



The Executive Committee of the National Prohibition Party of the United States has issued an address setting forth the facts of the recent campaign, stating the reasons for the party's existence, and asking for renewed and energetic support. On another page we publish some extracts from this address, that our readers will find well worth perusal. There is no doubt that the decisive action of our American friends in taking the step they did, has brought them nearer to the triumph of their cause. Either they will pledge one or both of the old parties to prohibition, and see that this pledge is redeemed, or they will go on growing in strength and influence, till they are able to grasp the reins of power, and inaugurate an era of moral reform, and purer and nobler national life. In either case the result will be the attainment of prohibition, far sooner than it could have been secured had not this bold step been taken.

We called attention some time ago to a proposal for a general celebration, by our friends on the other side of the line, of the present year as the Centennial of the American Temperance Reform. We have received from the National Temperance Society, a circular stating that they have been requested to call a Centennial Temperance Conference for three days during the week commencing Sunday, September 20th, at which carefully prepared papers will be presented by persons selected for that purpose. The National Temperance Society has undertaken this work, and appointed a Committee to carry it out. The Committee consists of the following gentlemen:—General C. B. Fisk, Rev. Dr. T. L. Cuyler, Rev. Dr. A. G. Lawson, Rev. W. C. Steele, Rev. Dr. D. C. Eddy, J. L. Baily, J. N. Stearns, T. A. Brouwer, Rev. Dr. D. Dorchester, John B. Finch, E. H. Clapp, General Louis Wagner, George W. Bain, F. M. Bradley, Rev. Dr. F. A. Noble.

Further particulars will be published from time to time, and, no doubt, the occasion will be one of unusual interest and importance. The following is the list of the subjects so far selected to be brought before the Conference:—1. The Inception of the Temperance Reform. 2. A Century of Church Work. 3. Total Abstinence during the Century. 4. Pen-Jottings of Early Temperance Reformers. 5. A Century of Liquor Legislation. 6. The History of Prohibitory Legislation during the Century. 7. The History of the "Maine Law." By Hon. Neal Dow. 8. Forty years in the field. By John B. Gough, Esq. 9. What has the Century shown in Literature? 10. The Centennial Verdict of Science. 11. Constitutional Prohibition. 12. Temperance in Public Schools. 13. Temperance in Sunday Schools. 14. Legislation in Congress. 15. The Temperance Problem in Cities.

#### POLLINGS FIXED.

Drummond, Que.....	March 5	Missisquoi, Que.....	March 19
Elgin, Ont.....	March 19	St. Thomas (City), Ont..	Mar. 19
Lambton, Ont.....	March 19		

#### THE DOMINION LICENSES AND THE GROCERS.

It is difficult to understand why the Dominion Government has again undertaken to issue licenses, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court. In some cases last year, as for example in this city, the authority assumed by the Dominion commissioners was exercised in overriding the expressed will of the people and forcing upon us saloons and taverns in places where there was no semblance even of a good reason for permitting them; indeed, in several instances, these licenses were given in the face of strong public protests.

There is another fact in view of which Toronto temperance workers cannot but be alarmed at the proposal to continue these Dominion licenses. A year ago, the City Council passed a by-law prohibiting the sale of liquor in retail stores. This action was undertaken under strong public pressure, by virtue of power conferred by the Ontario License Act. The Dominion Commissioners can claim the right to grant licenses only on the ground that the Ontario Act is illegal, and if this is claimed, then the by-law referred to must also be held illegal, and the Dominion Board free to grant grocers' licenses. In fact it is well understood that the grocers have been building for a long time upon the hope of some such arrangement.

We regret very much that there should be any conflict upon the question of jurisdiction in this matter, and we hope that the Dominion officials will not attempt to do anything so outrageously unfair as what is expected from them by the liquor party; but if such an outrage is attempted, temperance men must see that it is not carried out, without every possible effort being made to prevent it, and to thoroughly test the validity of the law under the sanction of which the whiskey sellers hope to defy an insulted community. This is not a political question; Conservatives and Reformers are agreed in condemnation of the vile shop-license system, and will feel equally aggrieved if they are thus cheated out of a benefit for which they fought so hard.

#### THE OTTAWA DEPUTATION.

Last Friday witnessed the culmination of the long talked of scheme by which the liquor party had hoped to impress the Dominion Government with the power and importance of the said party, and to secure some redress of their grievances, in the form of legislation that would either weaken or destroy the Scott Act. Unfavorable weather interfered to some extent with the success of the undertaking, but even after making allowance for this, it must be admitted that the enthusiasm aroused fell far short of what was anticipated by the promoters of the excursion. The *Mail* reports that about two hundred and fifty persons were present to meet the Government and state their case.

We have not, however, to deal with the size and character of the deputation; we propose simply to notice what was said and done by this party of whiskey-sellers and their friends, who described themselves as, "We, the delegates of licensed victuallers, bankers, cigar-makers, and workmen of the Province of Ontario."

The first document presented by the deputation was a petition, some of the statements of which are so untrue, and some of the prayers of which are so unreasonable, that it is difficult to believe that the petitioners really expected the Government either to accept the one, or grant the other. The first of these curious statements reads as follows:—