

made legal by the Government, and no redress to be found anywhere but in hopeless prayer to God. One Sunday she found the haunt of her boy. It was a saloon. In it her son had learned the deadly habit of drinking. What could she do? The law was against her. It protected the destroyer of her happiness. If she broke the windows or assaulted the saloon-keeper that would not bring her son back, and she would become a transgressor of law herself. She could pray, she could call upon God, the friend of the widow, to curse the business that had doomed her child and made her own heart and home desolate. She kneeled upon the street and presented her case to Him who hears the widow's cry, and asked Him to blight with His wrath the murderous rum traffic. A policeman came along, made her a prisoner and brought her before the city magistrate, who fined her, I understand, \$2.00, or thirty days in jail. Every law favoring the liquor traffic is against the sober citizen.

We all agree that with the attractions of open and legalized bar-rooms in every community, there are many acts of crime that would never have been thought of by the doers, but for the influence of the liquor bought and drank in those barrooms. The liquor traffic, as it is to-day, makes it easy to do wrong and difficult to do right. The people of this country are doing what they can to make the law right. We have laws to protect us from the lawlessness of people made drunken, and no one will go further than I will in denouncing the vice and sin of drunkenness. The liquor traffic is the producer of drunkenness; have we not a right to protection against it? The Scott Act begins well in this line of protection. Drunkards' wives and children have more protection under the Scott Act than under the best license law in the Dominion. This is one of the excellencies of the Act. I fear a great many expect too much from the Scott Act, and not finding it all at once, grow discouraged. Temperance people must remember the liquor traffic has had seventy years, more or less, to debauch the appetite and demoralize those who have come under its power. It has had all these years to work out its dread results in the bodies and souls of men, and is it reasonable to suppose that the tremendous evils resulting from the use of liquor as a beverage can be fully corrected in a few short months or even years. Yet, a fair enforcement of the Act will accomplish much.

In the next paper I shall speak of some of the difficulties in the way of the enforcement of the Scott Act.

Milton, May, 1885.

#### THE SCOTT ACT AND THE BREWERS.

To the Editor of THE CANADA CITIZEN.

DEAR SIR,—I have to-day seen in "Public Opinion" in your issue of April 10th from the Hamilton Times, an article on "The Coopers and the Scott Act." It is defective in this respect: It does not show the absurdity to the full. Most of the new barrels made must go to the States. The whiskey and beer barrels are used over and over again, and the railways carry them free on the return trip to get them full for freight. So that in reality the proportion is not \$252 to \$1.50, but \$2.52 multiplied many times over to \$1.50. Indeed, it would be a very interesting piece of information for your readers if you could find out what is the average number of times a whiskey or beer barrel is used over again, and therefore, what is the average sum spent over the bar for whiskey to the \$1.50 for the barrel. Of course the cooper's agitation has no force at all as regards liquor going to the States, as our Scott Act cannot affect that.

Yours truly,

J. S. C.

#### Parliamentary.

#### SENATE OF CANADA, OTTAWA, MAY 6TH.

Hon. Mr. POWER, on the order of the day to commit the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and Liquor License Act, 1883, Further Amendment bill to committee of the whole being read, moved that it be an instruction to said committee to insert a provision in the said bill requiring that whenever in future a poll is taken under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, the petition shall not be held to have been adopted unless more than three-fifths of the votes polled are for the petition.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL thought the motion was not in order. He claimed that such an instruction, being foreign to the bill, could not be given to the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER ruled the motion out of order.

The House then went into committee on the bill.

Hon. Mr. McINNIS (B.C.) moved an amendment to the second clause, providing that cities should be included in the electoral districts of British Columbia.

After some discussion the amendment was carried on division.

Hon. Mr. McINNIS moved an amendment striking out section 3, "The notice provided for in section 6 of this Act shall, so far as it relates to British Columbia, be deposited in the Registry offices in the respective electoral districts,

or in the Sheriffs' offices in such districts;" and substituting that notices should be deposited in the offices of the Registrar of Voters in Barkerville for the electoral district of Cariboo; Kamloops, for the district of Yale, and in the cities of New Westminster, Victoria and Nanaimo, for the districts of New Westminster, Victoria and Vancouver.

The amendment was adopted.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN moved in amendment to the fifth clause that duly licensed medical practitioners could purchase and dispense alcoholic liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes and not otherwise.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said the whole Act might as well be repealed as to be subjected to so much mutilation as was proposed.

Hon. Messrs. Vidal and Flint strongly opposed the amendment, which they considered injurious to the bill.

Sir ALEXANDER CAMPBELL suggested that the right for medical men to purchase alcohol should be dropped from the amendment.

This was done and the amendment was carried on a count of 25 to 16.

Hon. Mr. McMILLAN moved to strike out that part of section 5 providing that medical men summarily convicted of giving a certificate for any other than strictly medicinal purposes should be liable to a penalty of twenty dollars for the first one, and forty for a subsequent one.

Carried on division.

Sir ALEXANDER CAMPBELL moved to strike out that part of the clause relating to the efficiency of the forms given in the schedule of the Act and providing for the framing of new ones. Carried.

Hon. Mr. ALMON said if we went on as we are going in regard to temperance, what would become of the revenue of the Dominion? The debt of the Dominion was already far greater than he liked to see it, and he did not think such a fruitful source of revenue as wines and liquors should be lost. He moved that dealers in ales, porter, lager beer, cider, and light wines, containing not more than twelve per cent. of alcohol, be exempt from the operation of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY seconded the motion. He quoted the opinion of a clergyman to the effect that the use of light wines was sanctioned by scripture. He thought the temperate use of light wines could do no harm, but total prohibition he claimed to be a failure.

After some remarks from Hon. Messrs. Wark, Dever and Alexander,

Hon. Mr. FLINT said he had never voted for the Scott Act, because it didn't go far enough for him. He had been a total abstainer since 19th June, 1827, when he made up his mind at Quebec, after calm reflection, but he was neither a crank nor a fanatic. An hon. gentleman had just referred to the wine of scripture. If he could get any such wine as our Saviour made he would go for it; but he did not believe in the stuff made now-a-days. He would oppose the amendment.

Hon. Mr. THIBAUDEAU would vote with great pleasure for the amendment, which he considered some mitigation of an Act which he thought should never have been put upon the statute books.

Hon. Mr. PLUMB said the Scott Act was a deception. It had a pretended moral effect which it lacked in reality, and it had effects which were more demoralizing than the sale of liquor. Statistics show that the people of Canada are less in need of such legislation than other people in the world. He could tell hon. gentlemen who brought the bill into the Senate, that so long as they attempted to force the Scott Act upon the community by a minority, so long would they meet such legislation and opposition. The Act was never intended for a prohibitory measure. He would vote for prohibition with pleasure, and would be very glad to see it proposed, but in the meantime he would support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL said it was perfectly incomprehensible to him why a member of this House should apply the title *sumptuary* to this bill and he maintained that there was not the slightest anomaly. He challenged the hon. gentleman from Niagara (Mr. Plumb) to name any one place where he had found more drunkenness since the Scott Act came into force. He gave the testimony of the Supreme Court of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, recommending the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act as the best means of counteracting the enormous evils arising from the traffic in intoxicating liquors. He considered this testimony of more value than that of an unknown clergyman given by the hon. gentleman from Amherst (Mr. Dickey). Seven hundred and twenty petitions had been presented to this House, asking that no limitation should be made to the prohibitory character of the Scott Act. Were not these petitions, representing as they did the wishes of over a hundred thousand persons, sufficient contradiction to the cry that the people were opposed to it? They were anxious for prohibition, but in 1878 accepted the Act as the most judicious course in the meantime.

Hon. Mr. OBELL rose to express his admiration of the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Almon), because he believed it to be for the benefit of the majority, whose liberties were suffering from the action of a despotic minority.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE supported the amendment.

The motion being put to the House the amendment was carried on a count of 42 to 20.

The Committee rose and reported the bill as amended. — Mail.

SCOTLAND.—The plebiscites on the subject of the suppression of the liquor-traffic continues to be taken in Scottish communities with an almost uniform result in every part of the country. At Renton, in the Vale of Leven, 1,388 persons voted in favor of giving the people the power to suppress, only 71 voting in the negative, while 54 were neutral, and 111 returned the papers blank. The papers were signed by both males and females of eighteen years and upwards. At Campbeltown also, a central seat of the distilling interest, a plebiscite has been courageously taken; there 1,000 cards were issued to the electors of the burgh, and of these 517 were returned, of which 386 against 45 voted for placing the control of the licenses in the hands of the people, and 337 against 73 for the abolition of the liquor traffic. In Perth 1,608 have voted for and 435 against, prohibition by the direct vote of the ratepayers. — Exchange.