; that is to say, two acres front and forty acres depth. The second class contains farms of one hundred and twenty French acres; that is to say, three acres front by forty acres depth. This is the common size. The third class contains farms of one hundred and sixty French acres; that is to say, four acres front by forty acres depth. The fourth class contains farms of two hundred French acres; that is to say, five acres front by forty acres depth.

Toronto.

A. KIRKWOOD.

PASQUALINA.

(SERENADE.)

Silver starshine on the sea,
Twilight flying,
Day-winds dying,
This a song, my love, to thee—
Butterfly and bird and bee
Softly sleeping,
Silence keeping,
Listen thou, my love, to me.

Lina, Lina, Pasqualina
In the light above,
In the starshine,
By the moon-vine,
Hear me, Lina dearest, hear me
Sing of love!

Goddess, for thy love divine
My heart's yearning,
For thee burning,
My impassioned soul is thine—
'Neath the moon-white flower-vine,
Thus I woo thee,
List thou to me
Where the white moon-flowers shine.

Lina, Lina, Pasqualina,
In the light above,
In the star-shine,
By the moon-vine,
Hear me, Lina, dear one, hear me,
Thou, my love!

HELEN M. MERRILL.

November, 1893.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CAN PROHIBITION BE ENFORCED?

To the Editor of The Week:

Sir,—Nearly every witness examined before the Royal Commission was asked if, in his opinion, a prohibitory law could be properly enforced in Canada. The answer in each case depended largely on the meaning which the witness attached to the question, and the same question is troubling many men just now, in view of the approaching plebiscite. If, by the question, is meant can prohibition be enforced as to make violation of the law impossible, no sane man would answer yes. But we may reasonably expect that when the Government feels itself justified in passing such a law, the same support which enabled it to do so, will still be at its back to see that the law is carried into effect.

We might raise the point that such a question is irrelevant where a moral issue is at stake. If the liquor traffic is an evil, it should be placed at once under the ban of the law just the same as all other evils. We should not temporize with it, as if we were afraid to handle it manfully. The suggestion that any law cannot be enforced sounds like a slander on our administration of justice.

But there are men who call such an argu-

ment sentimental. They say, we want some practical proof that a prohibitory law can be enforced before we vote to enact it. We can only point to places where such a law is in force. Four States of the Union have passed prohibitory legislation, and what is their verdict? The men who have been interested in the business in some way, and men who have always opposed the movement, to whom the wish is father to the thought, declare that the law has been a huge farce—a complete failure. But a vast majority of unprejudiced people pronounce the law a great success. They do not say it has destroyed the evil—not at all. But they do say that it is growing less and less every year, and that, in course of time, it will die a natural death, like a fire that goes out for want of fuel. In the State of Maine, after thirty years' experience of the law, the people voted by an overwhelming majority to make the prohibitory law a part of their constitution. Which testimony is the more credible? If any further proof were needed of the effectiveness of prohibition, it would be found in this fact that, although according to their own story more liquor is sold under prohibition, and that without paying any license fees, the dealers always fight desperately for return to the old license law.

Now if the law is a success in States like Kansas and Iowa, and we have every reason to believe it is, there are good reasons for expecting it to be even more successful in Canada. Kansas is surrounded on all sides by states in which a license law prevails, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that intoxicating liquor could be imported into Kansas much more easily than into Canada with our well trained and vigilant staff of customs officials, who keep down so effectually the smuggling of other kinds of contraband goods.

Added to this, Canadians generally are much more law-abiding than the people of the Southern and Western States. This statement cannot be disputed. Who ever heard of lynch-law in Canada? Who ever heard of assassinating high officials in this country, or socialist plots and anarchist uprisings? Yet these things are of comparatively frequent occurrence in the United States. And if Canadians respect and honor all the other laws of their land, would they not equally support a prohibitory law if such were passed?

But, say some look at the Scott Act; it was not honored and respected; it was not enforced. Even so; but do not the records show that under the Scott Act the number of convictions were decreased, and crime and pauperism greatly reduced? Certainly they do; they speak for themselves. And the Scott Act had many obstacles which would not stand in the way of national prohibition. It could not be expected that a patch-work law of that kind would prove so effective as a law everywhere enforced. Which would be easier, to enforce the Scott Act in Middlesex county with two breweries and all the saloons of London in full swing, or to enforce prohibition, which would close the breweries and all? Under the Scott Act, a man could come to London, and take all the liquor he wished home with him, and the drinking habit was not affected in his case at all. This was the weak point of the Scott Act, and it could not be obviated.

There is one final consideration. Even if it were possible to prove that prohibition would not be immediately effective, would that be a sufficient reason for any man withholding his vote and influence from the movement? We think not. A great deal is being said just now about moral suasion and the education of the young. These are good things; but does it not seem incongruous to teach children the evil effects of intoxicants, while at every corner they see places licensed to sell them and we share the profits? Would it not be better to wipe out at once a business that the school-children are taught to regard as evil and evil only? Then they could be taught to respect that law, as they would respect any other law of their land. They would learn to consider it as disreputable to encourage liquor selling as they now believe it is wrong to receive stolen goods. How would such a process result? In twenty years, these children will be men and women with full powers of citizenship.