

"That despite all preceding legislation the evils of intemperance remain so vast in magnitude, so wide in extent and so destructive in effect as to constitute a social peril and a national menace.

"That this House is of the opinion for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

This resolution was introduced on Wednesday, March 5th, in a speech of some length by the mover. The debate was resumed on Wednesday 19th, when Mr. Fisher spoke at length. The resolution came up again on Wednesday, 26th March, when the following amendment was moved by Mr. White, of Cardwell, "that the following words be added to the said motion: And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

The debate was participated in by Messrs. White of Cardwell, Jamieson of Lanark, Cameron of Victoria, Beatty of Toronto, McCraney of Halton, Kirk of Treylboro' and Tiley of St. John. Mr. White's amendment was carried without division. Mr. Robertson, of Shelburne, moved in amendment "That the following words be added to the said motion:—And this House is of opinion that the public sentiment of the people calls for immediate legislation to that end." This motion was negatived by a vote of 107 to 55.

The original motion, with the amendment of Mr. White added thereto, was then adopted by a vote of 122 to 40.

This result cannot but be gratifying to the Alliance and its friends. The House, by a majority of 82 in a total vote of 162 accepted and indorsed the following:

Resolved, "That the right and most efficient remedy for the suppression of the evils of intemperance is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, and this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

The House has therefore by an overwhelming vote declared:

1st, That it indorses the principle of complete prohibition as applied to the whole traffic in intoxicating liquors.

2nd, That so soon as public opinion will sustain it, the House is prepared to enact such law.

Now, let the people of Canada make known to Parliament the extent and sufficiency of its sentiment.

How?

1. By adopting and carrying out the C. T. Act wherever possible.

2. By petitioning Parliament to enact a Prohibitory Law.

3. By pledging members of Parliament to, irrespective of party vote for such a law.

THE OXFORD CONTEST.

To the Editor.

SIR,—The Scott Act has been passed in the County of Oxford by a majority of 800 votes, though the most sanguine of its supporters never ventured upon expecting a majority of more than about 300. This speaks well for Oxford and must inspire confidence in the minds of all true lovers of sobriety and temperance in other parts of our province, where this great question is soon to be submitted to the arbitrament of the ballot box. These counties are Northumberland and Durham, Russell and Prescott, Stormont, Glengarry and Dundas.

I have taken some interest in the progress of this agitation in the County of Oxford and have read, to a large extent, the various statements and arguments advanced by both parties, and, I must confess that the platform utterances, like most of the opinions expressed in a more private way, so far as the anti-Scott Act advocates are concerned, are in no small degree made up of gratuitous statements. "I am confident," "I think," "I am not satisfied," "I have heard," "I was told by one likely to know," &c., &c., whereas, on the other hand the Scott Act people have had to produce their facts and give chapter and verse for every assertion advanced.

The opinions put forward to take the place of arguments I find most generally are:

1st. That there is more drinking—private and secret—than

when licensed houses are open.

This is purely and simply a fallacy. It is a well authenticated fact in every department of trade that the greater the facilities the greater the trade, and consequently *vice versa*, the less the facilities the less the trade. How comes it then that the liquor traffic is supposed to be an exception to this rule? It stands to common sense such cannot be the case, and the fact that the publicans are in such a state of excited annoyance at the passing of the Scott Act shows that they believe "that by this craft we have our wealth, and that this liquor traffic brought no small gain into the craftsman," that is if we are justified in honoring such a trade with the honorable title of "craft."

Treating is one of the chief modes of drinking, with the bar-room closed this evil is reduced to a minimum. Most of those whose habit is to treat deplore its necessity, and would not indulge in it if they did not fear consequences in a business way. Close the hotel bars and thus the temptation is removed. I would just as soon believe that black was white as that abolishing the means of treating promoted drinking.

2nd. It is further asserted that the Scott Act is of no use, because certain persons break the law.

Is the law honorably kept by publicans now? I trow not! The breaking of the law is only another reason why the provisions of the Act should be more rigorously enforced. The law in the past has protected the drunkard maker. If that protection is taken away, and these men previously protected defy the law and create a nefarious traffic, then it becomes the duty of those who are acquainted with these facts to see that those who break their country's laws are suitably punished for their transgression, and not to do their best to make beneficial laws nullity in their effects.

3rd. It is commonly asserted that in the County of Halton the Scott Act has been a total failure.

Halton has had less than a year's experience. The first year is sure to be the worst, and even if some of the evil consequences exist, which are asserted do exist as the outcome of this Scott Act, this will subside with time. Men tire of indulging habits which surround them with risks and pains and penalties. It may be pertinent to ask how have these men become so degraded as that they will pursue drink even into holes and dark corners? Drinking has been tried for years, yea, for generations, with known results! Is it fair to pronounce temperance and sobriety a failure, and to condemn it on one solitary year's trial? A year in which its enemies will naturally have done their utmost to make it non-effective. Oxford has replied with no uncertain voice, NO!

4th. It is asserted that the Scott Act giving "local option" to counties, makes the counties adopting it isolated, and thus places them in an unfair position as it regards surrounding counties.

Halton was isolated, but is so no longer, for Oxford has joined her, and soon other counties will have joined their ranks and in years to come Halton will be able to enjoy the enviable notoriety of being the pioneer in this beneficial and elevating mission of sobering the people of this Western Peninsula.

5th. It is asserted by opponents of the Scott Act that they would favor a Dominion Prohibitory law.

What guarantee have we of this? If prohibition is good for the Dominion it is good for the county, and by carrying out the Scott Act and adopting it in the various counties it becomes only a question of time and the whole Dominion will be included in its embrace. The Scott Act is practically a Dominion measure, at any rate it can easily be made one, if the counties so will it, and by so doing Canada can stamp her heel once and forever upon that hydra-headed monster—Strong Drink, which is sucking the life-blood out of our national veins and giving in exchange wretchedness, poverty, disease, crime and death.

Yours, etc.,

G. W. ARMSTRONG.

Woodstock, March 22nd.

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE TEMPERANCE LEAGUE.

This Temperance League was begun last November. A few of the undergraduates, deeply impressed with both the need and the usefulness of such a society among students, met one afternoon and resolved to do what they could. Information was obtained from Howard University (the only college known to have a Temperance Society at that time), a constitution was framed, officers and an energetic canvassing committee appointed, and a thorough personal canvass made of every student.