

THE SCOTT ACT A GRAND SUCCESS.

IT WORKS IN HALTON.

BARS ABOLISHED.

DRINKING LESSENER.

CRIME DIMINISHED.

BUSINESS IMPROVED.

READ THE EVIDENCE.

Georgetown Doing Well!

About the middle of October, 1883, the Rev. Mr. Robinson, pastor of the Congregational Church, Georgetown, County Halton, called on fifteen of the business men, merchants, manufacturers, &c., and asked them among other questions the following:—"What effect has the Scott Act had on your business?" With but one exception they said that business was just as good as in licensed times. Georgetown is a place of more than 1,500 inhabitants, and is within a very short run, by G.T.R., of Brampton, the County Town of Peel. How easy it would be for the Georgetown people to go down to Brampton to do their trading, but very few if any go. The Brampton merchants are not aware of any difference in the amount of goods sold, because of the supposed 'exodus' from Halton. One of the manufacturers of Georgetown said, the idea of the Scott Act hurting business was thoroughly exploded. Besides, Georgetown has added to its wealth during the past year in new buildings and improvements over \$20,000.

Acton does not Suffer.

Seventeen of the business men of Acton, including merchants, manufacturers, etc., have recently declared, amongst other things, that the Scott Act "Has in no way injured business in our municipality." Acton is a village of over 1,000 people, and is very near the boundary line between Wellington County and Halton, and within a short run of the city of Guelph, by G.T.R., where plenty of "accommodation" (?) in licensed whiskey can be had, but the people of this thriving town are satisfied to trade with their own merchants. Within the last six months between thirty and forty families have moved into the village. This does not look like decaying prosperity. The only business which has been injured in Acton is the liquor business, and that has been quite ruined.

The Villages are better off.

Killbride and Cumminsville are two small villages adjoining each other in the south-eastern part of the county, about one mile and a quarter from the line dividing Wentworth county from Halton, and about two miles and a half from the village of Carlisle, in the former county. A few miles further on is the large village of Waterdown. In March of this year (1884), eleven out of thirteen of the business men, mechanics, etc., of Cumminsville declared that if business had been affected at all by the Scott Act it had been affected favorably.

Business Improving in Milton.

A number of merchants in Milton, the county town of Halton, have testified to a large increase in their business. They are doing more business than before and doing it on a better basis.

Testimony to the Success of the Act

has been given by the Warden of the County, the Sheriff, the Jailer, the Police Magistrate, Constables, Justices of the Peace, Reeves, Deputy-Reeves, and a host of other unimpeachable witnesses, among whom are nearly all the clergymen of the county, and—most convincing evidence of all—the people have just increased their majority in its favor by OVER 120 PER CENT.

Rev. D. L. Brethour says

"No law ever placed upon the Statute Books of this country has so powerfully arrested, controlled and demoralized the liquor business as this Scott law has. It has a grip in it which this trade feels to its very centre of power. The men who deal in 'the bottled host of death,' hate it, and have set all their machinery of power to defeat it, but the temperance people are yet more vigorously rallying to the enforcement of the law. There is now no poetry in violating the Act. It secures no applause, approval or sympathy from any man of decent reputation. Only the lowest and most

debauched of men think there is anything of which to boast in such transgressions. It is not considered even moderately clever to break the law and sell liquor contrary to its provisions. On the contrary, it is a very risky and serious matter. The shadows of the prison loom up before many of them and throw themselves threateningly across their path, and with silent gesture warn them of approaching danger. The respectability of liquor-selling in Halton is forever destroyed."

W. Kerns, Esq., M. P. P.,

a merchant of Burlington and Representative for Halton county in the Ontario Legislature, has given strong testimony in favor of the Act, and in the recent contest travelled over the county addressing meetings in its favor.

W. McCraney, Esq., M. P.,

Halton's Representative in the House of Commons, a well-known prosperous and popular business man of Oakville writes:—

"I will give you my candid convictions, obtained from actual observations and information. First.—The Scott Act has been a success in Halton far beyond our most sanguine expectations. Second.—It has almost entirely destroyed the pernicious treating system, and saves scores of young men and old toppers; it has saved thousands of dollars to the poor and rich that would otherwise have been spent in liquors. I could give you the names of liberal men of means who are opposed to the Act, but who admit that they have saved hundreds of dollars that formerly went for treating, and how employers of labor, instead of fearing that their men may be led to drink and consequent neglect of their work, they have no fear now but the men will be found sober and industrious. I can produce the evidence of a large majority of the employers of labor in Halton to bear me out in the statement. Third.—There were forty-two hotels under license before the passage of the Act, and it has been estimated by reliable men that from seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars per annum was taken over the hotel bars. Now there is scarcely any, and drinking in all forms is greatly lessened. My opinion, and that of many others, is, that not one-tenth is drank now. If there is any drinking now, it is done in holes and dens without the sanction of the law, where few respectable men will go. They prefer to do without it, as is the case here largely. Fourth. The law is much better administered here than the Crooks Act ever was, or any other license law to my knowledge, when there was continual contravention by those engaged in the business of selling liquor. If the Act does not curtail the traffic and lessen the drinking, why are its opponents fighting it to the death? Fifth.—It has not injured business, but improved it, by diverting fifty to seventy-five thousand dollars per annum in this county from the pockets of those engaged in the traffic, to the pockets of the butchers, bankers, merchants, shoemakers and others, for the purpose of the necessities and luxuries of life, which must have improved business. There were parties here before the Scott Act was passed who purchased sugar by the pound and tea by the ounce, who can now purchase by the dollar's worth, and there are fewer paupers, fewer criminals, and but few prosecutions outside of those for contraventions of the Act. Our opponents fail to acknowledge (although it is a fact) that times are dull all over Canada and the United States, but we feel it in Halton less than other places. I have travelled over a considerable portion of Ontario, and especially the adjoining counties to Halton, and know whereof I speak. The financial condition of this beautiful town of Oakville is on a firmer basis now than before the Act was passed. For many years six thousand dollars of the taxes were allowed to go uncollected year after year. Now, we understand, nearly all this accumulation of back taxes and consequent loss to the town has been collected. Some opponents have been bold enough to assert that the taxes are higher than before; but that is not correct; they have been considerably higher when under license. Sixth.—The Scott Act has not cost the county of Halton one dollar. The fines have been ample to pay all costs for the administration of the law, and the machinery for working the law is so much more complete than the Crooks Act that it is utterly impossible to break it with that impunity as was the Crooks Act continuously. Occasionally there are persons seen under the influence of liquor, mostly obtained outside the county, but bear in mind that they are 'observed by all observers,' as it is the hotel-keepers' interest, 'from fear of law,' to keep them out of the back-room, cellar or stable, where they formerly used to sleep off their debauch. Now they are seen by all, and it appears to be the especial mission of opponents to bewail that occasionally a person is seen under the influence of liquor, when there were scores to one while under license. Speaking for myself, and I believe the majority of the temperance people of this town, before the passage of the Act it frequently reminded us (from a moral point of view) of Paradise lost; now it is Paradise regained, the change has been so marvellous, especially this year and at the present time.

Volumes could be filled with evidence similar to that given above. VOTE FOR THE SCOTT ACT.