

Correspondence.

The Scott Act in Muskoka.

Editor Canada Citizen:
Six.—In your issue of March 9th there appears an article on "Simcoe," in which you make some reference to the Muskoka District. You state that during the three months ending January 31st, only five informations were laid and one conviction secured. You then say that "this condition of affairs simply means, to take the most favorable view of it, inexcusable negligence on the part of the inspector."

I am,
Yours in Temperance work,
W. G. HOWSON.
Bracebridge, March 19th, 1888

Compensation for Scott Act Outrages.

Editor Canada Citizen:—
Six.—If a man has a number of sheep in his field and some of them be destroyed by a dog, (the owner of which cannot be discovered) the municipality in which the occurrence took can be required to partly bear the loss caused by the said dog. Such a municipal law is only just, the owner of the sheep paid his taxes, and it is only right that his property should be protected, or else paid for.

Government, Dominion or Provincial, that has jurisdiction in this matter, has not moved before this time; and I cannot but think that the thing would have been attended to long ere now, had the dwelling of any one of them been blown up by dynamite, or his barns destroyed by fire.
God helps those who help themselves: Temperance men have been vainly looking to, and waiting for governments to move; the fact is, governments calculate that temperance men will submit to be fooled with; and they do fool them; and will continue to do so, as long as they tamely submit. Let all this be ended. Let the Executive of the Dominion, or of the Provincial Alliance, as the case may be, frame a measure to require municipalities whose dynamite or other Scott Act outrages are perpetrated, to have the same and circumstances of the outrage investigated by a jury composed of the councillors of the municipality assisted by the assessor of the municipality, and make it part of the duty of such jury to determine how much damage has been done and to make payable to the victim of the outrage out of the treasury of the municipality a sufficient amount to cover the loss sustained by him. If a wisely framed measure of this kind be placed in charge of a member who has backbone in him, we shall soon find how the Government and the rank and file of Parliament feel on this important matter.

I am, sir, yours truly,
Guelph, Feb. 1888. J. W. T. U.

THOUGHTS BY THE WAY.

It is a pretty well established fact that when a man drinks to excess, not alone does he do injury to himself, but makes himself so dangerous a person that the law has to step in and place him in durance vile, until such time, at least, as he sobers off. Those engaged in the liquor traffic will sometimes admit that when one has come so far under the control of the liquids that they sell that he himself gets into this uncontrollable state, then the police cell is the best place for him. It is creditable to our common humanity that, outside of the man perhaps who has "put the bottle to his neighbor and made him drunken," this statement is not recognized as a commendable one.

And what of the liquor seller himself? His victim has been rendered unsafe to the community, but through the act of the liquor seller. Thus, at least, is the view that hard-headed insurance men take of this question. A contemporary has recently published a host of interviews with leading insurance men of the country, obtaining their opinion of the effects of the saloon business on surrounding risks. I find that these are most damaging to every man engaged in the liquor business. They with one accord unite in the sentiment that the saloon business is a dangerous business to all who get near it.

I shall just summarize some of the opinions expressed. The secretary of one of the leading companies says "That many fire losses are due to the use of intoxicants is evident to all underwriters." Another: "Many incendiary fires are doubtless caused by drunken strollers, and many more by thriftlessness engendered by the alcoholic habit." Again "Buildings adjacent to saloons are more hazardous than ordinary dwelling risks." The president of a large company uses the following vigorous sentence "There can be no question but that danger of fire is increased by intoxication." Another officer goes further than this "We insure no distilleries or buildings connected with them, nor do we insure saloons, beer gardens, or buildings adjacent to them." Further "Breweries and distilleries are extra hazardous." When insurance is effected a high price is the rule. Says the head of a mercantile fire insurance company "We require higher rates on buildings next door to saloons, beer gardens, etc." "Incendiarism is a crime, and nine-tenths of our crimes are due to intoxication." Another company takes the same prohibitory ground "We do not insure breweries and distilleries anywhere." And this fact, that the man who is unfortunate enough to have his property located next to a saloon, or rather, to have a saloon located next to his property, must pay the piper, is borne out by numerous quotations. Here is an addition to the one already quoted: "We have higher rates on property adjacent to saloons, beer gardens, etc." "Unless they have division fire walls we require higher rates on buildings adjacent to saloons, beer gardens, etc." One company emphatically says. "We do not insure breweries or bar-rooms."

This is entirely a material view of the obnoxiousness of the saloon business. To my mind the terrible effects of the traffic

on the individual himself is such that no material considerations should influence any man in his attitude on this question; but from what has appeared in those columns from time to time, and from the above references to a material view of the question, it is seen that alike from a moral or a purely business standpoint, there are the most substantial reasons for those who care for their property, as well as their lives, to set their face against the traffic, out of which comes no good, and which is productive only of evil, and that continually.

And what say our legislators when they frame laws permitting a traffic of this kind? They are simply taking a step that jeopardizes the interests of every man outside of the traffic itself. Is the liquor business so important a factor in the community that it should receive preferences of this character that, when they appear in any other line of business, are at once set down as monopolies, combines, rings, etc., and vigorous steps taken by the legislators to uproot them?

W. C. T. U.

The Semi-Annual Convention of the York County Branch—Important Meetings in Aurora.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union held a Semi-Annual Convention in Aurora on the 15th and 16th instants. The meetings were held in the Methodist Church.

At the opening session Mrs. Fawcett, the President of the York County Branch occupied the chair, and the session was opened by an hour spent in devotional exercises.

Among the delegates attending were—From Aurora—Mrs. Idle, Mrs. Woodrow, Mrs. Doan, Mrs. Kline, Toronto West—Mrs. Bulman, Mrs. Hughes, Mrs. J. J. Graham, Toronto North—Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Foster, Mrs. Foster, Mrs. Adams, Toronto No. 2—Mrs. Draper, Mrs. Norris, Mrs. Gallely, Mrs. Jacob Spence, Toronto No. 1—Mrs. Lobb, Richmond Hill—Miss Wylie, Mrs. Tindall, Newmarket—Mrs. Pearson, Mrs. Millard, Mrs. McCracken, Toronto, Central—Mrs. Skinner, Mrs. Foster, Mrs. F. S. Spence, Toronto, Bathurst street—Mrs. Garbutt, Parkdale—Mrs. Hughes, Mrs. Coxhead, Parkdale Y's—Miss Stephens, Miss Perry, Toronto Y's—Miss Tilley.

After the President's address, which was of an encouraging character, and in which reference was made to the rapid growth of the order and to the stability of the work being carried on, the formal business of the convention was proceeded with. The reports of local unions were called for, some of these were very encouraging. There are sixteen unions in the county, two of these having been formed since the last convention. The meeting adjourned at 5 o'clock to meet again at 7.30. Mr. Rankin, minister of Aurora Methodist Church, occupied the chair. After prayer and singing led by the choir, Mrs. Johnson, of Aurora, read an address of welcome, to which Mrs. Wylie, Richmond Hill responded. Mr. Steele, Aurora, read an address from the Royal Warrant to which Mrs. Fawcett replied. Mrs. Jarman followed with an address on the "White Slave" Movement during which she dwelt upon parents the necessity of more care respecting the pastimes and companionships of the young, and dwelt especially on the necessity of allowing but one code of morals for both boys and girls.

On Friday morning the executive met, and at the same hour the delegates gathered for devotional exercises under the leadership of Mrs. Draper, of Toronto. Later on in the day the subject of headquarters led to a prolonged discussion, the decision being to ask the Provincial Executive to meet with County and District Executives in Toronto next week in order to consult together upon this subject. Delegates were appointed to the Ontario and the Dominion Alliance meeting in Toronto March 20th and 21st, and the meeting adjourned at 12.

During the next session Mrs. Tully, of Toronto, presided and gave a Bible reading on the subject of guidance. Miss Orford, Toronto, sang a solo, and Mrs. Berkinshaw, Toronto, addressed the convention upon Y. W. C. T. U. work. Miss Skinner, Toronto, also addressed the meeting upon different departments of Y. W. C. T. U. work. Mrs. Coxhead and Miss Terry, Parkdale, sang a duett. Miss Orford spoke at length to the Band of Hope, interesting them greatly.

The closing session was held on Friday, March 16, at half past seven, when Rev. Mr. Amos, of the Presbyterian Church, presided. The choir and the members of the Band of Hope introduced pleasing selections, and Mrs. Keefer delivered a telling address. It was arranged to hold the next convention at Richmond Hill in September.

The Canada Temperance Act.

RESULTS OF THE VOTING SO FAR:

Table with columns: PLACE, VOTES FOR, VOTES AGAINST, MAJORITY, DATE OF ELECTION. Lists various locations and their respective voting results for the Scott Act.

NOTE.—In the preceding table a place that has voted more than once has the different votes indicated by the figures (1), (2), (3) after the name of place. Figures printed in italics are for first or second votes in places in which a later vote has been taken than that so printed. Names in heavy faced type are of cities, others of counties.

SUMMARY.
Nova Scotia has eighteen counties and one city, of which thirteen counties have adopted the Act.
New Brunswick has fourteen counties and two cities, of which ten counties and two cities have adopted the Act.

Not Scott Act majority... 50586
If we omit all voting but the last, in those places which have voted more than once we get the following as the latest vote:
For the Scott Act... 147226
Against... 102668
44668
It is more than eight years since the Scott Act was first voted upon and adopted in different localities, and ONLY ONE COUNTY HAS YET REPEALED IT, although many votings have taken place on the question of repeal.