

upon it being colored with malt charcoal, bittered with hop, and fired with whisky; and instead of having it for nothing consent to purchase it at 4d., 5d., or 6d. per quart? Could folly go further than this?

Beer not only intoxicates, but often makes people unwell, and then they are apt to say, "Oh, there was something in it," or to charge it with being "doctored" or adulterated: they think that beer made only from malt and hops *must be good* and will not intoxicate nor injure those who drink it. They are profoundly ignorant that *the purest beer is whisky and hop water*, colored and flavored; and until they are disabused of their unfounded notions, they will continue to go on reiterating these silly tales about adulterations. The people's belief that beer imparts strength, that it is feeding or nutritious, is a great delusion. It contains nothing that can give strength—it stimulates just in proportion to the whisky it contains; but it gives no real power to the body. I have no hesitation in saying that *there is more food in a pennyworth of bread than in a gallon of beer*. It is the solids (digested) and not the liquids that give strength to both men and animals. Millions of individuals work without beer. The testimony of masons, bricksetters, laborers, furnacemen, moulders, glass-blowers, sawyers, porters, plasterers, haymakers, shearers—in fact all trades, and of persons both on sea or land, even those who have been exposed in the most northern latitudes, to the hardest work and the severest cold—these all work and do their work better without beer. Malt liquor cannot give what it does not contain. You might as well ask the clouds to create sunshine, or the sun to freeze the ponds, as to hope for true muscular strength from beer drinking.

But even if beer were worth drinking, and contained the nourishment attributed to it, yet when you consider what evils it leads to, you will see strong reasons why you should never touch it. If it were as nutritious as bread, beef, or milk, yet so long as it contains the intoxicating principle, and brings so many to ruin, every good man should abstain from it. Beer is a deceitful drink. When men invite each other to go into the public house, they say, "Come, let us go in and have a glass," but the one glass taken they want another, and often stop till they are unfit for work. In the whole list of intoxicants, I regard beer as the worst. First, because public opinion runs so strongly in its favor in preference to what are called "spirituous liquors." Next, because it is usually looked upon as "food," and hence it is not reserved for special occasions, but is on the table of many families daily.

If any impartial person will examine this beer as I have done, or if he will carefully consider what it leads to, he can come to no rational conclusion but that it is wise to abstain from it altogether. If you will enquire of all the hard drinkers, men or women, how they commenced, you will find that in most cases it was with a glass of beer, or a glass of ale, or a glass of porter, and generally at the family table. If you want to make your children drunkards, there is no likelier method than giving them beer to their meals.—*Joseph Livesey.*

---

### Intemperance News.

---



---

#### ONTARIO TRADES (?) BENEVOLENT (?) ASSOCIATION.

---

The liquor sellers of Ontario in a society with the above misleading name have held their annual Convention at Hamilton. We take the following summary of their proceedings from the report of the *Globe's* special correspondent:—

The following executive officers were present: J. S. Hamilton, Brantford, President; P. Bajus, Kingston, 1st Vice-President; J. O'Donohue, Stratford, 2nd Vice-President; A. G. Hodge, Toronto, Secretary; W. G. Reid, Hamilton, Treasurer, Wm. Armstrong, Jas. Lennox, Toronto, Committee; John Millet, Auditor. A large representation of the trade was also present.

The minutes of the first annual meeting were read by the Secretary, Mr. Hodge, of Toronto. The minutes of the different meetings of the Management Committee were also read and adopted.

THE SECRETARY'S REPORT was then read. In it he recommended that large counties be worked from one or two centres; that the officers who do not give bonds be changed annually; that the

travelling expenses of the delegates be paid; and that a periodical and journal be established in the interest of the trade. The treasurer submitted his annual report, which showed the following:—Number of paying members in the association is 1,097. Receipts, \$2,294 18, with fifteen branches yet to hear from; balance from last year, \$1,786 53; total receipts, \$4,080 71. Total expenditures, \$2,300 31. Balance on hand, \$170 40.

THE PRESIDENT then delivered his address, and said that many events of importance to the trade had transpired, and to them the attention of the executive and management committees had been given. He then referred to the Ontario License Act to the Dominion Act, and to the case of Hodge v. the Queen, carried on by the Toronto Branch of the Association, even to the Privy Council and which had been decided against Mr. Hodge. The Ontario Trades Benevolent Association, he said, had done much good. It has shown the power of the trade, and has convinced even the most sceptical that if they are a united body the total storms and attacks of the skirmishers of the total abstinence army pass harmlessly by. It had shown that this association had been a power for good in diminishing and discouraging the evils of intemperance, accomplishing this by the education of its members to the idea that over-indulgence should be discouraged, and that a strict observance of the licensed law and keeping of their houses in a respectable manner is to the interests of each member as well as in the interest of the community at large and of the entire trade. He could not but feel that it is in future absolutely necessary that the Secretary of the Association should be in a position to give his entire time and attention to the duties of the office.

MR. VINCENT, Simcoe, wanted to know what assistance they could expect from the Society in the coming contest against the Scott Act campaign in Norfolk.

MR. HODGE, Toronto, stated that as there had not been a campaign since the Society was formed, he believed that every county belonging to the Association should have all they had paid into the Association, and as much more as possibly could be furnished by the Association.

MR. MCGUIRE said he understood that when the Society was formed it was for the purpose of fighting the Scott Act. He was led to believe that by Mr. Hodge when he was attending the meeting of the Association two years ago in Toronto. He believed in the Society taking hold of any contest—the first contest that may come up—and wining, and that would dispel the idea from other counties of submitting the Scott Act. He further stated that he believed the failure to pass the Act in Welland no doubt was the cause of the proposed submission of the Act in Lincoln.

MR. HODGE submitted that he believed that the Society should stand by any county till the funds ran out, and then, if necessary, pay in to the treasury in advance.

CAPT. MCBRIDE, St. Thomas, believed that the proper course was to be united in opposing the Scott Act anywhere. He stated that the ministers were very jubilant at first when the Act was about to be submitted, but when met were not equal to their cause.

MR. T. F. BROWN, Welland, detailed how the work was done in Welland against the Scott Act. He had spent time and money in his own county, and he was now ready to assist in a fight in any other county.

MR. HODGE thought the management committee of the Provincial Association should be the body to whom all moneys should be paid, they to hand what is necessary to the local associations in the county where the Scott Act is about to be submitted. In this way he thought that the brewers, wholesale dealers, and others would assist freely, as they would have a guarantee that the money was properly spent.

MR. MCLEAN, Windsor, stated that they did not want a fight in Essex. If they had to fight, he thought they could win even without the aid of the Association. He referred to the case *The Queen v. Hodge*, recently before the Privy Council. He was of the opinion that the matter was settled. He had no more to say, but he thought that the Society should be prepared to assist in any case that should come up in the future that interfered with their interests.

MR. LINDSAY, Hornby, Halton County, spoke to the question of the repeal of the Scott Act in Halton, stating that he thought the Act could be easily repealed. After some further discussion on the work of opposing the Scott Act, the following motion was passed: Moved by MR. ARMSTRONG, of Toronto, seconded by MR. O'DONOHUE, of Stratford, "That the Managing Committee be empowered by this Association to transact all business in connection