

Canada, the immigration of Germans, Norwegians, and others from the continent would cease, and that from Great Britain would rapidly decrease. Still, he would sink his own views and vote for prohibition if compensation were given.

Mr. Fisher moved in amendment, "That the time for Parliament to proceed to discuss the details of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, will be the proper occasion on which to discuss the question of compensation to the manufacturers of such liquors as may come under the operation of such law."

He said that no justification had been given for the present introduction of such a resolution. They had not shown that the House during the present session, or even the present Parliament, would be called upon to pass a prohibitory law. The resolution, even if carried, would not bind the people of Canada. It would therefore do no good and it might do harm by raising the hopes of those engaged in the business. It was said that the temperance people held the belief that the liquor men had no rights. There was a large body of temperance men who were not imbued with that spirit, and who would not use their power as the liquor sellers had used their power in the past, but would do justice to their enemies. The country had pronounced in favor of temperance, and temperance men were willing to give quarter, and to fairly consider the question of compensation if its justice could be shown.

Mr. Foster wanted a full and fair discussion of the matter, though he did not think the present was the time to decide it. He did not think a contingent resolution like this was the usual course. If passed the consequence would be to invite an increase in the amount of the capital invested in this business from twelve millions up to thirty or forty millions, and so to invite them to lay on the shoulders of the people the burden of an immense sum for compensation. There had been no petition on this subject from any part of the Dominion asking that this compensation should be given. It was true a petition had been made to the Government for compensation, but, as he understood them, they called for compensation not for the brewers, maltsters, and distillers alone, but for the coopers whom brewers employed, and cigarmakers, as well as for the compensation embodied in this resolution. There was no single petition before the Parliament. The only one of the petitions he had referred to which had descended to argument was that of the cigarmakers, which represented that the great falling off in the public revenue from cigars was due to the Scott Act. On this was based the claim for compensation.

At this point of the debate, it being six o'clock, the Speaker rose.

On Thursday Mr. Foster resumed the debate on Mr. Kranz's resolution, and on the proposed amendment of Mr. Fisher postponing the matter until the law was introduced. He said the resolution was not an agreeable one, because it was what might be termed a class resolution. It included only 130 men in the whole Dominion, and left entirely out of sight all those correlative industries and employments which heretofore they had been made to consider as depending upon their business, and liable to be greatly injured if it were swept away. There was another reason why he opposed the resolution. It was this: It was a most important point as to whether or no the liquor interest was a vested interest. This resolution created it into such. Besides in the event of the passage of this resolution, how easily the brewers and distillers could prepare for the coming prohibition by enlarging their premises and making the cost of the adoption by the country of the policy excessive. There was yet another important objection to the resolution before the House. It was the circumstance that it did not go far enough. If rich brewers and distillers were to be compensated, why should not compensation be also given to the farmer, who ploughed and sowed his land, and who brought to the market the grain out of which the liquors were made, to the railway companies which carried the grain, to the employes of such railways, to the employes of the distilleries and breweries, and to the ten thousand retailers of liquor, without whose labor there would be no rich brewers and distillers to-day? If the makers of the liquors were to be compensated, why, he should like to ask, should not the others who were connected with the business? In considering the question of compensation, if the House examined any of the restrictive measures adopted by the English Parliament in years past it would be found that no mention was made of compensation, no matter whether the measures were of a mild or drastic nature. In 1736 the General Act, which was prohibitory, was passed, but no mention was made of compensation. In 1742 distillation from grain, flour, or malt, was distinctly prohibited, and this had the effect of reducing in forty years the consumption of spirits from nineteen million gallons to four millions, but no compensation was given. In 1830 the Beer Bill was brought into Parliament. Every effort was made to defeat it, and the plea was put forward that if it passed, from fifty to seventy thousand persons would be ruined by it; but the Act was passed and no provision for compensation was introduced. In 1854, Parliament passed the Forbes-Mackenzie Act, prohibiting Sunday drinking in Scotland, but no compensation was given in that case either. The same thing could be said of the Irish Sunday Closing Act and the different restrictive measures passed in Canada or in the United States. To-day the public had about come to the conclusion to wipe it out altogether, and just as victory was perching on the banners of the moral reformers, the persons engaged in the liquor business came forward and demanded payment for their loss. The traffic was a tyranny. Did anyone ever hear of a tyrant being compensated because the people had come to a conclusion to throw off his yoke. How could it be pretended that the traffic had no warning of its approaching doom? No abuse had had longer warnings of its coming dissolution. This being the case, those who had gone into the business with their eyes open, to enjoy its profits, should be prepared to accept its losses. It had been said that as a railway had to compensate the proprietors of any property appropriated for the public good, the country was bound to compensate the brewers and distillers, whose business would be injured by prohibition. But he maintained that the Government had the right to legislate for the general good irrespective of individual losses and without compensation, even though private property used for the public advantage might be injuriously affected thereby. A precedent for this was to be found in the injurious effect of the

construction of railways upon old towns and villages, away from which these roads carried the traffic. Many old villages, which flourished in the days preceding the railway era, were now in ruin, but no one ever heard of their applying to Parliament for compensation from the railway or from the country. In conclusion he would ask a few suggestive questions. What were the liquor manufacturers to be compensated for? For the loss of prospective profits? Surely no one made so absurd a proposition as that, because their accumulated capital was not to be sacrificed. No one proposed to take that from them. Because they would have their stock left on their hands? Surely not, for they had warning already to get rid of it. Because their buildings and real estate would depreciate in value? The value of such property came out of the profits of business made in preceding years, in view of which the owners had no claim for compensation. But who would have to pay this compensation? The hard working man. He would have to accept a new burden to be relieved of a burden under which he had already been too long suffering.

Some other hon. members also spoke in favor of Mr. Fisher's amendment. A division was then taken, and the amendment was carried Yeas, 105; nays, 75.

#### SCOTT ACT AMENDMENT.

In the House of Commons, on February 25th, Mr. McCarthy introduced a bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. He said the object of the Bill was to permit those persons who by the Scott Act were authorized to sell where the Scott Act was in force, but not to sell to persons living in the county, to sell in the county. The law stood in this way, that those who were authorized, such as distillers, brewers, wholesale merchants, and others, might sell, provided they did so to persons who would take it out of the county, and those who lived in the county where the Scott Act was in force might go outside the county and bring it in. That appeared to him to be a manifest absurdity, and he proposed that those who had the right to sell under the Scott Act should sell to those who resided in the county or outside.

Sir Richard Cartwright—Is there any limit as to quantity?

Mr. McCarthy—It is just the same as the Act now provides, ten gallons as to wine, and eight to beer.

Hon. Edward Blake—I think while the hon. gentleman is engaged in amending the Scott Act, he might also turn his attention to amending the McCarthy Act.

Mr. McCarthy—I may satisfy my hon. friend by stating that there is a clause or two in that direction. (Laughter.)

Hon. Edward Blake—My hon. friend's modesty prevented him from mentioning that. (Renewed laughter.)

The Bill was read a first time.

#### BRITISH COLUMBIA AND THE SCOTT ACT.

In the House of Commons, on February 26th, Mr. Baker (Victoria) introduced a Bill further to amend the Canada Temperance Act. The object of the measure was to provide that in British Columbia an electoral district, instead of a county, as in Ontario, could vote upon the measure.

The Bill was read a first time.

#### COMPENSATION TO LIQUOR SELLERS.

In the House of Commons, on February 27th, Mr. Small, in introducing a Bill to make further provisions respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, said its object was to compensate hotel and tavern-keepers in consequence of the depreciation of the value of real estate by the passage of the Scott Act. This was to be done by a Court of Arbitration, which was to be a charge upon the municipality where the Act came in force.

The Bill was read the first time.

### Public Opinion.

#### THE LIQUOR DEPUTATION AT OTTAWA.

Sir John A. Macdonald and some of his colleagues went to the Grand Opera House, Ottawa, to receive the memorials which the Licensed Victuallers and others desired to present and to hear what they had to say. Sir John's answer was exceedingly non committal. All they asked he told them except that a commission be issued—was subject to legislation. Their statements and arguments would receive due consideration from the government, and would, he was satisfied, be carefully considered by members of Parliament. The government are not a unit on this question and are not prepared to take any action. They would consider the proposal to issue a commission. Were a general prohibitory act proposed he would himself vote for compensation. They were very fine fellows and he had the greatest respect for them, but he would not promise them any more.—Tribune.

Weeks ago we took occasion to point out that the pilgrimage to Ottawa of the Licensed Victuallers would have absolutely no practical result. We argued that Sir John Macdonald could not, would not and dare not take opposition to the Scott Act, and that he was too crafty to take ground against liquor dealers to their faces. The result has justified the position then taken. The license interests now know, at the expense of a large outlay of money and loss of time, that the Dominion Parliament will accord "anxious, earnest and immediate attention and consideration" to the prayer of their petition; all of which simply means that the last has been heard of it. But, by the way, they have learned something else. They have been duly informed that Sir John may, at some time in the future not specified, if a certain conjunction of circumstances should arise, vote for compensating hotel-keepers and others engaged in the business. \* \* \* \* \* The temperance people are left in the same state of uncertainty as their opponents. The result is no advantage to them if it is none to the other fellows. Sir John, at least, was impartial, he gave neither side information or hope.—Toronto News.