

COMPENSATION.

Taking into consideration the many millions of capital invested in the liquor business, we may well pause to consider what would be the consequences should a prohibition vote carry. And we doubt if the government has given the question that mature thought and consideration due to a matter of such vital importance. To attempt to put a prohibitory law into force without compensation would be worse than robbery, the liquor trade having been recognized and encouraged since the country was first discovered, as one of its most legitimate industries, the development of which has been simply in accord with the wishes and tastes of the people. Capitalists have been invited to invest their money in the trade, in various ways. The governments have, and are now drawing enormous revenues yearly out of it. Not only would it be criminal, but a gross breach of international commercial faith. Even though a majority should vote for it, it is a serious thing to destroy, or even attempt to destroy at one fell swoop, a trade which we have encouraged others to help us build up.

Unless due compensation be paid to all for the loss they sustain by our actions, and the amount necessary to do that almost takes our breath away, it would certainly double the debt of the Dominion.

Are we prepared for that?

What would Prohibition mean?

It would mean less freight for our steamships, consequently less work for the men on the wharf.

It would mean less travel on our rivers and lakes, less work for sailors and shipbuilders.

It would mean the absence of 75 per cent. of the visitors to our cities and towns and beautiful natural sights with an equal loss to the hotels, who thrive upon the visits of our neighbors and other visitors.

It would mean that every barman would be thrown out of work.

It would mean that the manufacturers of Ginger Ale and other kindred drinks would have to discharge 90 per cent. of their help.

It would mean that every man engaged in a brewery or a malthouse, would be wanting work.

It would mean that the beer bottlers and drivers' places would be declared vacant.

It would mean the discharge of thousands of clerks, the closing up of warehouses and offices and the laying idle of immense plants to rot.

It would mean that all property would depreciate in value, yet be taxed higher.

It would mean a loss of revenue to the country, that would have to be made up from extra charges upon the workingman's food and clothing.

It would mean that the glass blowers would have to support one third of their men out of work.

It would mean less work for the men who build the waggons and drays, and shoe the horses engaged

in the delivery or removal of liquor of any kind.

It would mean that fifty per cent. of the cigar and tobacco workers would not be needed.

It would mean almost the destruction of the cooper trade.

It would affect hundreds of printers and lithographers to their detriment.

It would force the farmers to sell their grain for less, owing to the contraction of the market.

It would mean the loss of hundreds of thousands to our railways and their employees through not having to carry beer, grain and liquors.

It would mean low wages, long hours and no recreation.

It would mean that the only solace or bright spark of forgetfulness of sorrow and trouble in the workingman's life, would be taken away, while the wealthy would enjoy their high class clubs while out, and the best of wines while at home.

It would mean the establishing of hundreds of shebeens and illicit stills for the manufacture of whiskey.

It would make of every drug store a saloon in disguise.

In fact it would demoralize the whole community and make hypocrites of us all.

In conclusion it would make us ungodly: for there are always some who are ready to perish, and of heavy hearts, and are we not told in the Bible, Proverbs, 31st chapter, 6 and 7 verses, that king Lemuel mother advised him, to give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts.

Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more. Did not St. Paul advise that a little wine was good for the stomach. How then, shall we pervert the law by obeying the prohibitionists.

HYDRAULIC PUMPS.

A deputation from the two Licensed Victuallers' Associations of this city, consisting of Theo. Lanctôt (chairman), E. R. Fitzgerald, E. L. Ethier, P. Monette, V. Lemay, John McDaid, L. A. Lapointe, W. Henderson, Ned Bell of E. A. Eker's & Co., and T. Cushing, representing the Montreal Brewing Co., waited upon the Water Committee on Tuesday afternoon to present the following petition:

To the Chairman and Members
of the Water Committee.

Gentlemen:—

We, the undersigned on behalf of the Licensed Victuallers Associations of Montreal respectfully state that on the fifth instant Mr. Laforest, Superintendent of the Department presented for your consideration a report on "hydraulic beer pumps." In it he states that from investigation by officers of the Water Department, he found that these beer pumps caused a certain waste of water and he asks your committee to act on his report.

Following the presentation of this report, Mr. Laforest has sent to us a circular asking us to send him a request for a meter, and if such request is not received by him within ten days, that, acting under *By-Law* 65 section 7 of the Department, that each and all of us using these pumps neglecting to send such request for a meter will be sued.

It was our misfortune not to have had the opportunity to be heard before your committee had accepted Mr. Laforest's report and we now respectfully beg that you will grant us that privilege before final proceedings are taken.

In the first place, we would beg to call your attention to the fact that in connecting the hydraulic pump with the water pipes, we only have acted within our rights and not fraudulently, as within the meaning of the *By-Law*, as the special tax we pay to the City gives us the right to use the water supplied us to the best advantage of our business.

Secondly, the alleged waste of water is so small as to be of but little account comparatively when the expense to the City of putting in meters is taken into consideration.

Thirdly, it is true that we would have to pay the City three Dollars a year rent for these meters, but this would be but a small return for the original cost to the Department in putting them in. We would be taxed these three dollars with no benefit to the Corporation whatever.

As citizens and heavy tax payers, we consider that our side of the question at issue deserves careful consideration, we believe that having to contribute a stipulated sum for the right to conduct a hotel or a restaurant, we are not in the position of the private citizen or business man who has no such burden to bear.

Gentlemen, we leave the matter in your hands being convinced that you will do us justice, and that the facts we have presented to you will have your due consideration before you act on the report of your superintendent.

We have the honor to remain,
Your most obedient and humble servants,

(Signed) Arthur Jones, tres.; Théo. Lanctôt, pres.; E. R. Fitzgerald, sec.; L. A. Lapointe, sec.; T. A. Lynch, H. Dubois, C. Vallée, Jos. Riendeau, V. Lemay, E. Cadieux, etc.,
Montreal, Oct. 1897.

The aldermen present being aldermen Costigan, Kinsella, Jacques, Oimet and Prenoveau.

The deputation were represented by Mr. J. O. Pelland, advocate, who fully explained the objects of the petition, and the desires of the petitioners. The committee deeming the matter of so much importance thought it best to refer it to a sub-committee, composed of aldermen Kinsella, Jacques and the chairman, to report back at an early date.

OUR PAPER

Beyond doubt, this paper which will reach every liquor dealer in this province, will be found the best possible advertising medium for all importers, manufacturers, distillers and wholesale merchants of liquors, wines, beer, aerated waters, cigars and tobacco.

THE PLEBISCITE BILL.

Apart from the various delegations that waited upon the Premier during the last session of parliament in reference to the Plebiscite Bill, so little transpired in connection with the matter, that quite a large number of those directly interested, really never knew what did transpire. For their information, we reproduce from *Hansard* the questions and answers given bearing upon the subject.

Mr. Davin (for Mr. Taylor) asked:

1. Is the promise made by the Premier to the temperance people and to this House, viz.: "That at the pre-

sent session he would introduce and pass a Plebiscite Bill," to be fulfilled, and will such a Bill be introduced and passed at the present session?

2. If so, when will the said Bill be introduced?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to pass a law enforcing prohibition in the provinces in which the plebiscite has already been submitted by the Liberal Governments, that is to say, Manitoba, Ontario, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, with the distinct understanding in each province that if it carried, a law would be passed giving effect to the will of the people?

4. It is the intention of the Government to submit the same question again to those provinces which have already pronounced in its favour.

5. And if when submitted, are there to be other questions asked, such as, "Are you in favour of direct taxation to make up the loss of revenue," or "are you in favour of compensation to the manufacturers whose business would be ruined by the enforcement of such an Act?"

Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) in whose name this question is placed on the Order paper, not being present, the question had better stand as I wish to refer to the form of it.

Mr. Davin. If there is any objection to the form it might be amended.

Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that the first part of the question makes an assertion, which may or may not be controverted. If the question were put in the form "was such and such a promise made by such and such a person" it would be more in order.

Mr. Davin. I will put the question in that form as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is very anxious to have the question answered.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Premier's compulsory absence from Parliament attending the Diamond Jubilee of Her Majesty will necessitate the postponement of several measures which it was the intention of the Government to recommend to the Parliament this session. Amongst these are the Franchise and Plebiscite Bills. The Government has concluded that as the former Bill ought to determine the franchise on which the plebiscite should be taken, and as the Premier was personally desirous of being present when they were under consideration by the House it was necessary to postpone further action with respect to them till next session. The details of the Plebiscite Bill will be pronounced on its introduction.

It will be observed that it is the intention of the Government to first amend the Franchise, which will determine the vote, upon which the plebiscite will be taken.

Nay, Never!

Alexander—There is one thing to be thankful for: the mother-in-law joke has been laughed out of existence.

Philip (gloomily)—Yes, but the mother-in-law hasn't. — *Typographical Journal*.