

"And we desire further to express our sincere hope that the House of Commons, composed of the people's chosen representatives, may not concur in the proposed change, which would in our opinion virtually destroy the Act as a prohibitory measure.

"Seeing the Canada Temperance Act has been so fully endorsed by the people of Canada as to have been successfully carried in 65 out of 75 contests, and to have received in its favor a majority of 45,000 out of an aggregate vote of 200,000, we would regard such a measure as provoked by the Senate, if concurred in by the House, as a direct thrust at the most valuable element of political liberty, viz., legislation in harmony with the will of the majority.

"For the reason stated and from a sense of duty to our country, our families, and those under our pastoral care, we pledge ourselves to oppose with determined purpose, and with all the power and influence we possess, any attempt made by our legislators or others to destroy or injure an Act in the adoption of which by so many counties and cities in Canada our people and ourselves have so largely co-operated at very considerable sacrifice of time and convenience.

"We cannot think that our representatives in Parliament will be so far forgetful of the duty which they owe to their constituents as to concur in the very objectionable measure proposed. If, however, such a calamity should befall our present temperance movements as their concurrence would bring, we shall feel that those who may have deliberately set themselves against so clear a manifestation of the popular will are unworthy of the honorable position of legislators for a free and enlightened people, and shall govern ourselves accordingly in the time to come."

In reporting these proceedings the *Christian Guardian* says—"On Friday afternoon there was a somewhat exciting time in the consideration of a motion presented by Rev. D. V. Lucas, and recorded by Dr. Douglas, referring to the Senate amendment to the Scott Act, which the motion declared would, if accepted by the Commons, destroy the Act. The Rev. Mr. Lucas, in supporting the motion, said he did not believe the House of Commons would endorse the action of the Senate, but having heard that the liquor men had decided not to pay orators and to save their money for use among representatives in Parliament, and a member of the House of Commons having said that the House had a surprise for the people, his action in moving the resolution would not be wondered at. Dr. Douglas, of Montreal, spoke eloquently, saying that there was a crisis pending regarding temperance reform, and all the emphasis the Conference could give in this connection was demanded by the state of affairs at Ottawa. A member of the Senate told him that he never saw such intense hostility to any movement as was shown to the Scott Act in the Senate, which, strange to say, passed by a large majority seven years ago. He referred to the leader of the Senate's opposition to the Act, and then said it was on the train that he (the speaker) proposed to Rev. Mr. Lucas to insert in the resolution the words 'determined resistance.' (Applause.) Their applause cheered his heart, as he interpreted it to mean determined resistance. The cheer meant mischief to the Senate. He was a loyal man, but he must raise his voice against a body that injured the greatest reform on this continent. Several members of the Conference followed with speeches, expressing indignation with the action of the Senate, but hoping that it would precipitate prohibition by exciting to more active zeal. Rev. Mr. Calbraith reminded the Conference and the country that there are 1,000 Methodist ministers, and 800,000 Methodist people in the Dominion who were almost a unit upon this question. Whatever action the Senate or the House took would hasten prohibition."

Presbyterian Synod.—The *Presbyterian Review* states that at the Synod of Ottawa and Montreal recently held at Cornwall, the report on Temperance was given in by the Convener, Rev. Prof. Day, of Montreal. According to it very marked progress had been made during the year in temperance reform. Among the causes for this named are temperance literature, women's societies, the secular press, and chiefly the Scott Act campaigns that have been carried on. A series of recommendations were made in the report, all of which were adopted by the Synod unanimously after being fully discussed, viz.:—Moved by Prof. Day, and agreed to unanimously:—

I. That this Synod reaffirms (1) its oft-repeated testimony against intemperance as a sin against God and a crime against society; (2) its conviction that the traffic in strong drink is one of the greatest hindrances to the spread of the gospel and destruction of the best interests of mankind, and (3) its desire to see this evil exterminated; and, II. That the Synod expresses its gratitude to God for this rapid spread of temperance and prohibition sentiment in our land during the past year. III. The third resolution is (1) that all our ministers and people seek by example and precept to promote total abstinence from intoxicating beverages; especially that they continue their earnest efforts to educate the young in this direction, and thus form a healthy public opinion; (2) that presbyteries, sessions, and congregations use their influence to secure the adoption and rigid enforcement of the "Canada Temperance Act of 1878," with a view to total abstinence.

The first section of this resolution was moved by Dr. Alguire, of Cornwall, and seconded by Rev. H. J. McDiarmid, of Kemptville. The next section of the resolution was moved by Rev. Principal McVicar, of Montreal, and seconded by Rev. Mr. Currie, of Three Rivers. Dr. McVicar laid down five propositions in support of his resolution, (1) That drunkenness is a great sin against God, and a crime against society. (2) That good men, on religious and patriotic grounds, are bound to suppress and prevent this great evil. (3) For the suppression of the evils in question, the chief means to be used among others are the Gospel of Christ, the press, scientific and popular lectures, text-books for schools on temperance, such as those prepared by Dr. Richardson, and the ballot-box. (4) That public opinion thus formed should be formulated in a clear law for the suppression of this great evil. (5) That it is the duty of Christian and good citizens to enforce every good law designed to suppress intemperance. Mr. Currie, the seconder, spoke very favorably of the Scott Act where he resides.

The fourth resolution was moved by Rev. J. K. Baillie. IV. That this Synod expresses its strong disapproval of the recent unwarrantable action of the Senate of Canada in passing amendments destructive of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, in the face of a strongly expressed public opinion; and the Synod resolves to petition immediately the House of Commons not to assent to these amendments, and not to make any changes in the Act except in the direction of greater stringency.

The Synod adopted a petition, submitted by Rev. Mr. Ley, to the House of Commons, against the late action of the Senate in passing amendments destructive of the Scott Act. It nominated three members of the House of Commons to present said petition, viz., Dr. Ferguson and Messrs. Jamieson and Charlton; and Revs. Messrs. Armstrong, Clark, and Joseph White to convey said petition to the fore-said gentlemen.

Strongly worded resolutions, the text of which we have not yet received, were also adopted by the district meetings at Picton, Hamilton, Brampton, Norwich, Strathroy, Sarnia, and many other places.

THE NATIONAL LIBERAL TEMPERANCE UNION.

AT IT AGAIN BUT THEY GET MORE THAN THEY WANT.

(Specially reported for the "Canada Citizen.")

There was a meeting held, on Thursday evening, the 28th ult., in Lorne Hall, by the Liberal Temperance Association, Prof. Goldwin Smith in the chair. The attendance was small. In opening the meeting Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH said that he desired the reduction of drunkenness, but, in trying to reduce drunkenness, we ought not to interfere unduly with commercial interests, nor with the right of private individuals, with regard to the use of beverages they thought harmless; that total abstinence and Prohibition as he understood them, interfered with both. The Association that he represented, the Liberal Temperance Union, condemned the use of ardent spirits, including brandy and whiskey, and desiring those drinks prohibited, believing in the harmlessness and utility of the use of beer and wine. He then called on

Mr. DRAYTON, who condemned total abstinence and prohibition in strong terms, asserting that partial prohibition even, in so far as Sunday was concerned, was a failure in Scotland and Wales.

Mr. C. G. RICHARDSON was called upon to speak. He desired to present the scientific and medical aspect of the question, asserting that the medical profession advocated the use of beer and wine, and pointed out the failure of the attempt in England to get up a medical testimonial against the use of intoxicating drinks, insinuating that fraud was used in the attempt to get up that testimonial.

Mr. JOSEPH TAIT asked the speaker to name the person who attempted by fraud to get up the document.

Mr. RICHARDSON said it was the Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance.

Mr. TAIT called the chairman's attention to the fact that as an educated Englishman he (the Chairman) knew something of the Alliance, its late President, Sir Walter Trevelyan, President Sir Wilfrid Lawson, its honorary Secretary, Samuel Pope, Q.C., and also the venerable Secretary from the commencement, Thomas Barker, and, as he knew that no dishonorable conduct could be attributed to such men, he ought not to sit in the chair and listen to such imputations being made.

THE CHAIRMAN then announced that an opportunity would be given to reply, and Mr. Tait thanked him and took his seat. Mr. RICHARDSON then proceeded to state that salt and many other things were poisonous equally with alcohol and that altogether the Total Abstinence and Prohibition movement was a great mistake.

When he concluded Mr. TAIT was called to address the meeting. He pointed out that the Chairman with his almost unrivalled power in the use of the English language had failed to give any adequate definition of temperance, as it dealt with quantity only and ignored the quality of the article; that it was hard for anyone to understand why the Chairman's glass of claret at dinner was evidence of a more exalted virtue than any other gentleman's cup of tea; that his ideas of commercial rights and individual rights too were somewhat defective, for, while he stood up for the rights of the brewer and wine merchant he desired to abolish the distillery, and, while he had strong sympathy with Englishmen and Germans wishing to retain further their beer, and Frenchmen and Italians their wine, he evidently thought there was no interference with right or individual liberty, in depriving the Scotchman or Irishman of his whiskey, to which certainly he had as much right, if he desired it, as the Englishman had to his beer. Referring to Mr. Drayton's speech he said that due appreciation of the intelligence of the audience prevented him from referring to it to any length, as it was its own best reply. He might say, however, with regard to Sunday closing in Scotland, that if Mr. Drayton, in any city or town or rural district in Scotland, was to advocate the opening of taverns on Sabbath, he would be considered either an escaped lunatic or a fit subject for an asylum—so unanimous were the people on the question. With regard to Wales, Mr. D., has declared that some temperance man had moved a resolution to the effect that Sunday closing was a failure. Were we to admit that such an event had occurred, it would simply prove that the gentleman, by crossing the Atlantic and travelling into Wales, succeeded in finding a man who was as great a crank on the question of prohibition as himself. Referring to Mr. Richardson, he said that perhaps he was a great authority on the scientific and medical aspect of the temperance question, but, from the version he had just given of Liebig's experiment, it did not appear to him that his knowledge was very extensive on the question, and that the reference he made to the three French chemists and Dr. Smith's experiment, showed that he had failed to grapple with the question, and certainly the dog story which he introduced did not throw any light on the subject. With regard to the statement that salt was poisonous, we accept it, of course, on his great authority, but temperance and moral reformers were practical men. They were engaged in fighting a practical evil, the evil of drunkenness, but, if in the months or years to come it became known to temperance reformers that the President of this meeting, and the three eloquent lecturers on the platform, were in the habit of spending their evenings around the social board with a huge bowl of salt on the centre of the table, each provided with a spoon, eating to each other's health, until they became so inebriated as to go home and abuse their mothers, wives or children, then, of course, the temperance men will take with consideration—the propriety of inaugurating a campaign against the use of salt. While we had amongst us men who had in former years been educated in the use of intoxicating drinks to their personal injury and great loss of family, who had ceased to use intoxicating liquors, and found that they were stronger, healthier, and purer and nobler in every respect, it was of no use talking to those men about what medical men might say. He then suggested to the gentleman that if they would advise people not to partake of ardent spirits, he would not quarrel with them, but bid them God speed so far as they went, but when they tried to induce young men to leave the safe path of true temperance—total abstinence from all intoxicants, he felt it his duty to oppose them.