

THE VANGUARD.

JANUARY, 1894.

WHAT NEXT ?

This is the question now in many hearts and on many lips in the Province of Ontario. A magnificent victory for the prohibition cause was won in the expression of opinion recorded at the polls on January 1st. Those who voted against the liquor traffic are anxious to know what will be the practical outcome of their declaration of opinion.

At the last session of the Ontario Legislature there was introduced into the House by Mr. G. F. Marter a bill proposing to entirely prohibit the retail sale of liquor. The House declined to enact the measure on the advice of the attorney-general, who stated that there was uncertainty as to the jurisdiction of the legislature to enact so large a measure of prohibition. The leader of the opposition took the ground that the bill, in proposing to prohibit the retail traffic was really only a restrictive measure, and that the right of the legislature to enact it was therefore clear. The attorney-general proposed to refer to the courts the whole question of the powers of the legislature in relation to the liquor traffic. This has since been done by the submission to the Supreme Court of the series of questions which will be found on page 92 of the December VANGUARD. It is expected that the decision of the Supreme Court will be

reviewed by the Privy Council. The decision of the latter body will finally and authoritatively settle the question.

It is certain that this settlement of the jurisdiction question will not be attained before the close of the next session of the legislature, which session will begin next month. The expression of public opinion has, however, been so strong that the legislature cannot afford to ignore it. Prohibitionists are anxious for immediate progress. They are and will be impatient of anything that seems like delay. There is, therefore, a great deal of anxiety as to what position our legislators will take and what action they will propose.

A number of temperance workers argue that the opinion of the leader of the opposition in the legislature is absolutely correct, and that the House's authority to prohibit liquor selling is not to any extent doubtful. They declare the opinion that the reference to the Courts is an expedient to retard settlement of the prohibition question, and demand the immediate enactment of a law similar to the measure which the House declined to pass last session.

On the other hand other earnest prohibitionists oppose this action. They claim that the vote of the people was given with an understanding that there should be a settlement of the question of jurisdiction before the enactment of legislation. This claim is based upon the fact that the Plebiscite Act and the Instructions to Voters, contained the following statement:—

Electors in voting "yes" on this question will be considered as expressing an opinion in favor of prohibition to the extent to which the Legislature of this Province or the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, as may be determined by the court of final resort.

They express a fear that legislation respecting which any uncertainty existed, would be therefore ineffective, that its enforcement would be hampered by litigation, and that the difficulties connected with such a condition of affair^s would be harmful to the prohibition cause.

Hon. R. W. Scott, of Ottawa, who as Secretary of State in 1878 introduced into the Dominion Parliament the measure known as the Canada Temperance Act, has expressed opinions upon the question which will be found in the present issue of this journal. He believes that the legislature has authority to enact prohibition of retail selling, but thinks that it would be wise to simply enact further rigid restrictions of the traffic pending the action of the courts upon the question submitted. He to a certain extent agrees with, and differs from, both of the other opinions above set out.

A certain amount of control of the liquor traffic is, without question, vested in each of five different parties:

1. The Dominion Parliament has unquestioned authority to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors
2. Local legislatures have unquestioned authority to limit licenses and otherwise control the liquor traffic to any extent short of prohibition. Their right to enact prohibitory laws is disputed.
3. Municipal councils in Ontario have power to limit the number of licenses to be issued within their respective jurisdictions, such limitation always being within the statutory limitations provided by the legislature.
4. Boards of license commissioners in Ontario have authority to further limit the number of licenses to be issued, to fix hours of sale and to make other regulations for the management of licensed places.
5. Electors in Ontario have authority by petition to prevent the issue of new licenses, to oppose the renewal of licenses and in conjunction with municipal councils to enact local option by-laws.

It is manifest that responsibility in relation to the liquor traffic rests with all the parties that have any authority in the matter. At the present time, however, special attention is being paid to the Ontario Legislature. That body provided for the taking of the recent plebiscite, and as a result

has before it now a complete declaration of the opinions of those to whom it is responsible and who have constituted it. It is expected to respond promptly to the demand of the electorate. The members of it will shortly appeal to the people for re-election. In that appeal those members who seek re-election will be expected to justify the course taken by them in the legislature. These facts centre most of the present interest round the approaching Legislative Assembly session.

This fact does not diminish any of the responsibility resting upon the other parties named. In localities where temperance sentiment is strong enough to extinguish the local liquor traffic, it is the duty of temperance men to take advantage of their strength and rid themselves immediately of the curse. It is their duty to press municipal councils for further curtailment and restriction of the dangerous traffic. It is their business to use all the influence they can exert to induce license commissioners to exercise their powers in the same direction. There is no inconsistency in doing all they can for themselves while urging the legislature to do still more.

The Dominion Parliament, whose power is supreme and unquestioned, must be urged at once and earnestly to take the complete and effective action, which it alone has authority to take. The fact that other bodies are possessed of limited power does not relieve the supreme body of the duty of putting down the liquor traffic, and the responsibility for the continued existence of all the evils that result from it.

But as has been already said, the present position of the legislature, what it has done, what it may do, and the conflicting views held regarding it, all make it the immediate centre of interest and the immediate object of prohibitionists' action and demand. The question everywhere asked is, "How will that legislature respond?"

What CAN the legislature do? It can certainly place itself on record as being in sympathy with public opinion and in favor of total suppression of the liquor traffic. It can join the people it represents in urgent demand upon the Dominion Parliament for the full legislation that body alone can enact. It can certainly restrict, repress, curtail the liquor traffic far within the limits inside of which it is permitted to operate. These are certainties. There may be dispute as to the wisdom or usefulness of any of these courses; there is no doubt as to the power of the legislature in reference to them.

It is in regard to action beyond all these that the controversy exists. Some earnest prohibitionists are demanding the immediate enactment of prohibition of retail liquor selling, while others plead that it would be detrimental to the cause to take such action before the jurisdiction question is definitely settled. Others urge the enactment of a law to be meantime inoperative, but to be brought into force by proclamation after the courts decide what power the legislature has, the proclamation to cover as much of the enacted measure as the courts will declare the legislature competent to pass. Others urge that wisdom would dictate no provincial prohibitory legislation until the jurisdiction of the legislature has been positively defined, when that body may act safely and definitely.

It looks at the present time as if the coming convention would be divided over these possible courses. It looks as if the legislature would be divided in the same way. There need be no difficulty in arriving at conclusions if temperance men will have full confidence in each other's honesty and integrity; if they will believe that differences of judgment may exist without improper motives. Many do. Unfortunately there are others who hasten to charge those who differ from them with being actuated by desire to injure or help a political party. These unworthy attacks have been

so freely made that it is possible some timid men may shrink from honest avowal of their convictions through fear of this misrepresentation. This is a time that demands moral heroism ; all the more so because that moral heroism is liable to be grossly misjudged.

It is not the purpose of this article to set out or advocate a policy. The great convention to meet next month will no doubt give much time and thought to this important question. Those who meet in that gathering ought to be prepared to consider the situation free from any motive other than an earnest desire to accomplish the best results for the prohibition reform. We expect that a great majority of the delegates will do this. It is hardly more desirable to adopt the wisest method than it is to become thoroughly united in carrying it out. Where no principle is at stake personal predilection as to motives should be subordinated to the general views of the plan to be followed. There was union and co-operation in our ranks that ensured success, in the battle that has just been fought. The same conditions will ensure still better results in the future. A failure on the part of any to fall in with the method approved by the majority would mean weakness to the extent of that hesitation. United we have won. United we shall win.

a
t
C
o
a
fo

qu

tro
jur
sol
int
erc
of
tab
whe
liqu
in C
of li
Cana
made
the t
"I
Cana

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION.

The Hon. R. W. Scott, of Ottawa, was recently asked by a representative of the VANGUARD to state his views upon the present position of the prohibition movement in Ontario. In reply, the learned Senator gave his opinion on the respective powers of the federal and provincial authorities on the subject of the liquor traffic in the following terms:—

“I see no reason for changing the opinion I have frequently expressed on this question.

“It may be laid down as a well settled point in the controversy that the Federal Parliament—as an incident of its jurisdiction over trade and commerce—can prohibit absolutely the manufacture and importation of intoxicants into Canada. It is equally clear that this power can be exercised in reference to one or more Provinces; as evidence of the exercise of this power I may refer to the Act establishing a government in the North-west Territories where neither the importation nor the manufacture of liquors was permitted; to the Act authorizing the Governor in Council to issue a proclamation prohibiting the sale of liquors in the vicinity of public works; and also to the Canada Temperance Act. By that statute it is moreover made apparent that the Parliament of Canada may prohibit the traffic even over so small an area as a county or city.

“It is therefore beyond question that the Parliament of Canada may at any time absolutely and entirely put a stop

to the liquor traffic over the whole Dominion, in any province of the Dominion, or even in any part of a Province.

“As under the B.N.A. Act the Provinces and the municipalities have the right to derive a revenue from the licensing of shops, saloons and taverns, it would not seem fair or reasonable to cancel or withdraw that source of revenue, except at the instance of the localities interested. It was largely on those lines that the Canada Temperance Act was passed, Parliament recognizing that if the rate-payers in the municipality affected decided to stop the licensing and prohibit the traffic they could do so by adopting the Act.

“I by no means wish to convey the idea that the Parliament of Canada could not pass such a statute, unless first carried by a vote of the people, but the expression of the desire of those interested to stop the traffic was a justification for the action of Parliament.

“On the same principle I do not think the Parliament of Canada should take away from a Province the large element of its revenue derived from licenses unless with the express approval of its people, and of its legislature, otherwise Parliament might fairly be asked to add to the provincial subsidy.

“It is conceded that prohibition can only be a success when supported by an educated public sentiment permeating a very considerable majority of the community, and for that reason prohibition can be best attained in Canada by its adoption first in those Provinces where public opinion is strongly in its favour, and where the provincial and municipal authorities will unite with those of the federal power in sustaining the law.

“As an illustration it will be conceded that while the public sentiment in Prince Edward Island will make the

law a success in that Province, yet its introduction at present into British Columbia would be unwise and would only tend to bring the law into contempt and derision.

“Where in any Province the opinions of the people have been formally invoked by the local legislature, and it has been shown by the votes of the people that public sentiment is in favour of prohibition, THE LEAST that the legislature can do is to place on record its acquiescence in the vote of the people, request the Parliament of Canada to pass a prohibitory law for the Province and to express its readiness to discontinue the licensing system, and to attach penalties for sales without licenses.”

In reply to the question, HOW MUCH can a provincial legislature do in reducing the traffic, Mr. Scott said:—

“The licensing of shops, saloons and taverns before Confederation was always regarded as being under municipal control, and municipalities undoubtedly possessed the power to limit, or even to prohibit sales of liquor by retail.

“The B.N.A. Act does not withdraw from the provinces or municipalities the powers previously enjoyed and expressly vested in them, to exclusively license, the traffic. The case of *Hodge v. the Queen*, and the judgment of the Supreme Court of the Privy Council on the submission of the *McCarthy Act* of 1883 established that the licensing power rested exclusively with the Provinces.

“The provincial legislatures cannot interfere with trade and commerce, and could not of course prohibit the importation or manufacture of intoxicants ; but the provincial legislatures would certainly seem to possess the power to limit or restrict the licensing system as affecting taverns, saloons and also shops, except where liquors are being sold in the original packages, the usual definition of which was generally accepted as being in quantities of not less than five gallons, or in cases of not less than 1 doz. bottles.

"In the second session of the Ontario House, 1868-9, at a time when it is to be presumed that the fathers of confederation were familiar with the B.N.A. Act the Legislative Assembly of Ontario passed an "Act respecting tavern and shop licenses" in which power was given to the council of every township, town and incorporated village, and to the commissioner of police in cities to pass by-laws,

'For prohibiting the sale by retail of spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors in any tavern, inn or other house or place of public entertainment: Provided that the by-law before the final passing thereof has been duly approved of by the electors of the municipality in the manner provided by the Acts twenty-nine and thirty Victoria, chapter fifty-one.'

"The right of the legislature to pass that Act has never been successfully challenged."

The judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal on the submission for its opinion of the 18th sec. of the liquor license law of 1890 (the local option law) supports the conclusion that the licensing system including sales by retail is under provincial control, and can be limited or prohibited.

In answer to the request for an expression of opinion on the questions submitted to the Supreme Court, Mr. Scott said:

"As the whole subject has been discussed in former references, it may not be considered too presuming to anticipate the answers, if the courts follow in their judgments on the lines previously adopted and laid down.

1st Question. Has a Provincial Legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the sale within the Province, of spirituous, fermented or other intoxicating liquors?

"The answer to the first question must be that the provincial legislature cannot prohibit the sale if in the original package; whether the court will go on and explain to what extent, if any, provinces may prohibit sales in saloons, taverns and shops is uncertain. Judges do not volunteer opinions unless called for.

2. Or has the Legislature such jurisdiction regarding such portions of the Province as to which the Canada Temperance Act is not in operation?

As to the second question the answer would be that the powers of the Legislative Assembly would be limited to those parts of the Province not under the C. T. Act.

3. Has a Provincial Legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the manufacture of such liquors within the Province?

"To the third question the simple answer must be NO.

4. Has a Provincial Legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the importation of such liquors into the Province?

"To the fourth question, a similar answer NO.

5. If a Provincial Legislature has not jurisdiction to prohibit sales of such liquors, irrespective of quantity, has such legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the sale, by retail, according to the definition of a sale by retail, either in statutes in force in the Province at the time of Confederation, or any other definition thereof.

"To the fifth question the answer should be YES.

6. If a Provincial Legislature has a limited jurisdiction only as regards the prohibition of sales, has the Legislature jurisdiction to prohibit sales subject to the limits provided by the several sub-sections of the 99th section of 'The Canada Temperance Act,' or any of them (Revised Statutes of Canada, chap. 106, sec. 99.)

"To the sixth question YES.

7. Had the Ontario Legislature jurisdiction to enact the 18th section of the Act passed by the Legislature of Ontario, in the 53rd year of Her Majesty's reign, and intituled 'An Act to improve the Liquor License Acts,' as said section is explained by the Act passed by the said Legislature, in the 54th year of Her Majesty's reign, and intituled 'An Act respecting Local Option in the matter of liquor selling?'

"To the seventh question the answer should be YES, if it is explained to the court, and the explanation be accepted by it, that the words 'and for prohibiting altogether the sale thereof in shops and places other than houses of public entertainment' in the 18th sec. refer only to sales by retail, and not to sales in the original packages.

"Unless that interpretation is accepted the language is so comprehensive that it might be argued that the clause gives

power for the passing of a by-law by a municipality prohibiting all sales, an interpretation that was never intended, and one that our own courts would not give it; but which might be misunderstood by the Privy Council.

“The Provincial Legislature must necessarily take some cognizance of the result of the plebiscite, and there can be no doubt that there will be an expression of opinion on the policy to be pursued.

“My own views in the course to be followed have been so recently given to the press that I need not here repeat them, further than to observe that joint action by the provincial and federal powers would effectually settle the question of jurisdiction and leave nothing for the courts to adjust.

“As absolute prohibition however can only be obtained at Ottawa and as no doubt exists as to the powers of the federal authority, it is important that the several temperance organizations in Ontario should send petitions to parliament calling attention to the recent vote and asking for the passage of a prohibitory law.

“This action is all the more necessary as the Government will no doubt submit to the House for ratification the treaty recently made with France under which wines of that country imported into Canada and testing 26 degrees or less of alcohol are exempted from the 30% ad valorem duty. The adoption of this treaty must necessarily embarrass the prohibition question, for though either party may terminate the treaty by giving 12 months notice it would seem more consistent and more in harmony with public sentiment to decline making such a treaty at a time when we are proposing to adopt a law prohibiting the importation of all intoxicants.

“Unless the friends of temperance protest against the proposed treaty, the Government will no doubt influence

Parliament to ratify it, thus complicating this important question."

The question was asked Mr. Scott "You have just said that 'the least the Legislature can do is to place on record its acquiescence in the vote of the people.'" In what way would you suggest that this could be done?

Mr. Scott replied "I would not presume to lay down a policy for either the Ontario Legislature or the friends of the temperance cause. The Legislature will be largely guided by the advice of the Premier, and as Mr. Mowat does not agree with me in the interpretation of the B.N.A. Act I cannot expect that he would surrender his opinions to mine. I recognize that his position involves great responsibilities in dealing with so important a subject. His judgment on the constitutional issues that have arisen in the past between Ontario and the Dominion, such as on the Streams Bill, the Ontario Boundary, and on many other subjects has always proved to be sound, and his opinions on the prohibition question are therefore entitled to very great respect.

"But in addition to the adoption of a resolution requesting the Parliament of Canada to pass a prohibitory law for the Province, the Legislature might wisely and safely emphatically declare its approval of the principle of prohibition, and pledge itself to enact prohibitory legislation as far as the decision to be given would warrant it in so doing, such enactment to follow the decision of the Court at the earliest period possible.

"And as the power of the Provincial Legislature to reduce the number of licenses is not disputed, it would be making an advance toward prohibition if an Act was passed diminishing the number to one-half, and doubling the fees. This action would be a fair warning to those engaged in the

traffic, that its days were numbered, and an intimation that they must seek some other occupation.

“If the Legislature adopt the suggestions I have outlined, such a course (under the existing circumstances of the present reference to the courts) would probably meet with the approval of the temperance people, substantial progress will have been made in reducing the traffic, and the advance towards prohibition will have been kept well within the limits of the constitution, even as interpreted by those who think the Provincial Legislatures cannot prohibit the retail traffic.”

e
g
P
a

n
v
b
p
al
to
pa
pu
?
an
ch
tit
pa

ANNOUNCEMENT.

Following close upon the plebiscite there was held a meeting of the union committee which summoned the convention held in October, 1893. This committee decided upon calling prohibitionists together for conference again, and has issued the following "call" which fully explains itself.

UNION PROHIBITION CONVENTION, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, 1894.

The plebiscite taken on January 1st last, resulted in a magnificent majority in favor of immediate total prohibition, clearly demonstrating that public sentiment in this province demands effective legislation for the abolition of the license system, and the suppression of the liquor traffic.

In view of the sweeping character of the vote, and in order that temperance workers may be thoroughly united in wise and energetic action to secure the very best outcome of the victory already won, it has been deemed advisable to summon another convention similar to that held in Toronto in October last. The undersigned representatives of the organizations which united in the "call" for the gathering named, therefore unite in calling a general provincial representative convention of friends of temperance and prohibition.

Representation.

Every friend of right who may receive this "call" is earnestly urged to use his influence to make the coming convention a success. Officers of all societies are requested to bring the matter before their respective organizations; pastors are requested to lay it before their congregations; all these bodies are earnestly requested to appoint delegates to the convention on the basis hereinafter set out; newspaper editors are respectfully requested to give it as much publicity as possible.

The plan of representation is as follows:— Every church and society to be entitled to two representatives, and each church or society having more than fifty members, to be entitled to an additional delegate for each fifty or fractional part of fifty after the full fifty members.

The following organizations are to be entitled to representation on the basis named :—

Branches of the W.C.T.U., Divisions of Sons of Temperance, Lodges of the I.O.G.T., Councils of the R.T. of T., Branches of the League of the Cross, prohibition clubs, and other prohibition or temperance organizations, church congregations, Young Men's Christian Associations, Salvation Army corps, Societies of Christian Endeavor, Epworth Leagues, Branches of St. Andrew's Brotherhood, Baptist Young People's Unions, any other young people's associations in connection with church work ; the Provincial officers and executive committee of the Ontario branch of the Dominion Alliance, the chairman and secretary of each county, riding, or city plebiscite committee, and the chairman of the committee for each municipality or ward, to be also members of the convention.

The convention will meet in the horticultural pavilion, Toronto, on Tuesday, February 6th, at 9.30 a.m.

Reduced fares will be given by all railway lines. Each delegate will purchase on starting, a regular, single-fare ticket to Toronto. He will also procure from the ticket agent at the same time a standard certificate, filled out, showing that he has purchased said ticket. This certificate he will present to the secretary of the convention, who will sign it. It will then entitle him to a return ticket free of cost.

Delegates are specially requested to procure the standard certificates before starting, as otherwise they will not be entitled to the free return. Those having to travel over roads operated by different companies should procure a certificate for each.

AN APPEAL.

It is expected that this meeting shall be even larger and more important than that held in the same place last October. All the organizations entitled to representation are earnestly urged to send delegates, and to do all in their power to make the convention a complete success.

PROHIBITION IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

BY B. D. HIGGS.

Editor of The Charlottetown Morning Guardian.

Prince Edward Island has uttered its voice on the prohibition question through a provincial plebiscite, and now stands hand in hand with Manitoba and Ontario awaiting the action of its other sister provinces.

Taking everything into consideration the vote for prohibition was a good one. Taken as it was amid the excitement and turmoil of a provincial general election, it shows that our people are thoroughly alive to the importance of the issue.

The plebiscite disposed of, the interest of temperance people throughout the island is now centring in Charlottetown. The preliminaries have been completed here to bring on another Scott Act campaign, and all are hoping that at an early day our little capital will undo the wrong it did to the whole province three years ago by repealing the Scott Act and making itself a general bar-room to which the weak and the dissolute could resort from the Scott Act country districts.

THE SCOTT ACT ADOPTED.

The Province of Prince Edward Island has always been noted for the temperate character and strong moral sentiment of its population. When the Scott Act was passed

by the Dominion Parliament in 1878, Prince Edward Island prohibitionists at once began work to secure the benefits of the new enactment. On December 20th of the same year it was voted upon and adopted in Prince County P.E.I. On April 24th, 1879, it was carried in the City of Charlottetown, on May 29th in King's County, and on September 22nd of the following year in Queen's County. The three counties have been under the Scott Act ever since. In 1884 an effort was made to repeal the law in Prince County, but an increased majority was recorded in favor of it. The same year a repeal campaign in Charlottetown resulted in the sustaining of the Act. A like result attended another attempt in 1887.

THE LAW IN OPERATION.

In the counties of Prince Edward Island the operation of the Scott Act has been, and still is, so effective that no one entertains any further idea of its repeal. It commends itself to the people, and they will not give it up until it is replaced by a more thorough-going and general law.

For about twelve years or so the Canada Temperance Act was in force in Charlottetown, as it still is throughout the province. At times, when law enforcement was weak, the monster Drink grew bold and thrust forth his evil hand. At other times, when honestly administered, the Scott Act muzzled the traffic and drove it into the earth. These conditions alternated, the conflict went on, and the lesson learned was that prohibition (by Scott Act) when enforced, prohibited.

No city in which the liquor traffic has flourished can rid itself in a day of the spirit of lawlessness which the traffic engenders. This Charlottetown found out to her cost. The liquor dealers, of course, were fighting for their living

and stopped at nothing. Circumstances favored the lawless, too, in peculiar ways. When the city was smaller than it is now it was divided into wards, each ward having the same number of representatives in the city council. No provision was made for additional wards when the city grew. In time the two northern wards extended far beyond their first boundaries, and here the great bulk of the best class of citizens resided. In the lower wards the rum party was pretty well hived, and the result was that it managed to secure control of the council and of the police. A special Scott Act prosecutor who had been appointed was dismissed. Several of the councillors sold liquor themselves, and made every effort to hamper and obstruct the law.

Another obstacle, almost insurmountable for a time, was a stupid decision of a Supreme Court judge that a liquor known as hop beer was not an intoxicating, but an "exhilarating" beverage, and therefore not prohibited from sale by the law. This decision was at once followed by a deluge of beer-drinking in Charlottetown, which had most demoralizing results. To overcome these the temperance people worked strenuously. The beer nuisance was largely stopped by decisions of the other Supreme Court judges convicting the liquor dealers for the sale of hop beer. The trouble with the city council was only overcome some time after the Scott Act was repealed, when a redistribution bill for changing the divisions of the city was passed.

With these disadvantages the prospect at times was most disheartening. But our temperance workers never lost courage. They felt it would be wrong to retract from what they had gained, and they saw light ahead. Besides, they knew that even at its worst, the Scott Act had proved better than the old license law. It had made drinking

disreputable, and by hiding the saloons had done great good. While, before its enactment, our county roads were unsafe to travel on at night after a market-day, under the Scott Act all this was changed. Excepting during the hop beer nuisance, a woman might safely drive any night on any road leading to the city. The country, too, was gradually growing in sobriety.

A REPEAL MOVEMENT SUCCEEDS.

There was, however, enough in the difficulties enumerated to discourage some, and three years ago the liquor men brought on a vote on the question of repeal. For this they had been preparing for many a day. They had done all they could, spending time and money to discredit the law, and now they determined to make a strong effort for license.

In the year 1891, by some way or other, in a revision of the Dominion Voters' Lists, there were left off the list the names of a large number of men who were known to be favorable to prohibition. The liquor party eagerly seized on this opportunity and a petition for another repeal vote was hurried off to Ottawa. The contest came on. The campaign was an eventful one. Nearly every clergyman in the city was for the retention of the law. Mr. Spence stirred the hearts of the people as never before and had he been able to join us sooner in the fight it is likely the act would have been retained. The repealers won with a narrow majority. Their victory may be ascribed partly to the defect in the voters' list just named, and partly to the indifference or discouragement of men who foolishly thought that the Scott Act should be a machine that would supply its own fuel, make its own steam and consume its own smoke.

THE BALLOT BOX RECORD.

The sentiment of the people of Prince Edward Island is pretty well shown by the figures of the votes polled in the different contests to which reference has been made. Taking them altogether they are as follows :

Place.	Votes.		Majority.	
	FOR.	AG'NST.	FOR.	AG'NST.
Prince Co. (1st vote).....	1,762	271	1,491	
Charlottetown (1st vote)...	837	253	584	
Kings Co.....	1076	59	1017	
Queen's Co.....	1317	99	1218	
Prince Co. (2nd vote).....	2939	1065	1874	
Charlottetown (2nd vote)..	755	715	40	
Charlottetown (3rd vote)..	689	669	20	
Charlottetown (4th vote)..	686	700		14

Adding together the results of the latest votings in the three counties and Charlottetown, we find that the last recorded verdict of the electors, through the Scott Act, on the question of prohibition, stands thus.

For Prohibition.....	6018
Against Prohibition.....	1923
Majority for.....	4095

A FREE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

After the repeal there came a period of free rum. During the time the Scott Act was the law of the whole Province the Provincial License Law was inoperative and the probability of its being required again was so small that it was dropped from the statute book. Charlottetown therefore when the Scott Act was repealed had in operation no law whatever, relating to the sale of liquor. The senti-

ment against the liquor traffic and any legal recognition of it was so strong throughout the Province that the Legislature refused to enact a license law. Even under free rum for a time the wonderfully educative effects of the Scott Act were apparent. Men still hesitated to enter the saloons branded as they were by public opinion.

RESTRICTION WITHOUT LICENSE.

Gradually this feeling began to wear away. The evils were so manifest that the Legislature was obliged to recognize them and on an urgent petition of the temperance people, proceeded to pass a law of a unique character. This measure did not license the sale of liquor, did not authorize anyone to carry it on, it simply provided rigid restrictions which all who sold liquor were required to observe. The sale was only permitted during certain hours, in premises having unscreened windows open to the street, having only one entrance and no seating accommodation. A number of other restrictions were also imposed.

HOW IT HAS WORKED.

For a time this plan worked fairly well. But the devil was still in the business, and even this restricting law was and is violated, time and again. The waters were slowly rising behind the dam and now there is no dam at all. Our roads are again dangerous for night travel. Our ferry has not carried so many intoxicated men for years.

If the editor of the VANGUARD could visit Charlottetown to-day he would see the fulfilment of his own prophecy. It is just three years since he stood before a Charlottetown audience, and warned them of the fearful results that would follow repeal. The warning, however, was unheeded. By the narrow majority of about a dozen votes the flood-gates were opened, and so fiercely has the tide of

intemperance surged that within a recent fortnight two men walked over the wharf under the influence of liquor; a boy under sixteen perished from exposure by lying out all night in a drunken sleep; and a man now lies in the hospital, having almost miraculously escaped death in a drunken row in which he was fearfully stabbed and cut. A widow and her orphaned little ones, sorrowing parents and friends, a heart-broken mother, a father and breadwinner taken from his bed while his little child slept beside him, to answer a charge of murderous assault—these and many other similar cases are all directly chargeable to the repeal of the Scott Act in Charlottetown.

A PLEBISCITE.

The result of the plebiscite campaign in Manitoba stirred Prince Edward Island prohibition workers. They felt an earnest desire to have their province similarly placed on record. Accordingly a law was enacted by the provincial legislature providing for the taking a popular vote on the question of prohibition. This vote was taken along with the general provincial election on December 14th, 1893. The total result is given in the following table. The figures for the city of Charlottetown are included in those of Queen's county. They showed in the city proper a majority of 558 in favor of prohibition.

THE VOTE BY COUNTIES.

	FOR.	AGAINST.
Queen's County.....	4,226	1,513
Prince County	3,579	1,109
King's County.....	2,811	768
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Totals	10,616	3,390
Majority for prohibition.....		7,226

ANOTHER SCOTT ACT CAMPAIGN.

Before the plebiscite victory was won the prohibitionists of Charlottetown had commenced operations to redeem their city from the control of the liquor traffic. A petition for re-submission was prepared, duly signed and filed, and arrangements are being made for the vote which is expected to be shortly announced.

Public feeling is being aroused. We know of men who formerly opposed the Scott Act and who are talking approvingly of it now. There is still an element, perhaps a large one, that objects to it, but we are confident that when it is next offered to the citizens it will be accepted by a large majority.

There is encouragement in the fact, too, that the liquor dealers are now pretty well disorganized. They had been fighting for license, and they have been disappointed in their hopes. It is not likely that much money will ever again be spent in fighting the Scott Act. So we look for better days soon in Charlottetown.

LOCAL OPTION IN CANADA.

Total national prohibition is the only form of legislation that will satisfy advanced Canadian temperance workers. Towards that end they are working. Other restrictive or prohibitory measures are looked upon simply as temporary methods of relief from the evils of intemperance, or as agencies for the strengthening and developing of right sentiment in the community. The prohibition principle has a firm grasp upon our people. In every organized part of the Dominion rigid restrictions are imposed upon the liquor traffic. These restrictions are being continually increased, so that we are moving continually towards the legislative end that we have in view.

In every part of the Dominion local option exists to some extent. Every province gives electors some control over the extent of the local liquor traffic. In a number of provinces no applications for the granting of a new license will be considered, unless the applicant has consent to its being granted, given in writing by a majority, and in some places a very large majority, of the electors residing in his neighborhood. In Nova Scotia this consent must be renewed every year. In some places a majority of local electors are allowed to veto the renewal of an existing license. Several provinces give local municipal councils power to limit the number of licenses to be issued.

Besides these restrictive provisions many provinces have also enacted local option laws empowering municipal

councils to entirely prohibit the issue of licenses and the retail selling of liquor. In some cases these municipal enactments require ratification by a popular vote of the local electors before their coming into force. In other places no such approval is required. Details of these different provincial methods of dealing with the liquor traffic will be given from time to time in the VANGUARD, so as to enable readers to understand fully the liquor legislation in every part of the Dominion.

In addition to the provincial local option laws named, our country has also the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, more generally known as the Scott Act. Under this measure total local prohibition of liquor selling may be secured by the following process. In the first place a petition of twenty-five per cent. of the electors of any city or county must ask the Dominion Government to have a general vote of the city or county taken on the question. The voting is then arranged for and superintended by officials appointed by the Dominion Government. The voting is by ballot. If prohibition is approved it goes into operation shortly afterwards, and cannot be repealed for a term of three years. Repeal can only be secured by the same process as that which originally brought the law into operation. If a repeal effort fails it cannot be renewed till three more years have elapsed. Under this law two counties in Quebec and a large number of counties and cities in the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island have prohibition in actual operation.

Prohibition through provincial local option is in force to a greater or less extent in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba.

The difficulties that beset the efforts of those who endeavor to suppress liquor selling by local option, are manifest. Among them are the readiness with which liquor can be procured in adjoining localities under license; the liability to repeal, which is nearly always looked forward to as a possibility, if not a probability, by friends of the traffic, who in this hope persistently make efforts to circumvent a law which has not in it the important element of permanence; the educative influence of contiguous, permitted licensing which prevents the public viewing liquor-selling as they do other violations of law; and other perplexities and obstacles that will readily suggest themselves.

On the other hand it is argued that local option has in it the fair principle of permitting the people to decide what legislation they shall have; that under it prohibition has the advantage of always having in its favor a majority of those affected by it; and that the continual discussion of the prohibition question, which it promotes, is an important educative process.

Generally speaking, however, local option is looked upon by prohibitionists mainly as a stepping-stone between permission and prohibition. They accepted it, in many cases under protest, as a partial recognition of the prohibition principle, for the embodying of which in general legislation they are earnestly, aggressively, and hopefully working.

In this issue of the VANGUARD will be found details of the local option system of Ontario, and of the steps necessary to bring it into operation. This will be of value to many friends who at the present time are writing for information regarding this matter.

THE ONTARIO LOCAL OPTION LAW.

Before Confederation, municipalities in Ontario, which was then a part of the old Province of Canada, had authority to prohibit the retail sale of liquor within their respective limits.

In 1878 the Dominion Parliament enacted the Canada Temperance Act which conferred prohibitory power on a majority of the electors in counties and cities. The old Act then fell into disuse, and was dropped from the provincial statute books.

The Scott Act came into force in a good many counties in the Province of Ontario but was subsequently repealed. After the repeal, temperance workers applied to the Legislature for the re-enactment of the old provincial option law. It was thought by some that the prohibitions of that measure could be made more effective than those of the Scott Act. It was also a measure available for smaller areas than is the Canada Temperance Act. The later measure applied only to a county or a city, local option by-laws could be enacted for the smaller municipalities, a number of which go to make up a county.

This article proposes to consider, firstly, the mode of bringing a local option by-law into operation, and secondly, the provisions of the law thus secured. The recent plebiscite resulted so overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition that in all probability general provincial or national prohibition will

prevail at an early date. The Ontario Legislature will shortly meet. Any legislation enacted by it can hardly be completed before the licenses for the year 1894-5 are issued. This is also true with reference to legislation that may be enacted by the Dominion Parliament. It is pretty clear therefore that we cannot have any such measure come into force before May 1st, 1895, at the very earliest. Local option by-laws if enacted soon will come into force on May 1st, 1894. There is therefore an opportunity open for important immediate restriction and curtailment of the liquor traffic.

At the present crisis it would be very unwise to precipitate a contest in which a victory was not almost certain. There are places, however, where the recent vote shows so much strength of sentiment against the liquor traffic, that it would certainly be wise to take steps to have that sentiment made immediately effective.

1. Method of Procedure.

To bring into operation a prohibitory by-law it is necessary to have such by-law first passed by the municipal council of the municipality in which it is to prevail, and then to have it ratified by a popular vote of the municipal electors.

The active friends of moral reform in different localities are always the best judges of the time and plan for commencing operations. A meeting of workers should first be convened, to which representative, prominent men and women might be invited. All churches and temperance organizations should be requested to take part in such meeting. Clergymen of the different churches will nearly always be found willing to co-operate. At such a gather-

ing the whole situation could be discussed, a committee or committees to direct campaign work appointed, and plans for action decided upon.

As has been stated in order to secure the benefits of this legislation the initiative has to be taken by the municipal councils. There are, however, very few councils that would not do this if requested, as no representatives would like to be in the position of refusing to allow the people to vote upon the question.

In a municipality in which licenses are in force a prohibitory by-law will come into operation on the first day of May following its final passing; that is, on the expiration of the existing licenses. It is well, however, to have voting take place as long as possible before the time of the by-law's coming into force. Reasons will readily suggest themselves in favor of such a course.

In many cases it may be the wisest course to petition the municipal council to take action, so as to bring the matter fairly under notice, although the council may take action without this being done. The petition for this purpose may be signed by ratepayers or by residents as deemed best. It may be in the following terms, or to the like effect:

"To the Municipal Council of the.....of.... .."

GENTLEMEN:—

The petition of the undersigned ratepayers of theof.....humbly sheweth that,

WHEREAS it is provided by the Statutes of Ontario, 53 Vic., cap. 56, sec. 18, that the council of any municipality may pass by-laws for the prohibiting of the sale of intoxicating liquor within the limits of such municipality, and may submit the same to the electors for ratification, and,

WHEREAS your petitioners believe that the enactment and enforcement of such a by-law would be in the interests of the material and moral welfare of the community.

THEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that your honorable body will be pleased to pass such a by-law and submit the same to the electors of the of for ratification, in accordance with the provisions of the said section of the Statutes of Ontario."

The getting of a by-law through the council and attention to the details relating to the same, should be entrusted by temperance workers to the most influential member of the council known to be favorable to the movement. The law relating to procedure is that which governs the voting on by-laws requiring the consent of electors of municipalities, and will be found in the Municipal Act commencing at section 293. Subjoined will be found a suitable form of by-law to be used for the purposes of this new legislation, also of a notice to be attached to the same when it is advertised. The persons entitled to vote at the election of members of the municipal council, and their qualifications are set out in sections 79 and following of the Municipal Act. Women whose names are on the voters' lists are entitled to vote as well as men.

It would be well to begin work even before the circulation of petitions, by the holding of one or more rousing public meetings, at which the new legislation would be fully explained and the duty of supporting it urged upon electors.

Any further information respecting this legislation or any other phase of our Canadian prohibitory work, will be promptly and cheerfully furnished (to the extent of his ability) by the Secretary of the Dominion Alliance, to any friend of the prohibition cause, applying to him either personally or by letter. His address is:—F. S. Spence, 86 King St. East, Toronto.

(Form of By-Law).

A BY-LAW

To prohibit the sale of liquor in the.....of.....

The Municipal Council of the.....of.....hereby enacts as follows :

1.—That the sale by retail of spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors is and shall be prohibited in every tavern, inn or other place of public entertainment in the said municipality, and the sale thereof is altogether prohibited in every shop or place in the said municipality other than a house of public entertainment.

2.—That the vote of the electors of the said.....of.....will be taken on the by-law by the deputy returning officers hereinafter named on.....the.....day of.....One Thousand Eight Hundred and Ninety... , commencing at nine o'clock in the morning and continuing until five o'clock in the afternoon at the undermentioned places :

(Here follows the list of polling subdivisions, polling places and deputy returning officers).

3.—That on the.....day of.....A.D. 189 .., at his office in theof.....at the hour of.....o'clock in the.....noon, the reeve shall appoint in writing signed by himself, two persons to attend at the final summing up of the votes by the clerk, and one person to attend at each polling place on behalf of the persons interested in and desirous of promoting the passing of this by-law, and a like number on behalf of the persons interested in and desirous of opposing the passing of this by-law.

4.—That the clerk of the said municipal council of the.....of.....shall attend at.....at the hour of.....o'clock in the forenoon on the..... day ofA.D. 189.. to sum up the number of votes given for and against this by-law.

5.—This by-law shall come into operation, and be of full force and effect on and after the first day of May next after the final passing thereof.

Council Chamber..... 189 ..

(L.S.)

..... Reeve.

(Form of Notice.)

TAKE NOTICE that the above is a true copy of a proposed by-law which has been taken into consideration by the municipal council of the of and which will be finally passed by the said council in the event of the assent of the electors being obtained thereto, after one month from the first publication thereof in the the date of which publication was the day of, and at the hour, day and places therein fixed for taking the votes of the electors the polls will be held.

.....
Clerk.

2. Local Option Prohibition.

The enactment giving municipalities power to absolutely prohibit the retail sale of liquor is found in the Ontario Statutes 53 Vic., cap. 56, sec. 18, and is in the following terms:—

“The council of every township, city, town and incorporated village may pass by-laws for prohibiting the sale by retail of spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors, in any tavern, inn or any other house or place of public entertainment: and for prohibiting altogether the sale thereof in shops and places other than houses of public entertainment: Provided that the by-law before the final passing thereof, has been duly approved of by the electors of the municipality in the manner provided by the sections in that behalf of the Municipal Act.

“No by-law passed under the provisions of this section shall be repealed by the council passing the same, until after the expiration of three years from the day of its coming into force, nor until a by-law for that purpose shall have been submitted to the electors and approved by them

in the same manner as the original by-law, and if any such repealing by-law (upon being submitted to the electors) is not so approved, no other repealing by-law shall be submitted for the like approval within the full term of three years thereafter."

POSITIVE PROHIBITION.

The right of the legislature to enact this law has been upheld by the Court of Appeal. It is at once simple, comprehensive and effective. Being a part of the so-called "License Act" of the Province of Ontario, it has no special machinery provided for its enforcement. A local option prohibitory by-law simply prevents the issue of liquor licenses. All the machinery and authority of the license law are available under it for the prevention of any liquor selling, as they are elsewhere for the prevention of unlicensed liquor selling. This is made very clear by section 13 of the Liquor License Amendment Act of 1892, which is in the following terms :

"The sale or keeping for sale of liquors without license in any city, town, incorporated village or township in which there is in force any by-law for prohibiting the sale of liquors passed in pursuance of section 18 of the Act passed in the 53rd year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled "An Act to improve the Liquor License Laws," shall nevertheless be a contravention of sections 49 and 50 of this Act; and all the provisions respecting the sale or keeping for sale of liquor in contravention of said sections, and penalties and procedure in reference thereto, shall be of full force and effect in such municipality, notwithstanding such prohibitory by-law.

"Sections 49 and 50 of this Act" referred to in the clause above quoted, are sections 49 and 50 of the Liquor License Act and are as follows :

49. No person shall sell by wholesale or retail any spirituous, fermented, or other manufactured liquors without having first obtained a license under this Act authorizing him so to do; but this section shall not apply to sales under legal process or for distress, or sales by assignees in insolvency

50. No person shall keep or have in any house, building, shop, eating-house, saloon, or house of public entertainment, or in any room or place whatsoever, any spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors for the purpose of selling, bartering or trading therein, unless duly licensed thereto under the provisions of this Act; nor shall the occupant of any such shop, eating-house, saloon, or house of public entertainment, unless duly licensed, permit any liquors, whether sold by him or not, to be consumed upon the premises, by any person other than members of his family, or employees, or guests not being customers.

It will be seen from the sections quoted that a local option prohibitory by-law means absolute prohibition of the retail sale of liquor. The machinery for enforcement has been in course of development and improvement for many years, and is now very strong and effective.

WHOLESALE LIQUOR SELLING.

As the Act now stands a local option by-law does not prohibit the issue of licenses to sell liquor by wholesale. Section 4 of the Liquor License Act, however, defines the sale of liquor by wholesale as selling, bartering or trafficking in liquor in quantities of not less than five gallons each or in the case of lager beer four gallons, or in the case of bottled liquor, one dozen bottles of three half-pints.

Section 35 provides that wholesale licenses shall be issued only for premises on which is carried on no other business than that of wholesaling, and provides that the license shall be void if any retailing is done upon such premises.

Sections 41 and 44 provide that no wholesale license shall be issued for a less fee than \$250.

Section 61 prohibits the consumption of liquor on the premises on which it is wholesaled, or within any building which communicates in any way with such premises.

These restrictions are so stringent as to make wholesaling practically impossible except in a few very populous municipalities. There were last year only nine municipalities, six cities and three large towns, in which wholesale licenses were taken out. A local option by-law therefore amounts to total prohibition.

PENALTIES.

As stated the penalties imposed upon persons who sell liquor in local option municipalities are the same penalties that are now imposed on persons found guilty of selling liquor without license. They are set out in clause 70 of the License Act which reads as follows :

70. "Any person who sells or barter spirituous, fermented or manufactured liquors of any kind, or intoxicating liquors of any kind, without the license therefor by law required, shall for the first offence on conviction thereof forfeit and pay a penalty of not less than \$50 besides costs, and not more than \$10 besides costs; and in default of payment thereof he shall be imprisoned in the county gaol of the county in which the offence was committed, for a period of not less than three months, and to be kept at hard labor in the discretion of the convicting magistrate; and for the second offence, on conviction thereof, such person shall be imprisoned in such gaol for the period of four months, to be kept at hard labor in the discretion of the convicting magistrate; and for the third or subsequent offence on conviction thereof, such person shall be imprisoned in some gaol for the period of six months, to be kept at hard labour in the discretion of the convicting magistrate; and in the event of the imprisonment of any person upon several warrants of commitment under different convictions in pursuance of this Act, whether issued in default of distress for a penalty or otherwise, the terms of imprisonment under such warrants shall be consecutive and not concurrent.

The having or keeping liquor for sale is also an offence against the law, being a contravention of section 50 above quoted. It is an independent offence, and a person convicted of it, whether found guilty of selling liquor or not, is punishable by a fine of not less than \$20 and costs for a

first offence, not less than \$40 and costs for a second offence with imprisonment at hard labor in case of default of payment, and for a third or subsequent offence imprisonment for three months at hard labor, without the option of a fine. Sec. 85 of the Act sets this out.

If an officer of a municipal corporation is convicted of an offence under the Act, he shall also vacate his office and be disqualified from holding any such office for two years.

If an inspector or officer appointed by the government or commissioners prosecutes an offender under this Act, and a fine is imposed, such fine is paid at once into the license fund to be used for paying the expenses of enforcing the law. If any other person is the prosecutor, the fine is paid to the treasurer of the municipality in which the offence was committed, and the municipal council is required to set apart not less than one-third of all such fines received, as a fund to secure prosecutions for violation of the law. These provisions are found in sections 89 and 90 of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW.

The provisions for securing enforcement of the law are very complete. The most important are contained in the following sections of the License Act:—

DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

139. "Every officer appointed under this Act, every policeman, or constable, or inspector, shall be deemed to be within the provisions of this Act, and when any information is given to any such officer, policeman, constable or inspector, that there is cause to suspect that some person is violating any of the provisions of this Act, it shall be his duty to make diligent enquiry into the truth of such information, and enter complaint of such violation before the proper court, without communicating the name of the person giving such information; and it shall be the duty of the crown attorney, within the county in which the offence is committed, to attend to the prosecution of all cases committed to him by an inspector or officer appointed under this Act by the Lieutenant Governor."

POWERS OF OFFICERS.

130. "(1) Any officer, policeman, constable, or inspector may, for the purpose of preventing or detecting the violation of any of the provisions of this Act which it is his duty to enforce, at any time enter into any and every part of any inn, tavern, or other house or place of public entertainment, shop, warehouse or other place wherein refreshments or liquors are sold, or reputed to be sold, whether under license or not, and may make searches in every part thereof, and of the premises connected therewith, as he may think necessary for the purpose aforesaid."

(2) Every person being therein, or having charge thereof, who refuses or fails to admit such officer, policeman, constable, or inspector, or any such searches as aforesaid, shall be liable to the penalties and punishments prescribed by section 70 of this Act.

LIQUOR MAY BE DESTROYED.

132. When any inspector, policeman, constable or officer in making or attempting to make any search under or in pursuance of the authority conferred by the preceding two sections of this Act or under the warrant mentioned in the last preceding section, finds in an unlicensed house or place any spirituous or fermented liquor which in his opinion is unlawfully kept for sale or disposal contrary to this Act, he may forthwith seize and remove the same, and the vessels in which the same is kept, and upon the conviction of the occupant of such house or place, or of any other person for keeping spirituous or fermented liquor for sale in such house or place without license, the justices making such conviction, may, in and by the said conviction, or by a separate or subsequent order, declare the said liquor and vessels, or any part thereof, to be forfeited to Her Majesty, and may order and direct that the said inspector, policeman, constable, or officer shall destroy the same or any part thereof, and the inspector or other person as aforesaid shall thereupon forthwith destroy the same or part thereof as directed by such conviction or order.

FREQUENTERS OF ILLICIT GROGGERIES.

(2) Any inspector, policeman, constable, or officer having in pursuance of the two preceding sections or either of them entered any unlicensed premises in which he seizes or from which he removes any such liquor as aforesaid, may demand the name and address of any person found in such premises, and if such person refuses to give his name and address, or if the inspector, policeman, constable or officer, has reasonable ground to suppose that the name or address

given is false, may examine such person further as to the correctness of such name or address, and may if such person fail upon such demand to give his name or address or to answer satisfactorily the questions put to him by the inspector, policeman, or officer, apprehend him without warrant and carry him, as soon as practicable, before a justice of the peace.

Any person found on the premises aforesaid who in answer to the inspector, policeman, constable, or officer, refuses to give his name and address or to answer satisfactorily the questions put to him by the inspector, policeman, constable or officer, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than \$10 nor more than \$20 besides costs, and in default of payment shall be imprisoned for a period of not less than twenty and not more than forty days.

PENALTY FOR DERELICT OFFICERS.

134. (1) It shall be the duty of every officer, policeman, constable or inspector in each municipality, to see that the several provisions of this Act are duly observed, and to proceed by information and otherwise prosecute for the punishment of any offense against the provisions of this Act; and in case of wilful neglect or default in so doing in any case, such officer, policeman constable or inspector, shall incur a penalty of \$10 for each and every such neglect and default.

(2) It shall be the duty of the board of commissioners and of the chief of police, to enforce the provisions of this section, and any officer or policeman convicted of violating the provisions thereof may be summarily dismissed.

EVIDENCE, ETC.

The law is very complete and distinct in its provisions as to what shall constitute evidence of sale or keeping for sale of liquor. It is the result of long experience and careful study, and effectively closes up many of the loop-holes through which offenders have heretofore been able to escape from the penalty of their wrong-doing. Some of the most important of these clauses are the following:

APPLIANCES ARE EVIDENCE.

108. Any house, shop, room or other place in which are proved to exist a bar, counter, beer pumps, kegs, jars decanters, tumblers, glasses, on any other appliance or preparations similiar to those usually found in taverns and shops

where spirituous or fermented liquors are accustomed to be sold or trafficked, it shall be deemed a place in which spirituous, fermented or other manufactured liquors are kept or had for the purpose of being sold, bartered or traded in, under section 56 of this Act, unless the contrary is proved by the defendant in any prosecution, and the occupant of such house, shop, room or other place shall be taken conclusively to be the person who has, or keeps therein, such liquors for sale, barter or traffic therein.

CONSUMPTION IS PROOF.

109. In proving the sale or disposal, gratuitous or otherwise, or consumption of liquor for the purpose of any proceeding relative to any offence under this Act, it shall not be necessary to show that any money actually passed, or any liquor was actually consumed, if the justices, police magistrate or court hearing the case is or are satisfied that a transaction in the nature of a sale or other disposal actually took place, or that any consumption of liquor was about to take place; and proof of consumption or intended consumption of liquor on premises under license or in respect to which a license is required under this Act, by some person other than the occupier of said premises, shall be evidence that such liquor was sold to the person consuming or being about to consume or carrying away the same, as against the holder of the license or the occupant of the said premises.

THE OCCUPANT HELD RESPONSIBLE.

122. (1) The occupant of any house, shop, room or other place in which any sale, barter or traffic of spirituous, fermented or manufactured liquors, or any matter, act or thing in contravention of any of the provisions of this Act, has taken place, shall be personally liable to the penalty and punishments prescribed in sections 70 and 71 of this Act, as the case may be, notwithstanding such sale, barter, or traffic, be made by some other person, who cannot be proved to have so acted under or by the directions of such occupant, and proof of the fact of such sale, barter or traffic, or other act, matter or thing, by any person in the employ of such occupant, or who is supposed to be or remain in or upon the premises of such occupant, or to act in any way for such occupant, shall be conclusive evidence that such sale, barter or traffic, or other act, matter or thing, took place with the authority and by the direction of such occupant.

(3) For the purposes of this section any person being an owner or lessee in actual occupation and possession of the premises, or any one who being in actual occupation and possession leases or sub-lets any part thereof in which

liquors are kept for sale, barter or trading therein, or in which they are sold or consumed, shall be deemed to be an occupant unless such leasing or sub-letting shall have received the consent in writing of the board of license commissioners.

REASONABLE EVIDENCE SUFFICIENT.

113. In any prosecution under this Act for the sale or other disposal of liquor without the license required by law, it shall not be necessary that any witness should depose directly to the precise description of the liquor sold or bartered or the precise consideration therefor, or to the fact of the sale or other disposal having taken place with his participation or to his own personal and certain knowledge, but the justices or police magistrate trying the case, so soon as it appears to them or him that the circumstances in evidence sufficiently establish the infraction of law complained of, shall put the defendant on his defence, and in default of his rebuttal of such evidence, shall convict him accordingly.

WITNESSES MUST TESTIFY.

The authority and power of justices to secure evidence in cases of prosecution, is very fully set out. Sections 115 and 116 authorize them to summon any person, compel attendance if need be by warrant, and commit for contempt any person refusing to give evidence or produce any books, papers or documents asked for.

THE BUYER PUNISHED.

The law recognizes the important fact that a person who buys liquor on an unlicensed place is blamable as well as the person who sells it, and provides for his punishment, by section 58 of the Act. There is no special penalty set out for the offender who buys liquor illegally. He is therefore punished by the penalty set out in clause 85 above mentioned, that is, he is punished with the same penalty applicable to a person who keeps liquor for sale without license.

CLUB SELLING.

Under previous prohibitory laws a good deal of trouble was caused by the formation of clubs, in which liquor was

supplied to the members so as to evade the law, which from its wording did not always cover the case of liquor purchased by an organization and distributed among its members. The law as it now stands is found in section 53 of the Act as amended by the Act of 1890. It reads thus :

53. (1) Any society, association or club which has been or shall be formed or incorporated under *The Act respecting Benevolent, Provident and other Societies* and any unincorporated society, association or club, and any member, officer or servant thereof, or person resorting thereto, who shall sell or barter liquor to any member thereof, or to any other person without the license therefor by this Act required, shall be held to have violated section 49 of this Act and shall incur the penalties provided for the sale of liquor without license.

(2) The keeping or having in any house or building, or in any room or place occupied or controlled by such club, association or society, or any member or members thereof, or by any person resorting thereto, of any liquor for sale or barter, shall be a violation of section 50 of this Act.

(3) Proof of consumption or intended consumption of liquor in such premises by any member of such club, association or society, or person who resorts thereto, shall be conclusive evidence of sale of such liquor, and the occupant of the premises or any member of the club, association or society or person who resorts thereto, shall be taken conclusively to be the person who has or keeps therein such liquor for sale or barter; and any liquor found upon such premises shall be liable to seizure in the manner provided by this Act.

OTHER PROVISIONS.

Of course the preceding are only the more important provisions of this valuable piece of legislation. The limits of the space available for this article preclude further details.

In the December VANGUARD, beginning on page 104 will be found an important statement of the actual results of the working of local option law in one Ontario township. Similiar results can be attained by judicious effort, in other municipalities.

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE

FOR THE TOTAL SUPPRESSION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

The Dominion Alliance is, in its plan and purpose, simply a union or federation of the different societies and agencies of Canada that are favorable to the suppression of the liquor traffic. It provides for a central council made up of delegates chosen from provincial branches of the Alliance and from different provincial temperance organizations and ecclesiastical bodies. This council meets annually and discusses plans and methods for the uniting of all branches of the temperance army in consultation and plans for general work, with the object of having co-operation and harmony of method as far as possible in the different parts of the Dominion. The council also watches Dominion legislation and persistently seeks to press upon the Parliament the important question of national prohibition.

The branches of the Alliance in the different provinces make their own constitutions and direct their own action, recognizing the council as the bond of union between the various organizations favoring prohibition. Herewith is given the constitution of the Ontario branch, which makes clear the objects and methods of that organization. The Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance is regularly incorporated under chapter 172 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1887.

ONTARIO BRANCH DOMINION ALLIANCE.

Constitution.

Name.—The name of this organization is “The Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance for the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic.”

Objects.—The purposes of the society are as follows:—To call forth and direct an enlightened public opinion to procure the total and immediate suppression of the traffic in all intoxicating liquors as beverages, and to unite all temperance and Christian workers in judicious effort for the attainment of this end.

Methods.—With this object in view the Alliance shall work for the enactment and enforcement of all available prohibitions and limitations of the liquor traffic, and the election to all legislative and executive political positions of representatives who are known, avowed and trustworthy supporters of the principles and methods of the Alliance.

Membership.—This branch of the Alliance shall be composed of its executive committee, and delegates chosen to represent churches, temperance societies and other organizations on the basis hereinafter provided.

The plan of representation is as follows:—Every church and society to be entitled to two representatives, and each church or society having more than fifty members, to be entitled to an additional delegate for each fifty or fractional part of fifty after the first full fifty members.

The following organizations are to be entitled to representation on the basis named:—Branches of W.C.T.U., Divisions of Sons of Temperance, Lodges of the I.O.G.T., Councils of the R.T. of T., Branches of the League of the Cross, Prohibition Clubs, and other prohibition or temperance organizations, Church Congregations, Young Men's Christian Associations, Salvation Army Corps, Societies of Christian Endeavor, Epworth Leagues, Branches of St. Andrew's Brotherhood, Baptist Young People's Unions, any other young people's associations in connection with church work.

The Alliance Council.—This branch of the Alliance shall recognize the council of the Dominion alliance as the bond of union between the several provincial branches, and shall co-operate with it on questions relating to temperance legislation for the Dominion, and inter-provincial work ; and the political platform of the Dominion Alliance, and the declaration of principles of the same body shall be accepted by this branch of the Alliance, and carried out as far as practicable.

Officers.—The officers of this society shall be a president, vice-presidents, a secretary and a treasurer. They shall be elected yearly at the annual meeting, and shall hold office for one year and until their successors are elected.

Executive.—The executive committee shall consist of the officers named and twenty-five other persons elected at the same time. It shall elect its own chairman, and shall meet at the call of the secretary, who shall be under the direction of the chairman of the committee.

Meetings.—The annual meeting of the Alliance shall be held at the time and place fixed at the previous annual meeting, or in default by the executive committee. Other meetings shall be held at the call of the executive committee. Fifteen members shall form a quorum for the transaction of business.

By-Laws.—This branch of the Alliance may enact any by-laws for the government of its officers, the control of its proceedings, and finances, or for any other purpose deemed necessary for the carrying out of its objects or the transaction of its business. Such by-laws before coming operative must be adopted by at least a two-thirds vote at a regularly called meeting of this Alliance.

Amendments.—The constitution shall be amended only by a two-thirds vote of the members present at a regularly called meeting.

LIQUOR MAKING IN CANADA IN 1893.

The report of the Controller of Inland Revenue for the year ending June 30th, 1893, has been issued. From it we learn the extent for that year of the liquor manufacturing industry in Canada.

The amount of spirits manufactured was less than during the preceding year. The amount entered for home consumption was greater. The number of distillery licenses issued was eleven, the number of distilleries operating was ten.

The manufacture of beer shows a slight increase. There is no duty collected on beer manufactured from malt, the malt manufactured paying instead a duty of two cents per lb. The total quantity of malt used, like that of beer produced, shows a slight increase. As before, we reckon the amount of malt liquor consumed as equal to that manufactured, less the amount exported.

The quantity of spirits now held in stock by distillers is larger than ever before in the history of the country. On July 1st, 1893, it was 13,502,814 proof gallons.

The total amount of grain used in the manufacture of spirits was 61,215,644 pounds, besides 3,059,087 pounds of malt. The total amount of grain used in the manufacture of malt was 66,674,168 pounds. This was a falling off to a small extent from the amount so used the preceding year.

Comparing the quantities of malt liquor manufactured and spirits entered for consumption with those of previous years, we get the following results :

CANADIAN SPIRITS ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION.

Year.	Proof Gallons.
1888-9	2,960,447
1889-90	3,521,194
1890-91	2,687,964
1891-92	2,545,935

Total 11,715,240

Total average of four years,
ending June 30, 1892..... 2,920,810
1892-93..... 2,731,896

MALT LIQUOR MANUFACTURED.

1891-2.....	16,915,428 gallons.
1892-3.....	17,157,879 "

EXCISE REVENUE FOR 1893.

Duty on spirits.....	\$4,139,307
License fees on 11 distilleries	2,750
Duty on malt used in making spirits.....	61,182
License fees of 62 malsters	6,475
Duty on malt used in making beer	951,536
License fees for 125 breweries.....	6,200
Duty on beer made from other substances than malt.....	429
	<hr/>
	\$5,167,879

If we take as the revenue from malt the exact amount paid by malsters, we shall find it to be \$1,001,655, which is slightly different from that obtained in above calculation, which includes only the duty on malt actually used in making spirits and beer. This would change the total amount above set out to..... \$5,156,816.

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION.

The report does not of course give the amounts of imported liquors and duty paid thereon. It contains, however, the usual estimate of the per capita consumption of all kinds of liquor by the Canadian people. This will be found in the following table, which may be added to the statement found on page 41 of the VANGUARD for November, 1893.

QUANTITY.

	Spirits.	Beer.	Wine.	Total.	Duty.
1893.	.740	3.485	.094	4.319	\$1.52

One feature of this report is the fact that the Controller of Inland Revenue refers approvingly to the increase of spirits exported and gives reasons for the increase of this branch of trade. The following is his statement :

“It will be interesting to note the gradual development of a foreign demand for Canadian distillery products.

“The quantities exported being as follows :

Year.	Proof Gallons.
1888-89.....	8,731
1889-90.....	12,003
1890-91.....	20,497
1891-92.....	32,223
1892-93.....	51,239

“This is believed to be largely due to the fact that the Government guarantee of age—when bottled in bond—is becoming known and appreciated abroad, and the enforced maturing has necessarily improved the quality. There seems to be good reason to believe that Canadian whiskies will soon constitute an appreciable proportion of the exports of our manufactured goods.”

VOTING ON THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

There exists a good deal of misapprehension among even temperance people as to the effectiveness of the Canada Temperance Act, commonly called the Scott Act, and the extent to which it is in operation.

The Dominion Parliament enacted this measure in 1878. The first voting took place on October 31st, of the same year, in the city of Fredericton. A number of counties in the Maritime Provinces followed suit. In most of these counties the law is still in operation.

In other parts of the Dominion the success of the measure has not been so great. A good many counties in Ontario voted in 1884 and 1885. Those which adopted the Scott Act went back to license in 1888 and 1889. The history of the measure in Ontario and the conditions and complications which led to its repeal have been already written.

Subjoined is a table giving the dates of all the Scott Act contests that have yet taken place in the Dominion, the date of voting, the number of votes polled for and against, the adoption of the law, and the majorities recorded.

These figures will be useful to Ontario workers in making comparisons between the Scott Act vote and the votes polled in the plebiscite on January 1st last.

The places that have voted more than once have the different votings indicated by the figures in brackets immediately after the name of the place.

All the figures are official except those for the last voting in St. John, N.B., and Brome, Que.

The places marked thus * are cities.

Date of Voting.	PLACE.	Votes Polled.		Majorities.	
		For.	Ag'st.	For.	Ag'st.
1878.					
Oct. 31	*Fredericton, N.B. (1).....	403	203	200
Dec. 28	York, N.B. (1).....	1229	214	1015
" 28	Prince. P.E.I. (1).....	1762	271	1491
1879.					
Mar. 14	Charlotte, N.B. (1).....	867	149	718
Apr. 21	Carleton, N.B.....	1215	69	1146
" 21	Albert, N.B.....	718	114	604
" 24	*Charlottetown, P.E.I. (1).	837	253	584
May 29	King's, P.E.I... ..	1076	59	1017
" 29	Lambton, Ont. (1).....	2567	2352	215
June 23	King's, N.B.....	798	245	553
July 3	Queen's, N.B.....	315	181	134
Sept. 11	Westmoreland, N.B. (1) ..	1082	299	783
" 11	Megantic, Que	372	844	472
1880.					
Sept. 2	Northumberland, N.B.....	875	673	202
June 21	Stanstead, Que (1)	760	941	181
Sept. 22	Queen's P.E.I.....	1317	99	1218
" 27	Marquette, Manitoba.....	612	195	417
Nov. 8	Digby, N.S.....	944	42	902
1881.					
Jan. 3	Queen's, N.S.....	763	82	681
Feb. 17	Sunbury, N.B.....	176	41	135
Mar. 17	Shelburne, N.S.....	807	154	653
Apr. 7	Lisgar, Manitoba.....	247	120	127
" 13	*Hamilton, Ont.....	1661	2811	1150
" 14	King's, N.S.....	1478	108	1370
" 19	Halton, Ont. (1)	1483	1402	81
" 19	Annapolis, N.S	1111	114	997
" 22	Wentworth, Ont.....	1611	2209	598
May 13	Colchester, N.S.....	1418	184	1234
Aug. 11	Cape Breton, N.S.....	739	216	523
Sept. 15	Hants, N.S.....	1082	92	990
Nov. 10	Welland, Ont.....	1610	2378	768
" 29	Lambton, Ont. (2).....	2857	2962	105
1882.					
Jan. 6	Inverness, N.S.....	960	106	854
" 9	Pictou, N.S.....	1555	453	1102
Feb. 23	*St. John, N.B. (1)	1074	1076	2
Oct. 26	*Fredericton, N.B. (2)	293	252	41
1883.					
Oct. 25	Cumberland, N.S.....	1560	262	1298

Date of Voting.		PLACE.	Votes Polled.		Majorities.	
			For.	Ag'st.	For.	Ag'st.
1884.						
Feb.	7	Prfnce, P.E.I. (2).....	2939	1065	1874
Mar.	7	Yarmouth, N.S.....	1287	96	1191
"	20	Oxford, Ont. (1).....	4073	3298	775
July	17	Arthabaska, Que. (1).....	1487	235	1252
Aug.	14	Westmoreland, N.B. (2) ..	1774	1701	73
Sept.	9	Halton, Ont. (2).....	1947	1767	180
Oct.	9	Simcoe, Ont. (1).....	5712	4529	1183
"	9	Stanstead, Que. (2).....	1300	975	325
"	16	*Charlottetown, P.E.I. (2)..	755	715	40
"	16	Stormont, Dundas, and Glengarry, Ont. (1).....	4590	2884	1706
"	23	Peel, Ont.....	1805	1999	194
"	30	Bruce, Ont. (1).....	4501	3189	1312
"	30	Huron, Ont. (1).....	5957	4304	1653
"	30	Dufferin, Ont. (1).....	1904	1109	795
"	30	Prince Edward, Ont.....	1528	1653	125
"	30	York, N.B. (2).....	1178	655	523
Nov.	7	Renfrew, Ont. (1).....	1748	1018	730
"	11	Norfolk, Ont. (1).....	2781	1604	1087
"	26	Compton, Que.....	1132	1620	488
Dec.	11	Brant, Ont. (1).....	1690	1088	602
"	11	*Brantford, Ont.....	646	812	166
"	18	Leeds & Grenville, Ont. (1)	5058	4384	674
1885.						
Jan.	15	Kent, Ont.....	4368	1975	2393
"	15	Lanark, Ont. (1).....	2433	2027	406
"	15	Lennox & Addington, O.(1)	2047	2011	36
"	15	Brome, Que. (1).....	1224	739	485
"	22	*Guelph, Ont. (1).....	694	526	168
"	29	Carleton, Ont. (1).....	2440	1747	693
Feb.	26	Durham and Northumber- land, Ont. (1).....	6050	3863	2187
Mar.	5	Drummond, Que. (1).....	1190	170	1020
"	19	Elgin, Ont. (1).....	3335	1479	1856
"	19	Lambton, Ont. (3).....	4465	1546	2919
"	19	*St. Thomas, Ont. (1).....	754	743	11
"		Missisquoi, Que.....	1142	1167	25
Apr	2	Wellington, Ont. (1).....	4516	3086	1430
"	9	Chicoutimi, Que.....	1157	529	628
May	21	*Kingston, Ont.....	785	842	57
"	21	Frontenac, Ont. (1).....	1334	693	641
June	18	Lincoln, Ont. (1).....	2060	1490	570
"	18	Perth, Ont.....	3368	3536	168
"	18	Middlesex, Ont. (1).....	5745	2370	3375
"	26	Guysboro, N.S.....	463	31	432
July	2	Hastings, Ont.....	2369	2376	7
"	16	Haldimand, Ont.....	1755	2063	308
"	16	Ontario, Ont. (1).....	3412	2061	1351
"	16	Victoria, Ont. (1).....	2467	1502	965

Date of Voting.	PLACE.	Votes Polled.		Majorities.	
		For.	Ag'st.	For.	Ag'st.
Sept. 24	Peterborough, Ont. (1)	1915	1597	318
Nov. 12	*Fredericton, N.B. (3).....	298	285	13
" 19	*St. Catherines, Ont.	478	1066	588
" 16	Prescott & Russell, Ont. (1)	1535	3131	1596
Dec. 29	Argenteuil, Que.	526	601	75
1886.					
Jan. 28	Pontiac, Que.	533	935	402
Apr. 19	*St. John, N.B. (2).....	1610	1687	77
" 19	*Portland, N.B. (1).....	667	520	147
" 20	St. John, N.B. (1)	467	424	43
1887.					
Nov. 24	*Charlottetown, P.E.I. (3)..	689	669	20
1888.					
Feb. 16	Westmoreland, N.B. (3) ..	2464	1698	766
Mar. 1	Halton, Ont. (3).....	1853	2050	197
Apr. 6	Dufferin, " (2)	1451	1664	213
" "	Huron, " (2)	4695	6005	1310
" "	Norfolk, " (2)	2082	2804	722
" "	Renfrew, " (2)	1670	2580	910
" "	Simcoe, " (2)	3894	6996	3102
" "	Stormont & Dundas, Ont. (2)	3155	5298	2143
" 19	Bruce, Ont. (2).....	3693	5085	1392
May 30	Stanstead, Que. (3)	1187	1329	142
July 12	Arthabaska, Que. (2).....	230	455	225
Nov. 29	Richmond, Que. (1).....	1231	721	510
1889.					
Apr. 4	Brant, Ont. (2).....	1289	1441	152
" "	Colchester, N.S. (2).....	43	1107	1064
" "	Frontenac, Ont. (2).....	1177	1690	513
" "	*Guelph, " (2).....	480	929	449
" "	Kent, " (2).....	2835	4455	1620
" "	Lennox & Addington O. (2)	1462	2066	604
" "	Northumberland & Dur-				
" "	ham, Ont. (2).....	4305	4932	627
" "	Victoria, Ont. (2).....	1560	2552	992
" "	Ontario, " (2).....	2866	3787	921
" "	Peterboro', " (2)	1564	1926	362
" "	Lincoln, " (2).....	1493	2090	597
" "	Lanark, " (2).....	1538	2309	771
" "	*St. Thomas, " (2).....	429	1001	572
" "	Wellington, Ont. (2)	2084	3944	1860
" 19	Carleton, Ont. (2)	1682	2407	725
May 2	Leeds & Grenville, Ont. (2)	3660	4938	1278
" 9	Lambton, Ont. (2).....	2044	3374	1330
" 9	Middlesex, " (2).....	2992	5530	2538
" 9	Oxford, " (2).....	1538	3460	1922
June 27	Drummond, Que. (2)	739	600	139
July 3	Elgin, Ont. (2).....	547	1770	1223
Nov, 28	*Fredericton, N.B. (4).....	370	302	68

Date of Voting.	PLACE.	Votes Polled.		Majorities.	
		For.	Ag't.	For.	Ag't.
1890.					
Apr. 17	*Portland, N.B. (2)	124	558	...	434
1891.					
Jan. 8	*Charlottetown, P.E.I. (4)..	686	700	14
Nov. 17	Charlotte, N.B. (2).....	1785	855	930
1892.					
Feb. 9	St. John's, N.B. (2).....	450	595	145
Sept. 29	Northumberland, N.B.....	1780	1561	219
Nov. 17	Drummond, Que. (3).....	505	1010	505
1893.					
June 16	Brome, Que. (2).....	1207	1073	134

SUMMARY.

Nova Scotia has eighteen counties and one city. Thirteen counties adopted the Act. In one of these it failed to come into operation on account of a legal technicality connected with the proceedings necessary to bring it into force. At the instance of friends of prohibition it was repealed. In the other twelve counties it is still in force. It is worthy of note that in four out of the remaining six counties no licenses are issued, so that there is prohibition in sixteen out of the eighteen counties in the province.

New Brunswick has fourteen counties and three cities. Ten counties and two cities adopted the Act. One county and one city repealed it. One city has been erected from a Scott Act county since the coming into operation of the law. It is thus at present in force in nine counties and two cities of that province.

In Manitoba the Act was adopted in two out of the four large electoral divisions into which the province was divided. Subsequently it was held that these electoral divisions did not correspond to the counties intended by the Act, and that the adoption was of no effect. The law therefore became inoperative without being repealed. The greater part of the province is however, under prohibition through provincial local option legislation,

Prince Edward Island has three counties and one city. All of these adopted the Act. The city repealed it. It is still in force in the three counties.

Ontario has thirty-eight counties and unions of counties, and twelve cities. Twenty-five counties and two cities adopted the Act. All of these repealed it.

Quebec has fifty-six counties and six cities. Five counties adopted the Act and three of these repealed it. It is still in force in two counties. Another county, Richmond, was under the old Dunkin Act, to which the provisions of the Scott Act now apply, so that Quebec has three counties still under the law.

British Columbia has five parliamentary constituencies and the North-west Territories have four. None of these have adopted the Act.

Counting the Richmond votings that have taken place under the Scott Act, we find that in all up to the present time eighty-two cities and counties have voted upon the Act, sixty-three adopted it. Thirty-four of these repealed it. Thirty-five counties and cities voted twice each, three voted three times, and four voted four times. Thus there have been altogether 134 contests, out of which prohibition has been victorious in 79.

Prohibition through the Scott Act is therefore now in force in twenty-eight counties and cities. In all of these it has been in continuous operation for more than eight years, and in none of them is there at present any probability of its being repealed.

RECORD OF EVENTS.

THE GREAT CAMPAIGN.

On January 1st the Province of Ontario told in no uncertain terms its views on the question of total prohibition. Our friends are referred to the article commencing on page 23 of the November VANGUARD for a history of the events that led up to this magnificent victory. By an overwhelming majority of more than 80,000, the banner province of the Dominion has declared in favor of "the immediate prohibition by law of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage."

We had hoped by holding over the January issue of this magazine to the last possible moment to be able to give our readers the exact official figures of the vote. The returns, however, are not yet sufficiently complete to enable us to do this, and the details will have to be left for the February number, in which we hope to publish them in such form as to make them convenient and valuable for future reference. The net majority for prohibition is probably over 80,000.

The magnificent result attained has demonstrated the wisdom of the plan adopted. Even those earnest friends of temperance who did not favor the plebiscite, realize to-day its value. It has placed the prohibition movement in Ontario in a position of strength such as it never before occupied. In our ranks to-day we have more confidence, earnestness and determination to put the liquor traffic down than ever we had before. The prohibition question

commanded more attention than ever before. The character and nature of the liquor traffic and the wisdom of the prohibition plan were talked of and read of and thought of as never before. Men and women grew in their knowledge of the question. They grew in their opposition to the drink traffic. There is to-day not only a stronger, but a vastly more intelligent public sentiment of hostility to the whole liquor business.

In the minds of our people the uppermost question is: "What Next?" The air is full of plans and suggestions. The convention to meet next month will no doubt result in a defining of the future policy of our workers. When this is done we shall be still better off. Political leaders realize the gravity of the situation, and, like the people, are planning how it is to be dealt with. In the hearts of all friends of moral reform there is a deep gratitude, strong hope and earnest resolution to stop short at nothing less than what the ballot of January 1st demanded.

GREAT BRITAIN'S GREAT CONVENTION.

December was a history-making month in relation to the temperance reform in Great Britain. On the 6th of that month the largest representative temperance gathering ever convened in the British Empire met in Covent Garden Theatre. W. S. Caine, M.P., presided, and was supported by a mighty array of ladies and gentlemen, whose names are famous the world over as leaders in moral reform. Anything like even a condensed report of the proceedings could not be made in the VANGUARD. We have to content ourselves with a mere setting out of the conclusions arrived at.

The first resolution adopted was presented by J. A. Murray McDonald, M.P., and was in the following terms :

“That this Convention, representing all parts of the United Kingdom, emphatically declares its strong conviction that it is neither just nor politic for the State to afford protection and sanction to any traffic or system which causes crime, suffering, and waste of national resources; and, as it has been abundantly proved by the declarations of judges and statesmen, that the liquor traffic is essentially inimical to the best interests of individuals and destructive of social order; and as experience of past legislation has shown that this traffic cannot be rendered harmless by any system of regulation; the people ought, for their own protection, to have a legal power to veto the issue of all licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors in their own districts by a direct vote.”

Sir Wilfred Lawson, M.P., moved the adoption of the second, which read thus :

“That this Convention, rejoicing that the Government have so far recognized the long-continued demand of the people for relief from the great and grievous evils of the drinking system as to introduce into Parliament the Liquor Traffic Local Control Bill; and realizing that every day's delay results in a fearful amount of loss, sorrow and suffering, hereby calls upon the Government to re-introduce their Bill at the earliest possible moment in the ensuing session of Parliament, to extend its provisions to the whole of the United Kingdom, and to use all their power to have it passed into law.”

A. Webb, M.P., submitted the third :

“That this Convention pledges itself to give its heartiest support to the Government in their efforts to pass the Local Control Bill into law during the next session of Parliament, and calls upon all its delegates to convey to the societies they respectively represent the paramount importance of loyally carrying this resolution into effect; and further calls upon every Christian church and temperance organization in the country to continue and increase their agitation in favour of the Bill.”

The fourth presented by Mr. J. Malins was an extensive memorial to the Right Honorable Prime Minister urging a prompt passing of the direct veto measure.

At a great mass meeting held in the evening, the immense theatre, estimated to hold between four thousand and five thousand persons, was packed in every corner. Sir Wilfred Lawson occupied the chair. All the addresses

were earnest, effective, and full of hope and determination. The speakers were Lady Henry Somerset, A. Birrell, M.P., D. Lloyd George, M.P., Mr. Pickersgill, M.P., T. P. Whitaker, M.P., Cameron Corbett, M.P., Samuel Woods, M.P., Mr. Snape, M.P., John Wilson, M.P., W. Crosford, M.P., Dr. Farquharson, M.P., W. S. Crane, M.P., Rev. Canon Wilberforce, Rev. Canon Murnane, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, Rev. Canon Barker, Mr. Samuel Pope, and Mr. J. H. Raper.

The following resolutions were adopted.

"That this meeting representing the friends of Temperance throughout the United Kingdom, rejoices that Her Majesty's Government have admitted the overwhelming magnitude of the evils arising from the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and have recognized the supreme importance of giving to the inhabitants of localities the power, by direct popular vote, to prevent the continuance of the liquor traffic in their midst against their will."

"That this meeting expresses its gratification at the introduction by the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the Liquor Traffic Local Control Bill, and earnestly and respectfully urges Her Majesty's Government to place it in the forefront of their programme for next session of Parliament, and to strenuously promote its passage into law."

"That the best thanks of this meeting be given to Sir Wilfred Lawson for presiding and that he be requested to send copies of the foregoing resolution, on behalf of the meeting, to the Prime Minister and other members of the Government, and to each member of the House of Commons."

A great overflow meeting was held in Exeter Hall addressed by some of the speakers already named and others.

On Thursday, the day following the convention, a great deputation representing in its membership every temperance organization in the United Kingdom, waited upon the Government to press for immediate direct veto legislation. Sir Wilfred Lawson and Mr. Caine were the spokesmen. They were replied to in courteous, eloquent and earnest terms by Sir William Harcourt and Right Hon.

W. E. Gladstone. Both these gentlemen warmly endorsed the policy of the proposed measure, and expressed an earnest hope that during 1894 an opportunity would be found for testifying "by works and acts the sincerity, reality and earnestness of the Government's desire and purpose to pass legislation on the lines asked for by the deputation."

The deputation subsequently held a meeting at which the following resolution was adopted :

"That this meeting expresses its heartiest thanks to Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt for their reception of the temperance deputation, and for the statements which they made with reference to the local veto, and congratulates the friends of prohibition on the present position of the question. The delegates also urge upon all societies earnest efforts during the months intervening before Parliament meets in 1894, to render substantial support to pass the Liquor Traffic Local Control Bill into law during next session."

LITERARY NOTICES.

A LIQUOR LAW ENQUIRY.

Liquor Legislation in the United States and Canada, is a report made by Mr. E. L. Fanshawe, Barrister, of London, England, of the results of investigations made by him in the United States and Canada. He was deputed to make the inquiry by W. Rathbone, M.P., who was desirous of obtaining the information for the guidance of British legislators. Mr. Fanshawe has carefully endeavored to avoid expressing opinions in reference to the different systems of dealing with the liquor traffic which he describes. The information he classifies and tabulates will no doubt be of much value to those for whom it is intended, and who have not free access to the materials from which it is drawn. His observations, made on the spot, of the working of different laws are also useful. Taken as a whole, his statements undoubtedly show better results, in the combatting of intemperance, from the legislation of Maine and Kansas, than from that of any other State visited.

TEMPERANCE EDUCATION.

The importance of temperance education has forced itself upon those who have to do with school work everywhere. The imparting of information regarding the nature and effects of alcoholic liquors is now recognized as a regular

part of the effective teacher's duty. Some difficulty has been felt in carrying out this duty because of the lack of the right kind of text books for teachers and scholars. Laudable efforts are being made to supply this deficiency. One of these, and a very successful one, is the plan of the Ontario Government to place in the hands of teachers and scholars, a work on *Physiology and Hygiene* prepared with special regard to the temperance question. The work of compiling and editing the information that it was desirable to furnish has been performed by Dr. William Nattress of Toronto. The result is a neat volume of about two hundred pages, commendable in appearance, arrangement and typography. Medical men will be the best judges of its actual value from a scientific standpoint. Teachers will appreciate it as being full of just the information they require in the proportions and on the plan that will make it most useful. It is freely illustrated with well-executed engravings, and cannot fail to give an impetus to a most important branch of study. It is published by William Briggs, Wesley Buildings, 29 Richmond Street West, Toronto.

CAMPAIGN ECHOES.

In these stirring times when prohibition is in the air, when men and women realize the imminence of a great change in the status of the liquor traffic and the legislative methods of dealing with it, there is much to be gained of information, instruction and encouragement from a perusal of the records of the journey by which we have reached our present advanced position.

There may be a little danger of our forgetting, in the excitement of the present, the deep debt of gratitude we owe to the pioneers who toiled so hard in the days gone by, and from whose self-sacrificing seed-sowing we are now

reaping the abundant harvest of strong public sentiment and bright outlook for our cause.

"*Campaign Echoes*," by Mrs. Letitia Youmans, honorary president of the Dominion W.C.T.U., will be found unusually helpful in view of the facts just stated. It covers the history of the prohibition movement in Canada from the earliest time up to the present. The writer was a remarkably able and effective advocate of prohibition at a time when women took little part in public affairs, and is thus entitled to the remembrance and esteem of those who believe that woman's ability should have a still larger sphere, as well as those who are champions of the temperance movement.

Much of the work referred to is personal reminiscence of the stirring scenes of the Dunkin Bill and Scott Act campaign days. Probably no other living Canadian did as much personal work as did this grand woman in public advocacy of those measures. We are accustomed to refer to them to-day with some feeling of superiority and with an idea that they were not of very much practical value. No greater mistake could be made. In those stern fights were forged the weapons that our ablest warriors wield to-day. At that time was done much of the educating work that has made us able to accomplish greater things.

It would be impracticable here to attempt the pleasant duty of a review of what Mrs. Youmans has written. Every reader who peruses her work will be well repaid for the effort and cannot fail to be profited as well as delighted by it.

"*Campaign Echoes*" is from the press of the Methodist Publishing House, Richmond St. West, Toronto. Address William Briggs, Toronto, C. W. Coates, Montreal, S. F. Huestis, Halifax.

A NEW TEMPERANCE ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Temperance in all Nations, is without exception the fullest and most comprehensive contribution to prohibition literature that has been given to the public during recent years. It owes its existence to the great World's Temperance Congress held at Chicago, in June of 1893. John N. Stearns, the indefatigable and able secretary of the American National Temperance Society, conceived the great idea of making the report of that convention a centre round which to gather an immense amount of important information regarding the history and position of the temperance cause in every part of the world. The result of his labors, in which he was enabled to enlist the co-operation of a remarkable number of able intellects and pens, lies before us in two handsome volumes, of 1016 pages in all, forming a work that hereafter will be an indispensable part of every fully equipped prohibitionist's library.

The first volume contains over a hundred historical and statistical papers by men and women of wide reputation, giving details of the origin, progress and operation of nearly every form of temperance effort in every land. An appendix gives reports prepared by nearly forty official representatives of the United States Government, upon the liquor traffic and the temperance movement in the different countries in which they reside. Some of these are very useful, though some are as might be expected, probably of less value than anything else in this important work.

The second volume gives a detailed record of proceedings of the Congress, full reports of all the speeches made thereat, and a very valuable and instructive series of over forty papers prepared for presentation to that gathering. These papers discuss every phase of work for the mitigation of the evils of intemperance, and are written by authors who stand in the front ranks of the literary profession.

The hearty thanks of temperance workers are due to Mr. Stearns for the industry, energy and thoroughness with which he has carried out the heavy task undertaken by him. Probably no one else on this continent was better qualified for the work. We cordially congratulate him upon the success he has achieved.

The National Temperance Publishing House, 58 Reade Street, New York, is responsible for the mechanical part of the production of this encyclopædia of temperance and prohibition facts, and deserves much credit for the way in which that duty has been performed.
