

In twenty-eight of the forty-seven carried counties, the Scott Act is already in operation. In eleven of them it will go into operation on May 1st, 1885; and in the remaining eight it will be brought into force on May 1st, 1886.

The Toronto *Globe* of Tuesday contains reports of a C. E. T. S. monthly meeting, arrangements for the formation of a branch. W. C. T. U., action towards the building of a new temperance hall by the Toronto Temperance Mission Union, a prohibition discussion in the Young Men's Liberal Club, and presentation to Parliament of a great number of petitions in favor of prohibition; also a review of a new and valuable temperance book and an emphatic endorsement of the soundness of the policy of prohibition.

The same paper contains a sickening account of the brutal murder of a helpless woman and child by a drink-maddened man; a report of a terrible tragedy at sea, in which the captain of a vessel, in the insanity of *delirium tremens*, shamefully abused his crew, recklessly assaulting and shooting them till they killed him in self-defence, a long list of drunks disposed of in the city police court; a letter from a prominent brewer, who is endeavoring to show that the sale of liquor is accompanied by an increase of crime; a statement about a proposed excursion to Ottawa by a section of the liquor fraternity who believe "that the time is opportune for making a strong representation to the Government of the pernicious effect of the passage of the Scott Act;" and an advertisement of "Fine Old Whiskeys."

THE ALLIANCE MEETING AT OTTAWA.

The peculiar organization of the Dominion Alliance, with its strong and active branches and its comparatively small Dominion Council, naturally makes the Provincial meetings larger and therefore more interesting than those of the central organization. The latter, however, is none the less influential and important. In it are brought together representatives from all our different fields of action. Here national legislation is devised and recommended. In it our legislators come into personal contact with our workers, and here it is that the sentiment of our whole Dominion finds at once a centre and an objective point.

From the Dominion Council of last year went out the decision that the House of Commons ought to be divided upon the question of prohibition, and to-day we have in the result of that division a standing endorsement of the soundness of our policy and the righteousness of our agitation. It is true that before the motion embodying this endorsement was carried, it had tacked to it an amendment relieving the House from any obligation to immediately do what it asserted ought to be done; and, in another division, the same House still further excused itself from doing its confessed duty by stating that such action was not yet demanded by public sentiment. However, the Alliance made its influence felt in Parliament, and will do so again and again, till its ultimate object is attained.

Most of the session of the Alliance Council held last week was devoted to consideration of the Scott Act, and discussion of various suggestions that were offered in the line of legislation to further facilitate the working of this measure. The whole matter was finally committed to the hands of a large permanent committee composed mainly of members of Parliament, whose duty it will be to press upon Parliament the carrying out of required improvements. To this committee, practically, was also relegated the question of the desirability of obtaining a further expression of the feeling of the House of Commons on the question of immediate prohibition. The Alliance Council re-affirmed the policy of total prohibition, asserted that the time has come for such legislation, and

instructed its friends in Parliament to do what they deemed wisest in regard to the matter.

We hope to publish shortly an official report of the proceedings of this interesting meeting, and to discuss more fully some of the important questions by it suggested.

A RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT.

Mr. Justice Johnson delivered a few days ago in the Superior Court, at Montreal, a judgment which will commend itself to every right-thinking person. Under the Quebec License Act, the wife, husband, father, mother, sister, brother, guardian, tutor, or employer of an habitual drunkard may recover damages to the extent of not less than ten or more than five hundred dollars from any dealer who, after being served with a written prohibition, sells the drunkard intoxicating drink. A tavern-keeper named Gerard, was warned by the wife of a man named Desjardins, not to supply him with the liquor to which he had become a slave. He ignored the warning, and on the wife's suit for damages, Mr. Justice Johnson awarded her the full amount asked—\$200. The case is thus reported in the *Witness*:—

Judge Johnson said the three questions to be decided in this case were: 1st, whether the notice was given; 2nd, whether the man was an habitual inebriate; and, 3rd, whether, knowing him to be the person mentioned in the notice, the defendant sold or delivered liquor to him within the year after getting the notice. He held that these three facts were conclusively proved. One witness, Bossé, proved that the notice was delivered on Friday, the 12th September, at a quarter to six, and that on the morning of the 13th the man, during one of his habitual sprees, got three bottles of liquor from the bar of the tavern and drank their contents.

The defendant pleaded that though he got the notice it was at night in an envelope which was not opened until next morning, when it was read to him, he not knowing how to read. The court held, however, that the law only required the wife to deliver the notice in writing, which was done, and that the defendant's ignorance or procrastination had nothing to do with his liability if once the notice was delivered. The question then arose as to damages. The 96th section of the Act says that a plaintiff "may recover from a defendant the sum of ten dollars at least, and five hundred dollars at most, according as it shall be adjudged by the court or jury as damages."

This created a very serious obligation on the part of the defendant, and there must be damages at least to the extent of \$10, according to the statute. The publican at first denied, but afterwards admitted, the sale of the liquor, and probably with a view of appeasing the plaintiff disgorged the unfortunate drunkard's watch, and told the wife she might keep the three empty bottles. The evidence showed that the wrong done to the immediate victim was no less serious as regards his wretched wife. "I do not speak now," continued Judge Johnson, "of her home or her heart; these are ordinary sacrifices by drunkard's wives—but of the actual business of life—appreciable in money; the little trade stopped, if not ruined—the being thrown out of work and disabled from winning bread for his family; not but that I must look also to the mental suffering, the misery, anxiety, and shame of which the defendant was the direct cause. Nor ought I to forget that this was a direct violation of a positive public statute, committed not only from the most sordid motives, but in defiance of duty and humanity. I must ask myself what is there in such a case as this to call on me to diminish the damages that are asked? I can only say that I see nothing that can justify me in doing so. The law says from \$10 to \$500, and the \$200 asked here are far short of half the extreme penalty; and what is there to mitigate the offence? I feel called upon to award the full damages asked, namely, \$200, with interest and costs."

So long as, and wherever the law allows men to make a business of selling the accursed stuff, which makes other men drunkards, and inflicts loss and misery on helpless families, it is to be hoped that such prosecutions will be common, and such judgments equally so. A few examples made of the offenders would teach them caution.

COMING HOME TO ROOST.

It would seem as if we had fairly reached the bottom of the charge against ex-Governor St. John, that he was bribed by either the Republican or Democratic party. The evidence adduced shows unmistakably that an effort was made by members of the Republican party to buy St. John out of the field, and that this effort ignominiously failed. The result is to completely clear the character of the man whom it was proposed to defame, and to brand. At least some members of the National Republican Committee are guilty of disreputable scheming to corrupt the Prohibitionist leader. The Republican insults to the Prohibition party have recoiled upon the