

suppress that Church. They had a Church so on trial in the States—the Mormon Church. Why was that Church on trial? Because it had chosen to degrade itself and its people, and on the same grounds they asked to place the liquor traffic on trial. If a minister preached a religion that would degrade our girls and debauch our boys and no law could reach him, we probably would tar and feather him. Now, if society would try a minister for these acts, had it not a right to try the liquor-seller who accomplished the same results? The liquor traffic had come into the country on a level of respectability with other trade and had as good a chance to make people love it. Other trades had stood the test of time and retained their respectability. The grocery business had lived all through these years and remained respectable, but its companion, the liquor trade, had become so disreputable that we had lately to dissolve the partnership. (Loud applause.) He was not against the men in the business; it was the system he opposed. People did not chain up any other businesses as the liquor trade was chained, even the Liberal Temperance Union wanted to kill one part of it. (Loud cheers.) Did the audience believe that if the liquor trade had made happy homes and loving husbands anyone would want to see it removed. No! Its record was one of crime, poverty, misery, and ruin wreaking. The issue, then, was, are the charges true? He charged that the bar-room was a public nuisance, that it beggared its patrons, stimulated brawls and fights, and was one of the principal stimulants of red-handed murder, and that it fostered pauperism and vice. Was it true? He said, yes. The gentleman who was to speak had come to prove that it was not.

The gentleman referred to, rose to say that he did not deny the charges, but he did not believe in the means advocated for its removal. Subsequently, in answer to a direct question from Mr. Finch, he said, "Yes, he did deny the charges"; and on coming forward gave his name as Mr. James Newton, Secretary of the Liberal Temperance Union, and said that he had been indeed to take the platform because Mr. Godwin Smith had been misrepresented. Mr. Smith did not object to American speakers coming here but he did object to them interfering between the people and their Government, or to advocate the confiscation of property. The speaker was not connected with the liquor trade, though he had been at one time an agent of that business in England. He had given it up because he found he had to drink too often, especially after he came to America. The question was not, is it an evil but how to stop it. Mr. Finch said prohibition was the way, while he (the speaker) with many others said it was not, because it was opposed to natural law, Divine law, and the principles of business. Had Christ been a prohibitionist of sin he would have come on earth with an army at his back. The prohibition of liquor had been exploded 2,000 years ago, in Greece among the Spartans, noted for their virtue. What he objected to was Americans coming here and inciting the taking away of our liberties. He believed in no license; he believed the Government's duty was to administer justice. A man had a right to do what he liked with his own stomach. (Laughter.) Salt, he asserted, was a deadly poison in certain quantities. Opponents of the L. T. U. denied the temperance of the people in wine-drinking countries. It had been said that a large proportion of the people in Lille were drunkards. That was not true; he had been there and knew it wasn't. Italy, Portugal, Spain, France, and Germany; countries where wine and beer was mostly drunk, were among the most temperate countries of the world. (A voice.—Plenty of drunkenness in Germany; I've been there.) He quoted the statistics from Maine, to show that after 33 years of prohibition in that State drunkenness was on the increase. Prohibition put down licensed houses and raised up grogeries. In looking over a recent paper he found that in Cumberland County, Maine, there were 33 divorces in one year, the greater proportion of which were caused by intemperance. (Loud laughter and cheers.) The speaker then put in a plea for the Senate's amendment and expressed his indignation at a certain rev. gentleman who had spoken of that dignified and venerable body as "Bull F. s." In a contention that the Scott Act did not poll a majority, the speaker said that in some places the Salvation Army could turn out and pass a law to make people wear poke bonnets and play tambourine, so indifferent were the electorate. (Several Salvationists among the audience cheered lustily.) The only law the Government had a right to force on the people was an Adulteration Act. He believed in no license law, but was a free trader on every question. He was not advocating the liquor trade at all.

At this juncture such confusion and noise reigned among the audience that he was forced to desist, and he immediately left the platform. His speech contained nothing more or less than the often reiterated and long-exploded arguments of the wine and beer men, and during its progress it was difficult to restrain individuals amongst the audience from springing up to refute his fallacious statements.

A collection was taken up to defray expenses, and a hymn was sung, led by Mr. Jas. Thomson.

Mr. Finch then rose to reply. He said that if the liquor trade was the liberty of the people of Canada he could only say he pitied the people. As to compensation, he held that compensation should not be given where the prohibited article was an evil. Liquor dealers and keepers of houses of ill-fame, or of lotteries, had not been compensated when their places were broken up. Mr. Newton had said that Christ came into the world to rule by love. Yet Christ had whipped the money changers out of the temple. Christ was all love to those who did right, and all punishment to wrong-doers. The Bible everywhere gave freedom to the right and prison to the wrong. He thought that the prohibitionists were the moral suasionists. He would like to know who worked to reclaim the drunkards or assist their families if not the prohibitionists. Every moral suasionist was a prohibitionist. As to Mr. Newton's Maine statistics, he could only say that the men of Maine were at least no fools, and yet after 32 years' trial they had last year sustained prohibition by a vote of 2 to 1. That did not look as if they thought it a failure. It seemed to him that Mr. Newton conceded all points claimed by the Scott Act men, but said the Act would not work. Well, we must make it work. When we bought a set of harness, if it did not fit we did not alter the horses to suit the harness, but buckled the latter up a little tighter; and so, if the Scott Act did not work quite right, it must be amended till it did. Prohibition was the natural basis of all law. We prohibited the sale of liquors to minors, Indians, and drunkards, and the Scott Act was only a step farther in the right direction.

The loud and prolonged applause which greeted Mr. Finch at the termination of his speech showed how thoroughly the audience appreciated his views and statements. The discomfort of the individual, who had the temerity to oppose him on the platform, was complete. During Mr. Finch's reply, Mr. Newton kept repeatedly interrupting him with questions, but Mr. Finch only made use of the opportunity to completely crush his opponent, and each conclusive answer was received by the audience with vociferous cheering.

A vote was then taken on the question of the Scott Act. Of the vast assemblage gathered in that hall only two individuals stood up when the vote was taken against the Act—those two being Mr. Newton and a groggy-nosed customer who sat beside him.

The proceedings terminated by singing the National Anthem, followed by three cheers for Mr. Finch and three for the Queen.

FRONTENAC.—Judge Price, in his address to the grand jury at the County Court, which opened at Kingston on Tuesday, referred in strong terms to the Scott Act. He said the people had asked for it, that the majority of the people had voted for its adoption, and he hoped it would be given a fair trial in the county. He counselled all connected with the administration of the peace to study its provisions and so be prepared to give them effect.

SIMCOE.—At a public meeting held in Bond Head on Friday, called for the purpose of forming a branch of the Dominion Alliance, the following resolution was carried unanimously:—Moved by Rev. T. Campbell, seconded by Mr. E. F. Jeffs, "That we have read with great dissatisfaction and alarm that the Senate of the Dominion have in their legislation been so mutilating the Canada Temperance Act that should the measure adopted be endorsed by the Commons we consider it useless, as it would destroy the operation of the Act, which has been accepted by a majority of more than 40,000 electors. We would therefore enter our earnest protest against the action of this honorable body of men, and appeal to the House of Commons not to sanction such a measure."

Contributed Articles.

THE WORKING OF THE SCOTT ACT.

To the Editor of THE CANADA CITIZEN.

LONDON, June 8th, 1885.

DEAR SIR,—I have just been travelling through the counties of Oxford and Norfolk, and have seen for myself the effect of the introduction of the Scott Act into those counties. One thing is certain that if the hotels (bar room department) are not so busy, they are largely free from what must be a source of annoyance to "respectable" men (and this the hotel-keepers profess to be) viz. a gang of loafing, good for nothing fellows, who live to drink and drink by sponging. These men have had their day, but now it is over, and for the future they will either have to work, or search out some means of lucrative idleness.

The storekeepers are well nigh unanimous in declaring that trade is no worse, and certainly, in some respects better, since "the Act" came in force.

The ex-liquor sellers are depressed, and indulge in doleful predictions respecting the speedy downfall of this fair Canada of ours. One is led to ask: "Do these men engage in selling whiskey from the love of it; or, for money making; or, from high and noble feelings of patriotism? They talk patriotically! and would have you believe that they engage in 'the trade' for their country's and not their personal good. Poor fellows, the law prohibits such self-denying patriotism! and they, as good, law abiding citizens submit (?) with a growl."

In the hotels where I "put up," I made it a rule, without ostentation, to get into conversation re the state of affairs. The inconsistency of the statements of the lords of the barrel led me to revolve in mind the sentiment of Burns,

"O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as ithers see us."

First of all they declare that there is more whiskey being sold than ever. Next, that there are more drunken men "about town"; and generally wind up by telling you, the hotel does not pay expenses, and that the Scott Act makes \$100 (one hundred dollars) a week difference in their business. Remarkable paradox—more drinking and less money spent on drink. Now this \$100 which several publicans assured me they were receiving less per week, is not thrown into the lakes; but, is either put into the family "old stocking" to provide against the time to come, or, is being circulated among other business men for goods which are more useful than drink, very largely the latter. But, say they, there is more drink being sold and more drunkards than under license! strange, isn't it, that no one except publicans know this? Other people about town, quite as wide awake as publicans, don't see it. But where does the whiskey come from to cause this excessive drinking? Not from the old-fashioned bar-room, for this yields \$100 less per week! where, then? These patriotic publicans are the knowing ones again and they say it comes from the licensed druggist. But druggists only supply on the certificate of a medical practitioner. Oh, there's the rub, Druggists and Doctors are in partnership. Doctors give certificates ad libitum and druggists sell without scruple. But how do the publicans know this? I asked a licensed druggist if he was disposing of much alcoholic medicine. He replied, some, but not a great deal—the doctors were not disposed to give certificates to every applicant. There is in every Scott Act county, without doubt, still a large quantity of the vile stuff out of which drunkards are made, and as yet there are many facilities for getting it from neighboring counties where the Act has not been adopted, or, is not yet in force; let these two sources be removed and then the Scott Act will have a fair field and its beneficial effects be apparent even to the dull intellect of a beer and spirit vendor.

Yours truly,

G. W. ARMSTRONG