

and the sale of liquor always augments the insurance premium and diminishes the security character of the building in which it is carried on, as well as of all those that a-join it.

What the deputation wanted, however, seemed to be what they brought a lawyer with them to plead for, namely, compensation. We presume their representative made out the strongest case that he could for his clients, and the result must satisfy the public that his clients really have no case. There has been, for a long time with some classes of the community, a sort of expectation that some time or other this claim would be put in form by the liquor men. This has now been done by a gentleman, who actually tried to make out that his clients' case was made strong by the fact of perjury on the part of those who favored it. This gentleman, who claimed to have with him "the feeling of half the people of the country," started his argument in the rather unusual fashion of proposing to answer objections to his position, without first establishing that position, either as a matter of right, on which ground we believe very few people seriously advocate it, or as a matter of expediency, which is the ground upon which the proposal is entertained by the most of those who do not condemn it. It would, perhaps, be going too far to expect calm and fair discussion of the situation from anyone who speaks of the motives actuating Scott Act workers as "rage and fanaticism," although he admitted the soundness of their position so far as to say "that he would be a prohibitionist himself if compensation was provided for." We are willing to discuss the compensation question at any time in a calm and rational manner, but there is no need to spend time in replying to mere illogical denunciation.

It is worth while noticing that no compensation was claimed for the bankers and loan companies, who were represented as being such heavy sufferers. In fact, the claim that the business community should pay the hotel-keepers, is hardly consistent with the position that business interests also suffer from the Scott Act.

Sir John's reply was purely non-committal. He made a promise. That promise he has already redeemed. There is no likelihood of Government granting, or Parliament ordering an enquiry into the workings of the Scott Act, merely from one special standpoint, in the interests of the liquor-dealing part of the community; and a report covering the whole ground of the question of prohibition and the working of the Scott Act, would be precisely what the liquor sellers do not want. There is before the public now sufficient evidence on this point to weaken the liquor traffic's hold on the community. A fuller report would make the vileness of the whole system still more manifest, and bring about more speedily its complete overthrow.

A new organization was formed with Mr. Kyle at its head. It calls itself by the name of "The Ontario Association for the Protection of Trade, Commerce and Property." It may be thought clever by these gentlemen to assume a title such as this, but they will not be aided in their vain effort to resist a great movement for the carrying out of a noble principle by avowing those principles in a title. Calling a rose a toadstool would not destroy its fragrance, neither would it improve the toadstool to call it a rose. The liquor traffic is too well known to allow it to cheat any one by flying false colors, or posing as "an angel of light."

#### POLLINGS FIXED.

Elgin, Ont. . . . .	March 19	St. Thomas (City), Ont. . . . .	Mar. 19
Lambton, Ont. . . . .	March 19	Wellington, Ont. . . . .	April 2
Missisquoi, Que. . . . .	March 19	Chicoutimi, Que. . . . .	April 9

## Parliamentary.

### ENFORCEMENT OF THE SCOTT ACT.

OTTAWA, on Feb. 23.—A large delegation, composed of members of Parliament, waited upon Sir John Macdonald with respect to the Canada Temperance Act. Among those present were Messrs Vidal, Shakespeare, Temple, Hackett, Thos. White, Peter White, Gigault, Townsend, Macdonald (P.E.I.), Walker, Landry, Wood, Kenney, Burpee and many others.

Mr. Foster, who was selected as spokesman, presented the following points:—

First.—That this is a representative delegation, enjoying the confidence of the people, and comes to you, Sir John Macdonald, asking that the people's will be carried out, and does not, after having been worsted in a contest with the people, come to you asking for a reversal of or injunction upon the people's decision. Second.—The Canada Temperance Act when passed was without proper enforcing machinery. Though often asked for, this machinery was not granted till 1883-4. Certain clauses were placed in the Liquor License Act designed to enforce the Canada Temperance Act in all counties and cities in which it had been adopted. The question of legality was raised, and by the Supreme Court of Canada it was decided that the clauses in question were *intra vires*. Since that a decision has been rendered by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, which partially sweeps away the procedure and penalties of the Canada Temperance Act. The confusion which has thus been caused is very detrimental to the working of the Act, and leaves the whole matter in doubt and abeyance. Third.—That what the delegation desires is that this doubt be removed and this confusion done away with, so that the people's will may have free course, as far as legal methods are concerned, and have its full effect. We have prepared certain amendments which we believe will clear the whole question of doubt. We desire you, Sir John Macdonald, to take them into consideration and try them, or in some other better way make it sure that the law shall no longer be blocked by the confusion and uncertainty which have too long existed. We would prefer to have this done by transferring the enforcing clause from the License Act to the Canada Temperance Act, so that the latter Act and its enforcing machinery may stand as one and complete. It seems to be certain that the Provincial Government of Ontario will not enforce the Canada Temperance Act in the face of the late decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. This duty is thrown upon the Government of the Dominion, and this delegation will support the Government in any reasonable and necessary expenditure for the purpose of enforcing the Act, which, after the 1st of May, will be in force in about forty counties and cities of the Dominion. Mr. Foster placed in Sir John Macdonald's hand the amendments, and said the delegation hoped they would be carefully considered, and that the Government would take sufficient measure to carry out the law provided by Parliament and adopted by the people.

Sir John Macdonald, in reply, said the matter was of great importance, and that the first step he would take would be to confer with the Minister of Justice to look at it from a legal point of view. He suggested also that certain members of the delegation should wait upon Sir Alexander Campbell.

Mr. Foster said he thought he could say for the delegation that they would support any legitimate or reasonable expenditure which had for its object the enforcing of the Canada Temperance Act.

Senator Vidal remarked that Parliament having given the law, should not Parliament make that law operative?

Sir John Macdonald, replying to this observation, said it is clear when there is a law on the statute books which requires machinery to work it, Parliament ought to make its legislation available and effective. (Hear, hear.)

The deputation then retired.—*Es.*

### COMPENSATION TO BREWERS AND DISTILLERS.

Mr. Krantz moved for a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—"That it is expedient, whenever Parliament decides that a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes should be enacted, that equitable provision should be made for the compensation of brewers, distillers, and malsters, so far as respects the diminution in the value of the real property, premises, and plant owned and used by them in their business."

He said that the principle of compensation to persons prevented by law from carrying on their business was so just as to require very few words to support it. It might be said that such a resolution was premature while no prohibition measure was before the House, but the industries in question had been very seriously disturbed by the passage of the Scott Act in several counties and by the agitation for a prohibition law. There were over two hundred brewers in Canada. The capital invested was twelve millions, and they employ 2,500 hands. The business was practically prohibited wherever the Scott Act came into force. It was but right that when a man was deprived of his property for the general good he should be compensated.

Mr. Wells in seconding the resolution said he would have been better pleased had this resolution been referred to another reputable class of the community, who had been harshly dealt with by this Parliament, namely the Licensed Victuallers. He entered upon a long plea for compensation, basing his claims upon the principles of justice, and the compensation given by England, to West India slave owners for the release of their slaves. The temperance people, whose earnestness he was glad to admit, and whose aim was a noble one, should not forget that it would be exceedingly difficult to enforce the Scott Act, particularly as a large portion of the vote in favor of it was made up of persons who would not actively and strongly support it in its enforcement.

Mr. C. Orton, also supported the resolution. He did not believe in prohibition. The Scott Act had proven a failure. It had promoted immorality through the general introduction of ardent spirits instead of wine, beer, and other comparatively harmless liquors. If prohibition was brought into force in