

D

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE

For the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic.

THE
ALLIANCE YEAR BOOK

→ 1884. ←

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF
THE COUNCIL OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE.

TORONTO:
CITIZEN PUBLISHING COMPANY, 8 KING ST. EAST.

1884.

A
18

IN MEMORIAM.

The Rev. Thomas Gales, until his death, the only Secretary of the Dominion Alliance, died at his home in Montreal, on the 24th of October, 1883. He was born in Wells, England, in 1841, and came to Canada in 1860. In 1870, after some years in the ministry, he devoted himself to the cause of Temperance, which thenceforth, to the very end of his life, occupied him fully. At first he was Secretary of the Quebec Temperance and Prohibitory League. He was the chief leader and organizer in all progressive movements, and at length was permitted, with his fellow laborers, to rejoice in the existence of allied organizations in all the Provinces of the Dominion. His influence was often felt in guiding the legislation of the country upon his one great theme. He was a most faithful and self-denying laborer, who endured much hardship for the cause that he loved. He had the rare gift of working with men of all kinds, having in himself nothing of the impracticability and narrowness by which reformers have so often been hindered. He made friends everywhere, and was held in high esteem wherever there were earnest and intelligent advocates of Temperance. It cannot be said that any man's work is indispensable to the desired results, or that any one man has brought to pass the victory for which many labored; but if the Temperance sentiment in the Dominion ever rises to triumphant power, and sweeps away the greatest evil in the land, it will be due in a large degree to the earnest and unassuming efforts of Thomas Gales, the brave, the patient and the faithful. His life closed peacefully after a painful illness. He kept his work in his hands as long as he had the power, and did not lay it down till all details that he could arrange had been carefully attended to, and all was ready to leave to his successor. He has served his generation honorably and well, and though his life was cut short in the midst of his days, this world is the better and the richer for his having lived in it.

A 178
a

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE

For the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic.

THE ALLIANCE YEARBOOK,

1884

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF
THE COUNCIL OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE.

TORONTO:
CITIZEN PUBLISHING Co., 8 KING STREET EAST.

1884.

INTRODUCTORY.

This is the third issue of a book that is intended as an Annual. It contains, however, much more than was given to the public in former editions. An earnest effort has been made to collect the most important facts of the year on the subject of Temperance, to bring the information down to the latest possible date, and in general to provide a manual that will be welcome and indispensable to the friends of Temperance in Canada. The difficulties have been considerable, and the Committee cannot claim that they have all been overcome. The success of such a publication is dependent upon the prompt and efficient co-operation of a large number of persons, scattered through the entire country, and it has not yet been possible to enlist them all as thoroughly as might be desired. Sincere thanks are hereby returned to the many friends who have given their help, and it is the hope of the Committee that the Alliance Year Book may become a permanent institution, so useful and so warmly recognized that no needed hand will be withheld from the work of making it perfect.

T
T
Exec
Vida
Com
Jami
addr
the
and a
I
the s
secon
to pr
of pr
T
T
whic
each

/
all Se
/
Doug
C
M. P
/
S. A.
/
Ferri

Pass & Received

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

—OF—

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE

Held in Ottawa, January 31st and February 1st, 1884.

The Council of the Dominion Alliance met, pursuant to the call of the Executive, in the City Hall, Ottawa, Jan. 31st, 1884, at 10 a.m. Senator Vidal, President, called the meeting to order, and appointed a Business Committee, consisting of Revs. J. Wood, D. L. Brethour, Jas. Kines, Geo. Jamieson and M. S. A. Abbott. On the Committee retiring, the President addressed the Council, specially referring to the great loss sustained by the Temperance cause in the lamented death of the Rev. Thos. Gales, and also to the general state of the work.

Desire having been expressed by several members of the Council that the session should be opened with prayer, on motion of Prof. Foster, M.P., seconded by Mr. Dougall, it was *Resolved*—That a Committee be appointed to prepare and report a form of prayer for the use of the Council, such form of prayer to be read by the President of the Council at its meetings.

The Rev. W. Scott then led the Council in prayer.

The Business Committee reported the following Standing Committees, which were severally put and appointed, and the report adopted as a whole, each Committee to have power to add to its number :

COMMITTEES.

Legislation—Senator Vidal, J. J. McLaren, Q.C., Judge Jones, J. R. Dougall and all Senators and Members of Parliament who are members of the Alliance.

Nominations—Messrs. S. A. Abbott, A. Longley, Prof. Foster, M. P., J. R. Dougall, Rev. James Kines and Mr. W. W. Buchanan.

Credentials—Rev. D. W. Lucas, and Messrs. W. H. Allison, M. P., G. G. King, M. P., J. K. Stewart, Geo. May and N. Shakespeare, M.P.

Resolutions—Rev. W. Scott, and Messrs. A. Gilmor, M.P., N. Shakespeare, M.P., S. A. Fisher, M. P. and F. S. Spence.

Finance—Messrs. Geo. May, A. C. McDonald, M. P., Senator McLellan, Senator Ferrier and Mr. Allison, M.P.

Committee on the State of the Work—Revs. D. L. Brethour, J. Wood and Messrs. M. Auger, M. P., Dr. Moore, N. Shakespeare, M. P., F. S. Spence, A. Longley, M. Gregault, M. P., and W. W. Buchanan.

Literature—Prof. Foster, M. P., Rev. D. V. Lucas, W. McCraney, M. P., M. Cotton, F. S. Spence and C. Burpee, M. P.

Letters were read from the Hon. G. W. Ross, Minister of Education for Ontario, from the G. W. P. of the Sons of Temperance, Mr. W. H. Howland and Rev. Dr. Clark, of Toronto: On motion, the letter of the Grand Worthy Patriarch, S. of T., was referred to the Committee on the State of the Work, and that of Mr. Howland to the Committee on Legislation.

Mr. S. A. Abbott, the Acting Secretary, then read the following report, which, on motion of Rev. Mr. Kines, seconded by Rev. Mr. Jamieson, was referred to the Committees on Legislation and The State of the Work.

ANNUAL REPORT.

It is proper, perhaps at the outset to allude to the circumstances which have placed me for the time being in the position of Acting Corresponding Secretary of the Dominion Alliance. The Rev. Thos. Gales, who was Secretary of the Alliance since its organization in 1876, died in Montreal on the 24th of October, last. A few days before his death, and while dissolution was imminent, he requested me to make the necessary arrangements for the present Council Meeting. It was impossible for me to refuse, and I consented, with extreme reluctance, temporarily to accept the post, my acceptance having been sanctioned by the President of the Alliance and the Chairman of the Executive. The great misfortune which has befallen the Alliance and the temperance cause generally throughout the Dominion, in the death of Mr. Gales, will be more fittingly set forth by resolution during this course of the meeting.

LEGISLATION.

The chief legislative event of the year is the passage of the "Liquor License Act, 1883," which will only come into full operation May next. Except in Nova Scotia, where it superseded in some respects, more effective provincial legislation, the Act was generally received with much satisfaction by the temperance public, as marking a very distinctive advance in restrictive legislation, but the high hopes conceived of its value have been lessened in some minds by doubts cast upon its constitutionality.

PUBLIC OPINION.

But among the masses of the people there has never been a more prosperous year for the temperance cause. Educating agencies are multiplying on every hand. The popular knowledge concerning the nature of alcohol—which is the most sure and durable basis of temperance legislation—has been steadily increasing, and the Dominion of Canada is getting its full share of the remarkable temperance wave which is sweeping over Great Britain and America.

Concerning the progress in the several provinces, I can only give such items as I have been able to gather. The reports of the provincial branches to be published in the next Year Book, will give more complete details.

ONTARIO.

Halton is still the only county that has adopted the Scott Act. Though the Act has not entirely prohibited liquor selling, it has greatly diminished it in towns and villages, and nearly extirpated it from rural districts. Fourteen clergymen in Halton have given the following testimony:—

“Whereas a controversy has been going on in the public press of the province, as to the benefit of the Canada Temperance Act in the County of Halton, we hereby give it as our unqualified judgment, derived from personal observation, that it has largely decreased the sale of strong drinks, as evidenced by the sobriety of the people at all the public gatherings in the county. We are also further convinced that drunkenness has vastly decreased—owing principally to the almost entire suppression of the ‘treating system,’ all statements to the contrary notwithstanding.”

Steps preliminary to the submission of the Scott Act are being taken in the counties of Oxford, Norfolk, Essex, Carlton, Kent, Lambton, Dundas, Stormont and Glengarry.

QUEBEC.

The Dunkin Act is in force in the counties of Brome and Richmond since 1877. In Brome it is regarded by the public as useful, but imperfect, and as having greatly diminished the sale of liquor. In Richmond, the town of that name, when incorporated, rejected the Act, but outside the town the results are returned as remarkably favorable. In many of the French parishes of the province prohibition prevails by the simple method of the municipal councils refusing licenses. Among the French population there is now visible a distinct stirring of public opinion in respect to the temperance question. In the cities of Montreal and Quebec there are large vigilance associations composed of influential French citizens, under

the patronage of the bishops of the dioceses, and whose object is the vigorous enforcement of the license law. Many of the French papers, too, publish editorials and contributed articles discouraging the drinking customs and deploring the evils of the liquor traffic.

The Provincial branch held its annual meeting in Montreal last week. The following resolution was adopted :

"That the Quebec branch request the Dominion Alliance to use its influence to obtain amendments to sections 32 and 47 of the License Act of 1883, so that a majority of the voters shall be substituted in lieu of two-thirds and three-fifths respectively."

The annual provincial pic-nic was held at Cowansville on August 31st. Sir. A. T. Galt presided, and, along with two members of the House of Commons and one member of the Quebec Government, spoke strongly for prohibition.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The Provincial branch met on the 31st October. The Secretary, Mr. Patrick Monaghan, stated in his report that the temperance work was being vigorously prosecuted. The orders of the Sons of Temperance and Good Templars have been extending and added largely to their membership. The Sons of Temperance have made unparalleled progress during the year. Since Nov. 1st, 1883, to January 14th, 1884, 84 new divisions have been organized, and 26 resuscitated, a total of 110.

During the session of the Local Legislature a bill was introduced with the object of making the Provincial License Law less stringent in its operation, but it was lost by a large majority, only four or five members voting for it.

In October last the Scott Act was adopted by a large majority in the county of Cumberland, making the eleventh county where the Act prevails, while Yarmouth is preparing to take the vote. Reports from the Scott Act counties show that in some of them it works satisfactorily. In others there is much difficulty in enforcing it, owing to the number and delay of appeals on mere technicalities, and the indisposition of the officers to do their duty. Under the Act a certain time is required to elapse after the expiration of the licenses in a county adopting the Act before it can come into force ; but in several counties which adopted the Act no licenses were running when the proclamation was issued ; hence the lawyers claim that the date of the expiry of the licenses has never been reached, and therefore that the Act cannot come into force. In order to meet the difficulties that have

arisen in the operation of the Act, Mr. Monaghan recommends that it be amended, first, so as to lessen the facilities for appeal from convictions; second, that in counties where no licenses are running the Act shall come into force thirty days after the proclamation of the Governor in Council.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

In September last a vigorous movement for the organization of the province was begun by Prof. Foster, M.P., and Rev. John McLeod, President of the Provincial Branch. Auxiliary Alliances were organized in the counties of Queen's, Westmoreland, Charlotte, St. John, Albert, York and Canton. The constitution adopted by these county organizations commits them to three plans of practical work: first, to hold at least one mass-meeting half yearly in the chief places of the county; second, to scatter widely temperance literature; and third, to see to the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act. Each county alliance pledges itself to give at least \$50 a year toward the general fund of the Provincial Branch, to be used in lecture work and the distribution of temperance literature. The Provincial Branch is composed only of delegates from the county alliances, from which it derives its financial support.

The Canada Temperance Act is in force in nine counties and one city. It is thoroughly endorsed by the people, and many of the legal difficulties which at first obstructed its operation, have been cleared away. So far it has been a fair success, and still better results are expected from it by the additional powers conferred by the new Liquor License Act, 1883. In Charlotte county an agitation was started to repeal the Scott Act, but the Alliance promised so vigorous resistance that the attempt appears to have been abandoned.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

In this Province also there has been great activity in the extension of the Order of Good Templars. In Prince County an attempt is being made to repeal the Scott Act, and the vote will be taken in a few days. The operation of the Act is said to be much hampered by delays from appeals on technicalities. The Provincial Alliance, however, has been very vigorous in prosecuting infractions, and on January 16th inst., there were forty or fifty cases down for trial.

MANITOBA.

The Scott Act is in force in the Counties of Marquette and Lisgar. From Marquette a test case is before the Dominion Supreme Court, and from Lisgar another case is before the Queen's Bench of the Province, and

owing to uncertainty as to the result, the Act is not well enforced at the present time. In the newly-added territory of the Province, the Northwest Act was supposed to be in force, and responsible persons testify that it is practically a dead letter, in so far as it was intended to prohibit the liquor traffic. Direct obstacles are put in the way of its enforcement in this respect by the Local Government and Courts. The Executive of the Provincial branch hold regular monthly meetings in the City of Winnipeg, and have important work in hand in prosecuting the appeals against the Scott Act in Marquette and Lisgar.

TEMPERANCE TEACHING IN SCHOOLS.

This matter is attracting greatly increased attention in all the Provinces. The Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have both provided for temperance teaching in the public schools.

In Quebec, the Argenteuil County Alliance memorialized the Provincial Teachers' Association in favor of the use of temperance text books in schools. Two philanthropic gentlemen in Montreal, Messrs. Henry Morton and W. J. Patterson, have, at an expense of \$500, placed a copy of Dr. Richardson's Temperance Lesson Book in the hands of every Protestant public school teacher in the Province, and also in every private school in Montreal.

In Ontario, the Women's Christian Temperance Union submitted to thirteen Teachers' Institutes a memorial in favor of scientific instruction on temperance in schools. From the replies received by the Union from several of these Institutes, it appears that in many parts of the Province temperance instruction is already given in schools. In Essex the Inspector made it one of the subjects the pupils have to pass for promotion.

THE WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

This organization is extending in all the Provinces of the Dominion, and promises to become second to no other in the work of delivering the country from the liquor traffic. The Ontario Provincial Union met in October, and reported returns from twenty-five local unions, with a membership of over seven hundred. The Union has done excellent service in promoting temperance teaching in schools, circulating literature, making use of the press, and promoting the use of unfermented wine by the churches. In Quebec there are from fifteen to twenty local unions, which have been organized into a Provincial Union. In Montreal the local union

numbers four hundred Christian women. Provincial Unions have also been organized in New Brunswick and British Columbia.

THE VOICE OF THE CHURCHES.

The United Methodist Church, at its first general conference, held in Belleville, adopted a report recommending the introduction of temperance text books into schools, urging the Methodist people throughout the Dominion to adopt the Scott Act, and entreating the official boards to use for sacramental purposes only the pure juice of the grape. It also recommended the Methodist people to vote only for candidates pledged to prohibition, and closed with these words:

"We strongly recommend to all to vote as they pray; then they can pray as they vote. It is a contradiction that should at once and forever end, that a christian man will pray in one way that God will remove the liquor traffic from our midst, and the next hour vote to perpetuate it."

The Ninth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted resolutions earnestly recommending to office bearers and members of the Church, the practice of total abstinence; approving the principle of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, as an important means of limiting the liquor traffic and educating the people for entire prohibition.

The Provincial Synod of the Church of England, at its meeting in Montreal, in August last, in reply to a memorial from the Church of England Temperance Society of the Diocese of Toronto, passed a resolution recommending the formation of parochial and diocesan societies throughout the ecclesiastical province, on the basis of the Church of England Temperance Societies of the mother land.

At the request of the Toronto Society above mentioned, the Bishop of that diocese has set apart Sunday, March 2nd, as Temperance Sunday within the Diocese.

The Ottawa Association of the Baptist Church, at its meeting in June, reaffirmed their interest as a Christian body in the cause of temperance, and in the suppression of the liquor traffic. The Canada Baptist Missionary Convention East, heartily recommended total abstinence to all members and adherents, and urged their cordial support to all legitimate organizations for the suppression of intemperance.

The Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec, at its meeting in June, urged all the churches to throw their strongest influence in favor of prohibition, recommended the use of temperance text books in schools, and

that all the churches use only the unfermented juice of the grape in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

On the whole the retrospect of the year is one of almost unprecedented encouragement. We have no great legislative nor electoral victories to chronicle, but we are able to signalize something far more important—a deep and rapidly growing conviction among the most influential classes of society, that the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage in any degree, is a physiological error and consequently morally wrong; and that the licensed sale of those liquors by the Government is a national crime against our own citizens and a national sin against God.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

S. A. ABBOTT,

Corresponding Secretary, pro tem.

The Council then adjourned to meet at 2 p.m.

THURSDAY, 2 P. M.

The Business Committee presented a docket of business for the afternoon. The minutes were read and approved. Item No. 4 was taken up first, and on motion the Council went into Committee of the Whole on revision of the Constitution, Rev. W. Scott in the chair. Several articles were amended, in accordance with suggestions of the late Rev. T. Gales, after which the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked that the remainder of the Constitution be referred to a Special Committee of seven, which the Chairman appointed as follows: Messrs. Dougall, Lucas, McLaren, McGill, J. K. Stewart, Abbott and Rev. W. Scott.

In the absence of Senator Vidal, Mr. Dougall was then called to the chair.

The Committee on the State of the Work reported. Several clauses were adopted or amended, when the clause referring to the Province of Quebec was referred back to the Committee for completion.

Prof. Foster addressed the Council on the "Extension of the Work." The subject was afterwards discussed by Rev. D. V. Lucas, Mr. May, Rev. W. Scott, Rev. D. L. Brethour and others. Prof. Foster moved, and it was

Resolved—That the Executive of this Dominion Alliance, in conjunction with the Provincial Alliance, be requested to prepare and hold, during the present year, a grand demonstration in two cities each in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, in Charlottetown, P. E. I., Winnipeg, Man., and Victoria, B. C.

On motion of Prof. Foster, seconded by Mr. Dougall, it was also

Resolved—That the Executive of this Alliance be authorized to employ for the year 1884, or as much of it as possible, an energetic and able agent, whose duty it

shall be, under the direction of the Executive, to perform such work of organization and advocacy as may be deemed best. That the salary be fixed by the Executive, and that a Finance Committee be appointed to collect for that purpose a minimum sum of \$1,000. That the employment of the agent be contingent upon the success of the Committee in the raising of the money.

EVENING MEETING.

A public meeting was held in the Dominion Methodist Church. Hon. Senator Vidal occupied the chair, and the meeting was addressed by Mr. McLaren, Q. C., Montreal; Rev. D. L. Brethour, of Milton, Ont.; Senator Girard, of Manitoba; Prof. Foster, M. P. and Mr. F. S. Spence.

FRIDAY, 10 30 A. M.

Senator Vidal took the chair, calling attention to the presence in the house of Mrs. Chisholm, President of the Ontario Women's Christian Temperance Union. On motion of Rev. J. Wood, seconded by Mr. Geo. May, Mrs. Chisholm was invited to a seat on the platform, and elected a corresponding member of the Council.

The minutes of Thursday afternoon's session were read and approved.

Mr. May presented the Treasurer's Report, which, on motion, was referred to the Finance Committee for audit.

The Committee on the State of the Work presented their completed report.

1. That the growth in every part of the Dominion of strong public sentiment in favour of Temperance and Prohibition is very encouraging.
2. In British Columbia the W. C. T. Union, Band of Hope Movement and Blue Ribbon work have been remarkably successful. A resolution is now before the Local Legislature favouring a most thorough-going measure of Woman Suffrage. This resolution is being promoted in the interests of Prohibition.
3. Manitoba and the North-West Territories have made much progress. The North-West Act has accomplished almost marvellous results among the native Indian population and the employees of the Canada Pacific Railway; the absence of crime, the maintenance of order, and the astonishing advancement of that new country, have been largely aided by the prohibitory clauses of the said Act. In Manitoba the Templars and Royal Templars have organized Grand Bodies; the Gospel Temperance Movement has met with the greatest success. The Province is ripe for Prohibition. The Provincial Branch of the Alliance has been reorganized, and is in a very flourishing condition. The Scott Act has been adopted in two counties, but owing to yet undecided appeals it is not at present enforced. In the territory claimed by both Ontario and Manitoba there is little restriction of the liquor traffic.
4. Ontario reports large increase in the membership of Temperance organizations, a special feature being the progress of the Church of England Temperance Society in the diocese of Toronto. As shown by the Secretary's Report there is a special effort being made in Scott Act work, and for the introduction of Temperance teaching into the Public Schools, the latter work being much promoted by the Women's Christian Temperance Union.
5. In Quebec there is a very extensive popular Temperance movement under the enthusiastic direction of the Roman Catholic Clergy, who are also in cordial sympathy with the Alliance in the effort to secure further restriction of the Liquor

Traffic. The rapid spread of the W. C. T. Union has created among all classes of society a new activity and zeal in advocacy of social reform in reference to drinking customs. A large number of County Branches of the Alliance are working vigorously in their respective localities. The effect of the enforcement of the Dominion License Act in the Province would, in populous localities, greatly lessen the number of places where liquor is sold.

6. The New Brunswick Branch of the Alliance is increasingly useful and active, and is looked upon favorably by the better class of the population, being recognized as the most important Temperance organization in the Province.

7. The acceptance by Nova Scotia of the Scott Act, as indicated in the Secretary's Report, shows plainly the trend of public feeling in that Province. The Act is being well enforced. The Sons of Temperance have made remarkable progress, and other societies are flourishing.

8. The Scott Act is in force in the whole of Prince Edward Island. An effort is being made for its repeal in Prince County, but the movement is not likely to be successful. The Good Templar order has been introduced, and has met with great success.

9. The almost unanimous support of Church organizations, and religious newspapers, and the support of a large section of the secular press, in every part of the Dominion, are specially encouraging features of our present position.

10. We respectfully submit the following recommendations: (a) That a page in our Year Book be devoted to details of the working of the prohibitory clauses of the North-West Act. (b) That the Legislation Committee be requested to report upon the subject of permits under the said Act. (c) That a special Committee be appointed to consider the recommendations of the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

The Report was unanimously adopted.

The Chairman appointed a Special Committee to deal with the letter of the G. W. P. of Sons of Temperance, consisting of Messrs. Brethour, McGill and Stewart.

Letters from Mr. I. S. Brown, President of the Quebec Branch of the Dominion Alliance, were read—the one, referring to Mrs. Gales, being referred to the Finance Committee, and the other to the Committee on the State of the Work.

A letter from Dr. Youmans, St. Catharines, Ont., was also read, and referred to the Special Committee on the letter of G. W. P. Sons of Temperance.

The Committee on Legislation reported:

On motion the Report was received, and the first clause considered, viz.: That a deputation from this Council do wait upon the Government of the Dominion at as early an hour as can be arranged, and represent to them, That in the opinion of this Council the country is, as a whole, favorable to complete prohibition, and requesting, first, That a Bill be introduced at this present session, totally prohibiting the liquor traffic throughout the Dominion; second, That if this request is declined, a Bill be introduced which will secure the polling of the whole country, so as to ascertain its views on the subject of total prohibition; Or, failing this, that in case of a simultaneous movement for the adoption of the Scott Act, in a large proportion of the

count
polling

Pr

1.
taneou
Canad

2.
Hous
law fo

O

T

T

Domin
during
for the
has be
Act.

T

A

on the

ing at

work

W

of the

Prohib

W

work

R

be ma

2.

comm

and o

peranc

taken

place,

report

T

letters

Dr. Y

tions

I

import

T

Fund

receiv

T

now d

action

Domin

as last

counties, the Government would be pleased to appoint as nearly as possible the same polling day, in all the counties.

Prof. Foster moved in amendment, seconded by M. A. Longley,

1. That we send a deputation to the Government asking them to grant simultaneous polling in groups of counties which are agitating for the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act.

2. That we instruct our Executive to take measures for introducing into the House of Commons a resolution affirming the desirability of passing a prohibitory law for the Dominion of Canada.

On the motions being put, the amendment was declared carried.

The second clause of the Report was then read and adopted as follows :

That it be recommended that action be taken in every county throughout the Dominion, where such action is possible, with a view to a simultaneous polling during the year of all such counties in favor of the Canada Temperance Act, not only for the extension of the splendid results which have flowed from that law where it has been duly enforced, but for the early passage of a complete National Prohibitory Act.

The Council then adjourned till 2 p. m.

FRIDAY, 2.30 P. M.

After the Minutes had been read and approved, the Special Committee on the communication from the Grand Division, S. of T. of Ontario, calling attention to the desirability of a general convention of Temperance workers of the Province, reported :—

Whereas, having heard from various reliable sources, and from various Provinces of the Dominion of the rapid growth of public opinion in the direction of a total Prohibitory law, and

Whereas, it is very desirable to secure unity of action between all Temperance workers in the country, be it

Resolved.—1. That in our judgment the time has come when a direct effort should be made to secure a Prohibitory Liquor law for the Dominion.

2. That we recommend the Executive of this Council to put themselves into communication with the Executive of the Grand Division of the S. of T. of Ontario, and other organizations, with the view of calling a general convention of all Temperance and Christian workers in the Dominion to consider what action ought to be taken with reference to this question—said convention to be called at some central place, and at as early a date as may be agreed on by said joint Executives. The report was adopted.

The same Committee also reported that the matters referred to in the letters of Mr. T. S. Brown, President of the Québec Branch, and Dr. Youmans, of St. Catharines, Ont., has already been covered by resolutions adopted by the Council.

Prof. Foster, M.P., read a letter from Mr. Johnson Harrison, of similar import.

The Finance Committee reported :—

The Finance Committee would report with much satisfaction that the Defence Fund has been closed. The amount, to be paid by the Government, has been duly received, and all accounts in connection therewith settled as per printed statement.

The current expenses of the Council, on receipt of the arrears of assessment, now due, amounting to \$165.00, will provide for all present liabilities. Pending the action to be taken on Professor Foster's motion, looking to the appointment of a Dominion agent, they would advise the assessment, on the Provinces to be the same as last year.

A letter from Mr. T. S. Brown, President of the Quebec Alliance, referred to us respecting the late Rev. Thomas Gales and his family we deem of such importance that we consider the Council should deal with the subject matter contained therein, and we respectfully refer said letter back for the earnest and practical consideration of the Council.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. C. MACDONALD.
W. H. ALLISON.
GEO. MAY.

The report was adopted, and the clause referring to the late Rev. Thomas Gales was referred to a special Committee consisting of five, consisting of Messrs. Buchanan, Bengough, Brethour, Lynch, and Spence.

The Committee of nominations reported the following list of Officers and Executive for the year 1884-85.

PRESIDENT:—HON. ALEXANDER VIDAL, Senator, Sarnia, Ont.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

- | | |
|---|---|
| Hon. S. H. Blake, O. C., Toronto. | Prof. Foster, M.P., Apohaquin, N.B. |
| Right Rev. Bishop Bond, Montreal. | N. Shakespeare, M.P., Victoria, B.C. |
| Right Rev. Bishop Baldwin,
London, Ont. | S. A. Fisher, M.P., Knowlton, Que. |
| Right Rev. Bishop Wilson, Ottawa. | M. Auger, M.P., Roxton, Que. |
| Sir S. L. Tilley, M.P., Ottawa. | John A. Kirk, M.P., Glevely, N.S. |
| Sir A. T. Galt, Montreal. | A. W. Ross, M.P., Winnipeg, Man. |
| Hon. James Ferrier, Senator, Montreal. | A. C. Macdonald, M.P.,
Montague Bridge, P.E.I. |
| Hon. Rev. Scott, Senator, Ottawa. | Rev. Dr. Dewart, Toronto. |
| Hon. M. A. Girard, Senator,
Boniface, Man. | Rev. Dr. Moore, Ottawa. |
| Hon. A. R. McLellan, Senator,
Hopewell, N.B. | Rev. A. A. Cameron, Winnipeg, Man. |
| Hon. D. Wark, Senator, Fredericton, N.B. | Rev. Dr. Clark, Toronto. |
| Hon. T. R. McInnes, Senator,
New Westminster, B.C. | J. R. Dougall, Montreal. |
| Hon. S. Creelman, M.L.C., Halifax, N.S. | J. H. Flagg, Mitchell, Ont. |
| Hon. J. W. Sifton, Brandon, Man. | J. W. Manning, Almonte, Ont. |
| Hon. G. W. Ross, M.P.P., Toronto. | Judge Jones, Brantford, Ont. |
| Lieut.-Governor, J. C. Aikins,
Winnipeg, Man. | H. O'Hara, Toronto. |
| W. McCraney, M.P., Oakville. | W. H. Lambly, Inverness, Que. |
| T. S. Brown, Montreal. | J. F. Butler, Halifax, N.S. |
| Rev. Jos. McLeod, Fredericton, N.B. | Rev. J. M. Cameron, Toronto. |
| Rev. E. Robson, New Westminster, B.C. | Rev. John Shaw, Peterboro, Ont. |
| F. W. Hales, Charlottetown, P.E.I. | Rev. W. Scott, Ottawa. |
| A. Longley, Paradise, N.S. | G. M. Rose, Toronto. |
| J. Scriver, M.P., Hemmingford, Que. | Alderman J. T. Moore, Toronto. |
| Jamieson, M.P., Almonte, Ont. | Rev. Dr. Burns, Halifax, N.S. |
| C. Burpee, M.P., Sheffield, N.B. | Sheriff Temple, Fredericton, N.B. |
| G. G. King, M.P., Chipman, N.B. | Andre Cushing, St. John, N.B. |
| T. Robertson, M.P., Barrington, N.S. | Rev. G. H. Hodgson,
Charlottetown, P.E.I. |
| James Reid, M.P., Cariboo, B.C. | J. Parsons, Halifax, N.S. |
| W. H. Allison, M.P., Newport, N.S. | T. M. King, Antigonish, N.S. |

Chairman of Executive, J. R. DOUGALL, Montreal.

Solicitor, J. J. McLAREN, O.C., Montreal.

Treasurer, GEORGE MAY, Ottawa.

Corresponding Secretary, F. S. SPENCE, Toronto.

Recording Secretary, REV. JOHN WOOD, Ottawa.

COMMITTEE.—The members of the Executives of the several Provincial Branches of the Alliance, with the Rev. A. P. McDiarmid, M.A., Rev. B. Longley, B.A., Rev. Dr. Moore, and Messrs. E. Steer, J. G. Howe, J. K. Stewart, J. B. Halkett, R. E. Jamieson, E. Botterell, J. M. T. Hannum and John Lamb, all of Ottawa.

These several nominations were confirmed.

The Finance Committee reported the Treasurer's Books audited and found correct.

The following is a summary of the Treasurer's accounts :

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT DEFENCE ACCOUNTS.

STATEMENT NO. 1.

Bill of Messrs. Simpson, Hammond & Co., London, taxed by order of the Board of the Privy Council, Feb. 21st, 1883.....	£249	3	2
Amount taxed against Appellant in the judgement and collected by Messrs. Simpson, Hammond & Co.....	214	10	10
Balance due Simpson, Hammond & Co.....	34	12	4
	£249	3	2

STATEMENT NO. 2.

Amount remitted to Messrs. Simpson, Hammond & Co., London (as per Alliance Year Book, 1882, page 22).....	9735	55	
Amount retained by Messrs. Simpson, Hammond & Co. in settlement of their account as per statement No. 1.....	£34	12	4
Cash received from Simpson, Hammond & Co.....	557	03	
Exchange.....	10	05	
	9735	55	

STATEMENT NO. 3.

Receipts and disbursements of the Committee from February 14th, 1883.

RECEIPTS.

Balance (as per Year Book, 1883, page 15).....	4	50
Cash from Messrs. Simpson, Hammond & Co., London, (as per Statement No. 2).....	557	03
Cash from the Government.....	2,083	04
	2,644	57

DISBURSEMENTS.

J. J. Maclaren, Q.C., on account.....	1,522	57
Sundries.....	19	70
Repaid the Branches:		
Ontario.....	382	80
Quebec.....	286	80
New Brunswick.....	96	00
Nova Scotia.....	96	00
Prince Edward Island.....	40	70
	902	30
Repaid loan (see Year Book, 1883, page 15).....	200	00
	2,644	57

STATEMENT NO. 4.

Summary of all expenses Securred and paid by the Alliance.

Simpson, Hammond & Co. balance on their account.....	\$	168	47
J. J. Maclaren's account.....		1,822	57
Paid C. H. Lugin (see Year Book, 1882, page 22).....		90	00
Sundries.....		32	15
Exchange (as per Statement No. 3).....		10	05
			<hr/>
CR.—By cash from Government.....	\$2,083	04	
" " Branches.....	40	20	
			<hr/>
	\$2,123	24	
July 13th, 1883.			

GEORGE MAY, TREASURER, IN ACCOUNT WITH THE
DOMINION ALLIANCE.

DR.

RECEIPTS.

Assessments, 1882-3.

Ontario.....	\$105	00
Quebec.....	75	00
New Brunswick.....	37	50
Nova Scotia.....	37	50
Prince Edward Island.....	15	00

Assessments, 1883-4, on account.

Ontario.....	\$ 50	00
Quebec.....	37	50
New Brunswick.....	20	00
Nova Scotia.....	20	00
Prince Edward Island.....	7	50

Quebec Branch.

Literature Fund, on account of Gem book, 500 copies.....	\$40	00
For extra Gem books.....	17	85
" " 	40	00
" " 	3	85
To balance.....	3	67
		<hr/>
	\$510	37

Au
 A
 H. M
 copies
 of whi
 in the
 Institu
 with th
 reply t
 to assu
 they h
 Th
 Scott :
 1. T
 the lie
 through
 for the
 contain
 2. T
 John W
 to Geor
 3. Y
 the pro
 tained t
 brought

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

17

CR.

DISBURSEMENTS.

Sundry charges Annual Meeting.....	\$ 5	
Printing Account submitted to the Council, Feb., 1883. See Year Book, page 16.....		\$ 5
Witness Co., printing.....	143 44	
Bentley.....	5 25	
T. Gales.....	24 74	
		173 43
Postage Year Book.....	5	
Amount voted Secretary.....	100	
Witness Co. on account of 2000 copies Year Book, 1883.....	121 57	
Witness Co., 1,500 extra copies.....	40	
Postage circulars.....	1	
Postage Year Books.....	3 37	
Witness Co., extra Year Books.....	49	
" " " ".....	40	
Post Cards.....	2	
		331 94
		\$510 37
Balance due Treasurer.....		3 67

Audited and found correct.

A. C. MACDONALD.
W. H. ALLISON.

A letter was read by the Secretary from Messrs. W. J. Patterson and H. Morton, of Montreal, along with which he presented, in their name, six copies of the "Temperance Lesson Book," by Dr. B. W. Richardson, copies of which had been presented by them to all the Protestant School Teachers in the Province of Quebec, and many Public Libraries, and Benevolent Institutions, and which they asked the Alliance to endeavor to co-operate with them in circulating. On motion, the Secretary was instructed to reply to their letter, thanking them for their liberality and public spirit, and to assure them that the Alliance will do all in its power to further the object they have in view.

The Committee on Resolutions reported through the Rev. William Scott:—

1. That this Council again expresses its thankfulness to Almighty God, in that the life of the esteemed President of the Dominion Alliance has been preserved through the year; and this Council records its gratitude to the Hon. Senator Vidal for the valuable services rendered to the cause during the year, and trusts that his continued Presidency will redound to the progress of Prohibition.
2. That our cordial thanks are justly due, and are hereby tendered to the Rev. John Wood for the excellent work done by him as the Secretary of the Council, and to George May, Esq., for his valuable services rendered as Treasurer of the Alliance.
3. Your Committee feels itself altogether unable adequately to express in words the profound sorrow which pervades this Council in consequence of the loss sustained by the death of the Rev. Thomas Gales. His foresight, wisdom, and tact brought into existence the Dominion Alliance. His readiness in the preparation of

business, and his promptness of action, are gratefully remembered. To his laborious exertions, and indefatigable persevering zeal, the Dominion Alliance has been greatly and constantly indebted. Although our beloved brother cannot any more appear among us as a fellow-laborer, yet his example and exertion cannot fail ever hereafter to exert a beneficial influence on the cause we have at heart. While deeply feeling the loss we have sustained, we bow submissively to the will of God, and at this time also express our Christian sympathy with the bereaved widow and family of our departed brother, and commend them to the care and Providence of God, the Father of the fatherless, and the husband to the widow. But it must not be forgotten that the bereaved ones have not only claims on the sympathy of the Temperance community, but considering our great indebtedness to the late Brother Gales, this Council bespeaks a cheerful and liberal response to the appeal which has been made on their behalf.

4. That the most cordial thanks of this Council are due to Mr. S. A. Abbott for the great service rendered by him in supplying the place of the late Brother Gales, and for the manner in which he has fulfilled the special duty of preparing for this Annual Meeting, and carrying through the several parts of our business.

5. This Council reiterates the sentiment of grateful appreciation of the grand work accomplished by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and anticipates still further beneficial results from the establishment of these Associations. This Council therefore recommends that all friends of the Alliance render all possible assistance to the operations, and enlargement of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, as being essentially auxiliary to the practical ends contemplated by the Dominion Alliance.

6. That the thanks of the Council are hereby given to the several Railway Companies for the facilities granted to its members in travelling to and from the city.

7. That the Council has much pleasure in again acknowledging, with thanks, its indebtedness to the Mayor and Council of this city for the use of this commodious Hall for the transacting of our business; and that the City Clerk, M. W. P. Lett, be requested to present this resolution to the City Council at an early sitting of that body; and that the same be published by the city papers.

These resolutions were severally adopted. It was also, on motion of Rev. Geo. Jamieson, seconded by Rev. W. McGill,

Resolved.—That the second Sabbath of December be appointed a day on which the ministers of the Gospel throughout the Dominion be requested to preach a Temperance sermon, or any day near that date that may be convenient, and that the Secretary be requested to send circulars to said ministers to that effect.

The Committee on Literature reported:

(1) We reiterate and emphasize the necessity for a wide and constant use of the best selected temperance literature as an indispensable adjunct to the progress of our reform. The printed page can be placed where the lecturer cannot possibly gain a hearing. (2) We earnestly recommend that so far as possible literature, pertinent to the particular phases of the temperance question as developed in Canada, be secured for distribution. (3) We recommend to the Council to take into consideration the propriety of adopting some one paper as a special exponent of its principles. In this respect THE CANADA CITIZEN possesses special claims to recognition.

The report was submitted, clause by clause, and adopted.

On motion of Mr. Dougall, seconded by Prof. Foster, M. P., the Constitution was referred to the Executive to report upon next year.

A committee, consisting of Prof. Foster, Mr. F. S. Spence, Rev. Dr. Clark, Toronto, and Rev. John Wood, was appointed to prepare and publish the *Alliance Year Book* for 1884—the number of copies being left to their discretion.

The special committee on Mr. I. S. Brown's letter reported :

Your Committee, appointed to deal with the suggestions of Mr. I. S. Brown, regarding the indebtedness of the temperance people of Canada to the family of our late Secretary, Rev. Thomas Giles, reports: In view of the tributes paid to the memory of our late indefatigable co-worker by the resolutions and expressions of the Council, we would but reaffirm the necessity for acknowledging in some practical way the great debt due from the Alliance and the temperance people of the Dominion to the memory and relatives of the late Secretary. The only feasible plan presenting itself to your Committee for carrying into effect such an expression is that of securing a free-will offering testimonial, in which every temperance man and woman, or society, in the Dominion would have opportunity to participate. We recommend that the Executive of the Council prepare a circular and subscription lists for immediate submission to the temperance public, setting forth the claims of the testimonial, and soliciting the aid of all interested in making it creditable to the source from which it emanates; that the necessary machinery for carrying the effort to a successful issue, including the appointment of a treasurer for each Province, and the publication in THE CANADA CITIZEN of all subscriptions received, be arranged and provided by the Council's Executive.

The report was adopted, and it was ordered that all sums over \$1 be acknowledged.

On motion of Mr. J. R. Stewart, seconded by Mr. Fee, it was

Resolved,—That this Council desires to place on record its appreciation of the active efforts of Temperance people in the various counties in the Dominion in which the Scott Act has been adopted, and is pleased to learn that, notwithstanding the efforts of the Agents of the liquor traffic to prevent the Act from being successfully enforced—notably in Halton in Ontario, that the results in staying the evils of intemperance are highly gratifying, and should induce a concentration of force to prevent a repeal of the Act, wherever such attempt may be made.

It was also

Resolved,—That this Alliance recommend the Counties that they have their petitions for the submission of the Canada Temperance Act ready and deposited with the Government by the 1st July, and that the vote be asked for the latter part of October, 1884.

Prof. Foster moved, seconded by Rev. Mr. Kines, and it was

Resolved,—That the Executive be authorized to prepare a circular, embodying our action, and have it published in the principal papers, and sent to the Temperance Organizations throughout the Dominion.

It was further

Resolved,—That the Deputation to the Government consist of all members of Parliament who have been in attendance at this Council, and the Rev. William Scott; Prof. Foster to act as Convener. And further, that Prof. Foster be requested to bring up the Resolution on Prohibition in the House of Commons, and that Mr. S. A. Fisher, M. P., be requested to second it.

The preparation of a form of prayer, for use at the Sessions of the Council, was remitted to the Executive, to report next year.

On motion the minutes of the afternoon's session were accepted as read, and the Council was declared adjourned.

JOHN WOOD,

Recording Secretary.

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

BY PROF. GEORGE E. FOSTER, M. P.

I.—ITS HISTORY.

The Canada Temperance Act marks an important era in the history of our Temperance Reform ; and the date of its passage will forever stand out as a memorable transition period in the attitude of Canadian legislation towards the sale of alcoholic liquors.

Previous to 1878, Canada, as a whole, had taken no decided Parliamentary stand upon this question. The various Provinces dealt with it, each in its own chosen way, and, in the main, in about the same spirit as before the Confederation. License was the rule in all the Provinces, conditioned it is true, with greater or less strictness of provision and severity of penalty.

Ontario and Quebec had, in addition, the "Dunkin Act," by which, upon a majority vote of any Municipality, the retail trade could be prohibited in quantities of five gallons and under. Nova Scotia required a two-third ratepayers' petition before a license could issue, and this had driven the traffic to a large extent from many of her Counties. New Brunswick had passed a Prohibitory Law in 1855, which, however, owing to political complications, was but of short duration, and thereafter license was the rule.

After the Union in 1867 a strong and wide agitation was set on foot for the enactment of a Prohibitory Law by the Dominion Parliament, and petitions praying for this object were, in 1873-4, presented, representing a total of five hundred thousand names. Parliament went so far as to appoint a Commission, which, in 1874, made a personal investigation into the working of prohibition in countries which had adopted it. Their report was thoroughly sifted by Parliamentary Committees, and resolutions recommending the passage of a Prohibitory Law were adopted by both Senate and Commons.

Then arose the mixed question as to whether the Dominion or Provincial Legislatures had the right to prohibit ; a question to solve which many and ineffectual steps were proposed or taken.

At last, in the Session of 1878, "The Canada Temperance Act" was submitted by the Mackenzie Government, and after a full discussion was passed

on its second reading without a division. It received the assent of the Governor-General, and in May, 1878, became law.

Three attempts have since been made in Parliament, to impair the efficiency of the Act. In 1880 the Boulton Amendment, which provided that before the Act can be adopted it shall receive the majority of the whole number of votes on the voters' lists, was carried through the House of Commons, but defeated in the Senate. In 1881 it was again introduced into the Commons, but thrown out by the significant vote of 82 to 54. In 1881, the Almon Amendment, which proposed to exempt from the operation of the Act, malts and wines having less than 10 per cent of alcohol, passed the Senate by a vote of 28 to 26, but was not suffered to come to a vote in the Commons. No attempt was made in 1882 to tamper with its provisions.

The constitutionality of the Acts had to be tested in the Courts. It went into operation in Fredericton, May 1st, 1879, and a test case was taken to the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. On August 12, 1879, the Court decided the Act unconstitutional—Judge Palmer alone dissenting. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, when in April, 1880, the judgment of the New Brunswick Court was reversed, and the Act declared to be constitutional, only one Judge (Henry) dissenting.

The enemies of the Act were not, however, content to abide by the decision of the highest Court of Appeal in Canada, but determined to carry their contention to the Privy Council of Great Britain. This was done in the case of Russell vs. Woodward, and Mr. Benjamin, Q. C., was retained by them. The Dominion Alliance sent Mr. Maclaren, Q. C., of Montreal, to plead the Act.

On the 22nd of June, 1882, judgment was given by the Law Lords, affirming the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, and placing the constitutionality of the Canada Temperance Act beyond all doubt.

Thus, after a struggle of fifteen years, from 1867 to 1882, the Temperance people of Canada succeeded in forcing the question of Prohibition to a successful issue in the Parliament of Canada, and settling beyond all dispute the absolute right of that Parliament to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic liquors.

It is true that the Act is a local option one; but it is prohibitory in principle, and may be extended as widely as Canadian territory reaches. Its enactment may justly be looked upon with pride, and its adoption and enforcement in a large part of our territory may be fairly anticipated.

The enforcement of the Act has been sadly interfered with on account of the various test cases carried to the Higher Courts involving the constitutionality of the Act, and other points. The other points have been chiefly these :

1st. As to whether an appeal could be taken from the judgment of a Police Magistrate ; decided in the negative.

2nd. As to whether Moncton and other places were Cities or Towns under the Act ; decided in the negative.

3rd. As to whether Summerside, P. E. I., was a city under the Act, and Charlottetown a town under the Act ; decided in the negative in each case.

4th. As to the coming into force of the Act in counties where no licenses are in force at the time of the adoption of the Act ; difficulty removed by special Act at last session of Parliament.

Notwithstanding all the difficulties encountered, the law has abundantly proved its capacity for enforcement ; and now that the decision of the Privy Council has established its constitutional character, we may look for a fair and impartial enforcement of its provisions.

And whenever this is done, its beneficial effects in lessening the public sale, and consequent drunkenness and crime, will establish it in favor, and lead in the coming years to the enactment of a full measure of complete Prohibition.

II.—ITS PROVISIONS.

1. It is an Act passed by the Dominion Parliament in 1878, and may be applied to any city or county in Canada, upon a majority vote of the electors therein qualified to vote at a Dominion election. The object, as stated in its preamble, is to promote temperance and secure in all the Provinces uniform legislation respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors. It was passed in answer to the petition and prayers of hundreds of thousands of men and women in the Dominion, for some effective measure to diminish drunkenness and promote the sobriety and happiness of our people.

2nd. In order to bring the Act to a vote, a petition must be signed by at least one-fourth of the legal voters in a municipality, which petition, after

The sale of alcohol compounds is allowed for three purposes—medical, sacramental and mechanical; and vendors not to exceed one in each township, two in each town, or one for each 4,000 inhabitants in cities, are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor for this purpose. The conditions of sale for each of these purposes are very strict and such as to effectually guard against any abuse.

4. The following parties are allowed to sell by *wholesale*, and then only to the vendors mentioned in above paragraph, or to such persons as shall forewith carry the same beyond the limits of the county or city, or of any adjoining county or city which is under the Act, viz.:—manufacturers of cider, licensed distillers or brewers, companies incorporated to carry on the business of cultivating grapes and manufacturing wine therefrom, and persons exclusively engaged in a wholesale trade, and licensed by the county or municipality.

The smallest quantity which can be sold by *wholesale* is:—for beer, 8 gallons, for all other liquors, 10 gallons. Whenever cider, distilled, or malt liquors are sold by those producing them, it must be only at the place of manufacture, and in all the above cases the burden of proof lies with the sellers to furnish satisfactory evidence that the liquors sold were to be carried forewith outside the limits of the city, or county, or of an adjoining city or county under the Act. Manufacturers of pure native wine made from grapes grown by them in Canada, may also sell their wines at the place of making, but, only in quantities of not less than 10 gallons, and only when duly licensed by the municipality.

5. The adoption of the Act, therefore, entirely precludes the retail of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. All bars, shops, tipping places and shebeens are to be closed—temptations are removed; it allows the sale, under strict regulations, for medical, sacramental and mechanical purposes; it limits the wholesale traffic to customers who shall forthwith carry being deposited for ten days in the office of the Sheriff or Registrar, is forwarded to the Dominion Government, and thereupon the Governor and Council examine the petition, and, if they approve it, give official notice of a day upon which the electors may vote for or against the adoption of the Act.

3. When the Act has been adopted and proclaimed in force, the retail sale of all intoxicating liquors for use as beverages is at once and entirely stopped; all bars are closed, and no licenses can be issued.

the liquor outside the limits of the city or county, or of an adjoining city or county which may be under the Act.

The Act cannot be repealed under three years ; has heavy and increasing penalties ; and with some exceptions allows of no appeal from the decision of the first court.

The convictions are summary, and the penalties adequate. For the first offence not less than \$50 fine and costs. For second offence not less than \$100 and costs. For each subsequent offence, imprisonment.

When tried before a Stipendiary or Police Magistrate, a Parish Commissioner, Sheriff or Recorder, the decision of the court is summary and final. There is no long harrassment of appeal.

The precise description of the liquor, the actual passing of money, or consumption of liquors, has not necessarily to be proved ; if the Court is satisfied from the evidence that a transaction in the nature of barter or sale has taken place, conviction may follow.

The person charged with unlawful sale may be called upon to testify under oath.

Apparatus for the sale found along with liquors are *prima facie* evidence of guilt, and unless satisfactorily explained will cause conviction.

Prosecutions may be brought by or in the name of any persons, or by or in the name of the Collector of Inland Revenue, and it shall be the duty of the latter officers to prosecute upon reasonable evidence. One-third of the fines resulting to the municipality are to be put aside as a fund for prosecuting illegal sales under the Act.

In Ontario the three Commissioners, and an Inspector appointed and paid by the Government, are charged with the oversight and enforcement of the law. Any county or city may appoint any additional officers and appropriate funds for the better carrying out of the Act.

III.—THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CAMPAIGN.

The following is a statement of the counties and cities which have voted upon the Act up to May 1, 1884, the votes polled for and against, and the date of the election :

Fred
York
Princ
Char
Carle
Char
Albe
King
Lamb
King
Quee
West
Mega
North
Stans
Quee
Marq
Digby
Quee
Sunb
Shelb
Lisga
Hami
King
Halto
Annar
Went
Colch
Cape
Hants
Wella
Lamb
Inver
Pictou
St. Jo
Freder
Cumb
Prince
Yarm
Oxford

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

PLACE.	VOTES POLLED.		DATE OF ELECTION.	
	For.	Against.		
Fredericton (city), N. B.....	403	203	October 31,	1878
York, N. B.....	1229	214	Dec'r 28,	"
Prince, P.E.I.....	2062	271	" 28,	"
Charlotte, N.B.....	867	149	March 14,	1879
Carleton, N.B.....	1215	96	April 21,	"
Charlottetown (city), P.E.I.....	827	253	April 24,	"
Albert, N.B.....	718	114	April 21,	"
King's, P.E.I.....	1076	59	May 29,	"
Lambton, Ont.....	2567	2352	May 29,	"
King's, N. B.....	798	245	June 23,	"
Queen's, N.B.....	500	315	July 3,	"
Westmoreland, N.B.....	1082	299	Sept. 11,	"
Megantic, Que.....	372	841	Sept. 11,	"
Northumberland, N.B.....	875	673	Sept. 2,	1880
Stanstead, Quebec.....	760	941	June 21,	"
Queen's, P.E.I.....	1317	99	Sept. 22,	"
Marquette, Man.....	612	195	Sept. 27,	"
Digby, N.B.....	944	42	Nov. 8,	"
Queen's, N. S.....	763	82	January 3,	1881
Sunbury, N.B.....	176	41	February 17,	"
Shelburne, N.S.....	807	154	March 17,	"
Lisgar, Man.....	247	120	April 7,	"
Hamilton (city), Ont.....	1661	2811	" 13,	"
King's, N.S.....	1477	108	" 14,	"
Halton, Ont.....	1483	1402	" 19,	"
Annapolis, N.S.....	1111	114	" 19,	"
Wentworth, Ont.....	1611	2202	" 22,	"
Colchester, N.S.....	1418	184	May 13,	"
Cape Breton, N.S.....	739	216	August 11,	"
Hants, N.S.....	1028	92	Sept. 15,	"
Welland, Ont.....	1610	2378	Nov. 10,	"
Lambton, Ont.....	2988	3073	Nov. 29,	"
Inverness, N.S.....	960	106	January 6,	1882
Pictou, N.S.....	1555	453	January 9,	"
St. John, N.B.....	1074	1074	February 23,	"
Fredericton, N.B.....	293	252	October 26,	"
Cumberland, N. S.....	1560	262	October 25,	1883
Prince County, P. E. I.....	2939	1065	February 7,	1884
Yarmouth, N. S.....	1300	96	March 7,	1884
Oxford, Ont.....	4073	3298	March 20,	1884
Total,	49,103	26,944		

Stormont, Glengarry, Dundas,	Ontario,	Norfolk,
Russel and Prescott,	York,	Perth,
Carleton,	Peel,	Lambton,
Leeds, Grenville,	Simcoe,	Huron,
Lennox, Addington,	Grey,	Bruce,
Prince Edward,	Brant,	Kent,
Northumberland, Durham,	Elgin,	

are already moving, and others will join in the work as advised by the Dominion Alliance.

Several points of great significance may be noted in a careful review of the above table.

1. The preponderating prohibition sentiment in the Maritime Provinces as shown by the greater number of counties and cities that have adopted the Act.

Out of 40 contests, only 2 have been in Quebec, 2 in Manitoba and 7 in Ontario, while 29 have taken place in the Maritime Provinces. The result of the vote has been unfavorable to the Act in two cases in Quebec, four in Ontario, and one in the Maritime Provinces.

2. The preponderating number of instances in which the Act has been adopted.

There have been so far 40 contests. The Act was carried in 33, lost by majorities in 6, lost by a tie in 1. 33 victories and but 7 defeats in a series of 40 battles!

3. The preponderating majorities in favor of the Act as shown by the votes cast.

In the 33 constituencies which carried the Act, the vote stands:—

For 39,027
Against 13,624

Majority in favor of Act 25,403 or over 48 p.c. of total vote.

In the 7 constituencies in which the Act was lost, the vote stands:—

Against 13,320
For 10,076

Majority against 3,244 or 14 p. c. of the total vote.

The vote in the 40 contests stands:—

For 49,103
Against 26,944

Majority 22,159 or over 29 p. c. of total vote.

4
votes o
discour
ericton
and wh
destroy

The
it was c
The vo
signific

The
large sc
Dundas
moving
Allianc

1.—
tempera
circular
any be
trusted
intruste
All
invited
general
these ci

2.—
Secretar
ward of
its comm
and its c

Prov
is to asse
responsi
App
Executiv
literatur

4. The satisfaction given by the Act when adopted as shown by the votes on repeal in Fredericton, N. B., and Prince, P.E.I. Under many discouragements and with the full burdens of all the appeals taken, Fredericton tried the Act for three years. The results were taken into account, and when the vote for repeal was brought on, and every effort made to destroy the Act, it was sustained by a good majority.

The same was true of Prince County, P.E.I., and when repeal was tried, it was defeated by the decisive vote of 2,939 to 1,065, a total vote of 4,004. The vote was unprecedentedly large and the majority of 1874 equally significant.

The agitation for the adoption of the Act is being undertaken on a large scale in Ontario. Norfolk, Kent, Essex, Lambton, Grey, Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry, Northumberland, Carleton and Russell are already moving, and others will join in the work as advised by the Dominion Alliance.

III.—HOW TO SECURE ITS ADOPTION.

1.—Let a brief, neat, circular be prepared, calling a convention of temperance people to meet at a certain place and on a fixed date. This circular should be signed by the President and Secretary of the Alliance, if any be in existence in the county, and by a committee of known and trusted temperance men. This committee can be arranged for by any one intrusted.

All temperance bodies, churches and benevolent societies should be invited in this circular to send two or more delegates. Besides them, a general invitation should be extended to all friends of the movement. Send these circulars far and wide through the county.

2.—When the convention meets let it appoint its officers—President, Secretary, Treasurer, Vice-President for each parish or township, village and ward of the city, an Executive of about five persons living near each other, its committees of which each Vice-President is an ex-officio convener, and its Canvassers for the purpose of getting signatures to the petitions.

Provision should be made for raising funds for the work. A good plan is to assess each township or ward, and make the Vice-President of such responsible for the collection of the amount.

Appoint a Lecture and Literature Committee, which had better be the Executive, and give them instructions to be liberal in the use of pertinent literature and good speakers.

3.—The Canvassers should be supplied with proper petitions, revised voters' list and instructions as to whom and how to canvass and witness the signatures. They should be urged to take small districts, and do the work thoroughly and quickly. Not more than a fortnight should be used in canvassing names to the petitions. So soon as the Canvasser has completed his work he should make his affirmation in proper form before the proper officers, and then forward his petitions to the Secretary.

It would be well to hold some meetings in advance of the Canvassers, so as to inform the people and make the work easier.

4.—Keep up a gentle agitation while the petitions are going through the forms prescribed, and do this in a great measure by literature distribution and personal conversation, having occasional meetings at prominent points.

The Executive should, in the meantime, perfect their arrangements for holding as perfect a series of public mass meetings at all possible points in the county, and have its speakers ready for the campaign.

5.—So soon as the petition has been affirmed by the Governor-General in Council, let every body go to work. Keep the platform busy, the literature agoing, the personal canvass persistent and constant, and allow not one moment's slacking of effort until the close of the poll.

On polling day let all the temperance people give up their time in seeing that every available voter, favorable to the adoption of the Act, deposits his vote. If you are successful, congratulate your neighbors and go quietly home, thankful for victory. If you are beaten, determine there and then that in the first opportunity you will try again.

Above all things, the work should be done heartily and promptly. The surest way to kill all prospects of success is to drag the canvass and contest over a year or so, now up and down, alive for a little, then dead for a longer time.

So far as possible, several adjoining counties should enter upon the contest together. Mutual aid and sympathy assist very much to a favorable result, and distract and divide the forces of the opposition.

The
19th da
The ma
it was s
to decla
midst.
that dru
sellers h
the new
were no
that the
people.
the situ
perance
spirit an
show ho
kept. U
courage
which n
received
should h
from the
tant cla
hands fo
courage
came.
were con
soon be
dark roc
spoken,
enforcen
cision w

THE SCOTT ACT IN HALTON.

BY REV. D. L. BRETHOUR.

The Canada Temperance Act was passed in the County of Halton on the 19th day of April, 1881, and came into force on the 1st day of May, 1882. The majority with which it was carried was not very large, being only 81, but it was sufficiently large to indicate the decided opinion of the people, and to declare their purpose to tolerate no longer the licensed liquor traffic in their midst. By this majority, small as it was, the voters of the county asserted that drunkard-making by law would no longer be allowed. The liquor-sellers had ample time to dispose of their "stock," and fall into line with the new order of things had they been so disposed. But unfortunately they were not well advised by their friends, and it soon became but too evident that they intended to disobey the law and set at defiance the temperance people. To the great credit of some of the ex-hotel keepers they accepted the situation and went out of the trade, or turned their hotels into temperance houses. But, to the disgrace of many others, their law-defying spirit and purpose were soon manifest. The records of the police court show how well and truly the compact they had made between themselves was kept. Unfortunately those law breakers received both direct and indirect encouragement from some of respectable influence and character in the county, which made them all the more determined in their course of defiance. They received also, if not direct, at least indirect, encouragement from others who should have stood by the law, encouraging them to hope that by appeals from the Police Magistrate's decision to the superior courts some important clauses in the Act would be broken down. This strengthened their hands for a season. For a time the temperance people were greatly discouraged, but prayer to God was constantly made, and encouragement came. Information of the violation of the Act was received and many were convicted. Public opinion which seemed to waver for a short time soon became so decided that the outlawed liquor trade hid its head in dark rooms and secret dens. Many who gave the law-breakers, if not outspoken, at least silent, sympathy, began to speak out in favor of the enforcement of the law. Several appeals from the Police Magistrate's decision were dismissed and his judgment sustained by the higher courts, and

the hands of temperance workers were strengthened. In the practical enforcement of the Act it has shown itself to be a better law than many thought. No law ever placed upon the Statute Books of this country has so powerfully arrested, controlled and demoralized the liquor business as this Scott law has. It has a grip in it which this trade feels to its very centre of power. The men who deal in "the bottled host of death" hate it, and have set all their machinery of power to defeat it, but the temperance people are yet more vigorously rallying to the enforcement of the law. There is now no poetry in violating the Act. It secures no applause, approval or sympathy from any man of decent reputation. Only the lowest and most debauched of men think there is anything of which to boast in such transgressions. It is not considered even moderately clever to break the law and sell liquor contrary to its provisions. On the contrary, it is a very risky and serious matter. The shadows of the prison loom up before many of them and throw themselves threateningly across their path, and with silent gesture warn them of approaching danger. The respectability of liquor-selling in Halton is forever destroyed. There is no Act of Parliament now behind which to take refuge and justify themselves in their work, but the statutes which have been so long with them now at last thunder their anathemas of penalty against the business.

The results of nearly 23 months of the operation of the Act are satisfactory. Crime has been reduced to a minimum. The reduction of committals to the gaol for 1883 as against 1882, is 40 per cent. The reduction of crime, as shown by the quarterly schedules of convictions for the last 16 months of license as compared with the 16 months of the Scott Act ending Dec. 11th, 1883, was 70 per cent. at least. There have been 4 sittings of the Assizes in the county since May 1st, 1882, and there has been no case of crime before the judges. In this crime calculation we except all prosecutions for violation of the Scott Act, or cases arising out of such violations. Several of the county constables testify that their business has been destroyed, some of them making not one dollar in 20 months of Scott Act rule, where under license they made \$70 a year. Some of them have not served a summons or warrant, or arrested a man in all this time, while they very frequently did it before. They cheerfully testify to the good order, peace and sobriety of the various places where they reside, as compared with licensed whisky times. The sheriff and jailer say their business is nearly ruined also. The costs of criminal justice in this county is a mere bagatelle. The sheriff says

'The
but o
disor
shoul
planat

It
by the
ton a
remen
count
well a
tempe
serious
ing of
and in
of less
various
been in
that so
it follo
find th
yet opp
instanc
the cou
mercha
ever sin
years in
same ti
kind, th

It is
said the
was not
consum
stater
of the

"There is no crime." The ~~gaper~~ says the same thing. There has been but one committal, I believe, to the gaol in six months for "drunk and disorderly." It seems fitting that the Inspector of Prisons for this province should write an official letter to the sheriff of the county asking for an explanation as to the cause of the great decrease of crime in Halton.

BUSINESS.

It has been claimed that business has been greatly injured in the county by the Scott Act. That its enforcement has driven trade to Peel, Wellington and Wentworth. This statement cannot be sustained. Let it be remembered that there is a great depression in trade everywhere in this country, and it would not be at all surprising if Halton felt the pressure as well as every other county in the Province. If the statement of anti-temperance men is true, the public may be prepared to hear of many and serious failures among the merchants, but this is not the case. The standing of the business men in Halton is equal to what it was under license, and in some cases better. The failures in the county have been fewer and of less importance than in neighboring counties. Many merchants from various parts of the county cheerfully declare that their business has not been injured by the Scott Act. A few say it has. It may be quite true that some merchants have not done as much business as before, but does it follow the Scott Act must be the cause? In most of such cases you will find these men to have been opposed to the passing of the Act, and are yet opposed to it. But the cases are very few indeed. In some noted instances business has largely increased—people coming to Milton from the counties of Wellington and Peel to buy goods. The business of one merchant, who took an active part in the passing of the Act, and has been ever since an outspoken advocate for its enforcement, has in the last two years increased his sales to nearly \$1600 more than under license for the same time. There is the most abundant testimony, and of the very best kind, that the Act has not injured business in the County of Halton.

NOT MORE LIQUOR SOLD, NOR DRUNKENNESS.

It is true there is liquor sold and drank in the county. No one ever said there was not. There is drunkenness also. No one ever said there was not. But what the temperance people have said is, that the sale and consumption of liquor and drunkenness have largely decreased. For this statement we have the very best evidence from many of the leading citizens of the county, including the members of the Dominion Parliament and

Local Legislature, the Sheriff, Warden, Gaoler, Police Magistrate, Justices of the Peace, County Councillors, business men, etc., etc.

The Act has greatly disappointed the anti-temperance people. They thought it would be a mere toy in their hands to play with as they pleased, but they have found to their bitter sorrow that it has heavy money penalties within and prison bars behind it. The present position of the Act in public confidence is very encouraging. Many who did not vote for the Act when submitted will now vote for it if a repeal is attempted; many who voted against will now either not vote to repeal it, or will vote against a repeal of it. Very few who voted for it will vote against it now. It is winning many friends and losing very few. As the time passes on it is becoming more certain that Halton will never go back on its record of April, 1881. The Scott Act has come to Halton to stay until a total prohibitory law for the Dominion will supersede it.



Ea

Resp

p

3

A

Cana

of th

or fo

part

passe

unde

of 18

or to

No.

It

correc

Th

satisf

to the

J

I-

was p

sec-

signat

Justices

They
pleased,
penalties
Act in
for the
many
against
It is
is be-
f April,
hibitory

ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Extract from THE CANADA GAZETTE, of February 5th, 1881.

REGULATIONS

Respecting Petitions under "The Canada Temperance Act 1878," approved by His Excellency the Governor-General in Council on the 31st day of January, 1881.

I.

All petitions to the Governor General in Council under "The Canada Temperance Act 1878," whether the same be for the bringing of the second part of the Act into force in any County or City in Canada; or for the revocation of any Order in Council bringing the said second part of the Act into force as aforesaid, or for the repeal of a by-law passed by the Council of any County or City in Ontario or Quebec, under the authority and for the enforcement of "The Temperance Act of 1864," are required to be executed and attested in the form following or to the like effect, viz.:

Petition as per Schedule A, of Act.

No.	Genuine signature of elector.	Name distinctly written.	Description or addition of elector.	Polling district or division of Voters' List where name may be found.	Witness to signature.

It is particularly requested that the signatures to the petition be correctly and consecutively numbered.

II.

The evidence required under Sections 6 and 7 of the Act for the satisfaction of the Governor-General in Council shall be as follows, or to the like effect:

a.

Declaration by Witness to signature. (Under 37 Vic. chap. 37.)

I _____ of _____ in the _____ of _____ do solemnly declare that I was present and did see _____ sign the { within or foregoing } Petition, and that the signature _____ appended to said petition and numbered _____

is in the proper handwriting of the said _____

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the thirty-seventh year of Her Majesty's Reign, intituled "An Act for the suppression of voluntary and extra-judicial oaths."

A. B.

Declared before me at _____
 of _____ in the County
 of _____ this _____ day of
 _____ 188_____

C. D.

(Justice of the Peace or other functionary authorized by law to receive the solemn declaration of any person voluntarily making the same before him under 37 Vic., chap. 37.)

N. B.—Any number of signatures may be proved by the same declaration, making the change from singular to plural where necessary. Where an elector is unable to sign and makes his mark in the presence of a witness, the above declaration may be varied to suit the case.

b.

Declaration as to qualification of persons signing petition. (Under 37 Vic. chap. 37.)

I _____ of the _____ of _____ in the _____ of _____ do solemnly declare,

That I have carefully compared the petition of certain electors of the _____ of _____ to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council praying that (*here state the purport of the Petition*) with the last certified Voters' List in force in the said _____ of _____, and that from such comparison I find that the persons who have signed said petition are persons named in the said Voters' List and as I verily believe qualified and competent to vote at the election of a Member of the House of Commons in the said _____ of _____.

And I make this solemn declaration &c., (*remainder as in form "a."*)

N. B. The above declaration may relate to the whole or part of a petition. If it be made with respect to part of the petition only it should be varied accordingly.

Where a difference in spelling or otherwise exists between the signature as on the petition and the name as on the Voters' List which it

is desired to explain, a special declaration in explanation should be given.

c.

A declaration or certificate by the Registrar, City or Town Clerk, Clerk of the Peace or other proper custodian of the Voters' Lists, as to the number of electors in the County or City qualified and competent to vote at the election of a Member of the House of Commons at the time of the deposit of the petition with the Sheriff or Registrar of Deeds.

d.

A copy of the Revised Voters' List in force in the County or City at the time of the deposit of the petition with the Sheriff or Registrar of Deeds.

e.

A declaration or certificate by the Sheriff or Registrar of Deeds of or in the County or City named in the petition as to the date of the deposit of the petition and the time it remained in his office for public examination by any parties.

f.

Two copies of two newspapers containing the notice previous to deposit as required by section 6.

True copy,

J. O. COTE, Clerk Privy Council.

W. C. T. U. WORK IN CANADA.

MRS. ADDIE CHISHOLM.

Many years ago a woman in Israel, a judge and prophetess, having heard the voice of the Lord in relation to a great work to be done in that land, gave the divine command to Barak, who then went forth to battle in behalf of an oppressed people. The most noted leaders were in that company, ten thousand men were under arms and victory was promised, for had not the Lord said, "I will deliver the enemy into thine hand?" Still the army hesitated. Why did they not move?

Barak said to Deborah, "If though wilt go with me, I will go." So Deborah arose and went with Barak to Kedesh, where the battle was fought, the victory won and *the land had rest*.

From that time till the present many battles have been fought between truth and error, freedom and oppression, where the the leaders have recognized and invited the presence of women.

The Deborah of the anti-slavery army, Mrs. Stowe, uttered this same prophecy as she, with those grand leaders went forth to the aid of a down-trodden race. "The Lord will deliver the oppressed people." That, like the sound of Prohibition at the present day was not a popular cry, neither was the work praised of men, but a work which was done largely in secret by many, because of the varied interests involved. Ridicule, denial and abuse were used against the truth, but in vain. The work went steadily on, until a few years later, the tide of right feeling arose, came nearer and nearer, and finally it swept over the whole country, washing away the whole stains of slavery, that curse of a nation which delights to call itself free.

The women of Canada having heard the voice of the Lord in secret, are hearing the Barak-call from the leaders in this great army of temperance workers. Not only that, but they hear more loudly and frequently the cry of the enslaved people, the wail of little ones who suffer and die under the reign of the tyrant, and the bitter moaning of those who wish for death, but no death comes. They have gone in and out of homes saddened by a great sorrow and have sat silent before the hopelessness of broken-hearted

wives
made
Our
homes
there t
So, in
help in
the pe
so mar
they co
when t
world,

The
Do
On
Qu
Ma
Brit
The
will hol
years—
their w
to devis
detail t
The

The
local U
1100.
importa

wives and mothers whose very effort to conceal the cause of their grief only made it more apparent.

Our women see, too, that their homes are in danger. While some happy homes have been entered and their peace destroyed, what guarantee is there that other happy homes may not be touched with the same blight? So, in self-protection and in the interests of humanity, they have united to help in freeing this people from a tyranny greater than that exercised over the people of Israel, and from a slavery of both soul and body into which so many thousands of our people have sold themselves. While they work they continue to look forward with the sure gaze of prophecy to the time when this land—now grown to be a country among the countries of the world, and this people a nation—shall have rest.

The W. C. T. Unions of Canada, are classed as follows:—

Dominion Women's Christian Temperance Union.

Ontario Provincial " " "

Quebec Provincial " " "

Maritime Provincial " " "

British Columbia Province Women's Christian Temperance Union.

The Dominion Union was organized in Montreal in Oct. 1883, and will hold its first meeting—which meetings are to be held once in two years—in the early part of 1885. Its aim will be to unite more closely in their work the Christian temperance women of the different provinces, and to devise plans for the general good; these to be largely carried out in detail throughout the Provincial Unions.

The officers are:

Mrs. L. Youmans, President.

" Addie Chisholm, Ontario,

" Middleton, Quebec,

" Todd, New Brunswick,

" Pollard, British Columbia.

" Tilton, Corresponding Secretary.

Miss Renard, Recording Secretary.

Mrs. Steadman, Treasurer.

} Vice-Presidents.

The Ontario Provincial Union, organized in 1877, now comprises 49 local Unions, with a membership, according to latest quarterly report, of 1100. The attention of this Union has been largely directed to the great importance of introducing scientific instruction in temperance into our

public schools. Dr. Richardson's Temperance Lesson Book, and other books, have been widely circulated in teachers' conventions and elsewhere. Petitions have been presented to School Boards, etc., and recently a deputation of ladies from this Union waited upon the Minister of Education, asking that temperance text books be introduced into our public schools, to which request a very favorable reply was received. Medical Conventions and Associations have been approached, and correspondence had with Synods, Conferences and Assemblies, on the medical use of alcohol and the use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Table. 20,000 tracts have been sent out during the year from the Literary Department of the Union, and more than fifty newspapers supplied regularly with temperance items. 2,174 meetings have been held by local Unions, and 1,864 signatures to the pledge have been obtained by individual effort, exclusive of signatures given at public meetings. Three Y. W. C. T. Unions are in connection with this Union, under whose control and supervision Boys' Schools, Girls' Sewing Schools and Bands of Hope are successfully carried on. There are eleven different departments of work in connection with this Provincial Union, each Committee being actively at work.

LIST OF DEPARTMENTS.

1. Plan of Work.
2. Literature.
3. Prison and Jail Work.
4. Legislative.
5. Press.
6. Unfermented Wine.
7. County Fairs.
8. S. S. Temperance Work and Juvenile Unions.
9. Presenting the Claims of Temperance to Religious and other Bodies.
10. Scientific Instruction in Temperance.
11. Y. W. C. T. Unions.

President, MRS. ADDIE CHISHOLM, Ottawa.

Cor.-Secretary, MRS. M. FAWCETT, Scarboro'.

The Quebec Provincial Union was organized in Montreal, October 17th, 1883. Starting with 18 auxiliary local Unions and a membership of over 900, this Association bids fair to become a power for good in the

land. Although the Provincial Society has been so recently formed, effective work has been done for some time by local Unions, the first W. C. T. U. in this Province having been organized at Stanstead by Mrs. Pierce, of Boston, Mass., in 1877. The education of the children in temperance principles has received the special attention of very many Unions throughout this Province, and, according to the last report, nearly 1,000 children are members of the Bands of Hope. Public meetings have been promoted, literature distributed, free reading rooms and coffee rooms established, petitions circulated against licenses, temperance picnics held, introduction of temperance text books into public schools attempted, cottage and mothers' meetings held, and a great amount of individual work done that has greatly aided and strengthened the cause of temperance in this Province. There is one Y. W. C. T. Union at Point St. Charles recently formed, which is already doing active work, and will be found to be a social power, whose weight and influence for good cannot be estimated.

LIST OF DEPARTMENTS.

1. Heredity and Hygiene.
 2. Scientific Instruction.
 3. Sunday School and Juvenile Work.
 4. Temperance Literature and Influencing the Press.
 5. Evangelistic Work among Railroad Employees, Soldiers and Sailors, and to secure the use of the unfermented juice of the grape at the Lord's Table.
 6. Prisons and Police Stations, and Work among Intemperate Women.
 7. Social—including
 1. Y. W. C. T. Unions.
 2. Kitchen Garden.
 3. Flower Mission.
 4. Parlor Meetings.
 8. Legislation and Petitions.
- President, MRS. MIDDLETON, Quebec.
Cor. Sec'y, MISS LAMB, “

Four years ago a Provincial Union for New Brunswick was organized at Fredericton, in that Province, the first local union having been formed at Moncton in 1875. In 1883 this Provincial Union was merged into a

Maritime Union formed at Fredericton, which includes Auxiliary Union, from the three Provinces, N. B., N. S., and P. E. I. The exact number of members is not furnished, but, if we judge by the work accomplished, there must be very many willing workers in behalf of this cause in these eastern provinces. The work done has been :

1. Establishment of coffee and reading rooms, soup kitchens and sewing schools.
2. Formation of Bands of Hope.
3. Holding Temperance news meetings and providing popular lectures and distributing temperance literature.
4. Promoting scientific instruction on temperance.
5. Urging the use of unfermented wine at the Lord's table.
6. House to house visitation.

President, MRS. (Dr.) TODD, St. Stephen.
Secretary, MISS ELLA THORNE, Fiton.

The Provincial Union of British Columbia was organized in 1883, and comprises two local Unions, one in Victoria and one in New Westminster, with a membership of 140. In addition to the branches of work undertaken by the other Provincial Unions, this society has declared in favor of the ballot for women.

President, MRS. POLLARD, Victoria.
Cor. Sec'y, MRS. D. A. JENKINS, "

In Manitoba two local Unions have been organized during the last year. One in Winnipeg, of which Mrs. Monk is President, Mrs. Somerset, Cor. Sec'y, and one in Brandon in the same Province. These are just beginning the good work, and at the close of another year will have doubtless a record to give of many useful measures planned and executed, by means of which reformatory, educational, preventative and legislative work will have been effectively accomplished.

THE SONS OF TEMPERANCE.

This organization was instituted in the city of New York, September 29th, 1842, to supplement, solidify and perpetuate the results of the Washingtonian Reformation. For forty-one years the Order has been working diligently and increasing in numbers and power. It is now composed of a National Division, forty Grand Divisions, and nearly three thousand Subordinate Divisions embracing every State and nearly every Territory of the Union—also, Canada, Great Britain, and the Islands of both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, and it has enrolled more than three millions of persons.

Canada has six Grand Divisions, a great number of Subordinate Divisions, and an aggregate membership of about thirty thousand.

This Society has for its fundamental principle total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks. It presents a fraternal combination to meet and overcome the social allurements of intemperance and the combined influence of the liquor traffic. Its beautiful and instructive ritual, filled with the spirit of love, and self-sacrifice for the welfare of others, appeals to the highest faculties of human nature. The plain and simple constitution, practical code of laws, sound financial basis, co-operation, sympathy and union with the moral and Christian elements of the country, are making it one of the most powerful agencies against intemperance and the liquor traffic in the world. The growing temperance sentiment of the country necessitates permanent organization, in order that the good accomplished by the Murphy Movement and previous efforts may be perpetuated. The experience, moral, numerical and pecuniary strength of the Sons of Temperance, offers every advantage necessary to satisfy the requirements of such an organization. Its membership is composed of the best class of persons of both sexes, old and young, who are actuated by a common purpose of reclaiming the fallen and throwing around them an influence calculated to benefit them morally, socially and intellectually.

The Order aims to educate the children in the principles of total abstinence, through organizations of the Cadets of Temperance, superintended and managed by the Divisions, and create a wide-spread public sentiment

in favor of total abstinence, and to support and aid in carrying forward ALL movements designed to suppress the vice of intemperance. Not only does it aim to reform and save the drunkard, but also seeks to throw safeguards around the innocent, which shall prevent them from becoming victims to the vice of intemperance.

The Division Room is an educator, and possesses the charm of a social circle, where there exists the warm fraternal feeling and a community of interest. Those who enter this group come into an assembly of sympathetic friends, who receive them into cordial fellowship, and take a kindly interest in their welfare. As the bar room has its social fascinations, so this Order aims to render temperance attractive. In addition to the social features, new and beautiful ceremonies are employed. The exercises at the regular meetings are always of an interesting character, being an agreeable blending of business and social recreation. Its grand purpose is indisputably an offspring of the Gospel. Its principles, laws and practices are in accordance with its motto, "Love, Purity and Fidelity."

Since the Order was first instituted, it has been steadily at work saving the fallen and advancing temperance sentiment among the people. Many of the leading and most influential statesmen and orators, of the past and present, commenced their work in the Division Room, and owe a portion of their success to the Sons of Temperance, of which they are still members.

The following are the present officers of the National Division :

B. F. Dennison, 27 North Third Street, Philadelphia, Penn.; Charles A. Everett, St. John, N. B.; Rev. R. Alder Temple, 183 Hollis Street, Halifax, N. S.; Wm. A. Duff, 121 North Ninth Street, Philadelphia, Penn.; Rev. C. Henry Mead, Hornellsville, N. Y.; Mrs. G. L. Sanford, New Haven, Conn.; George P. Bliss, Brandon, Manitoba.

The next Annual Session will be held at Mountain Lake Park, Maryland, commencing on the 8th day of July, 1885.

of E
temp
I
the
3rd
of T
the
Gran
prog
part
tion.
ficia
doin
Cour
mem
1700
S
to ob
can b
rema
be at
prin
brief
amon
ance,
liquor
sick,
sure a
cease
accide

ROYAL TEMPLARS OF TEMPERANCE,

The order of Royal Templars of Temperance was organized in the city of Buffalo, N.Y., in the year 1870, by Cyrus K. Porter and a few earnest temperance men.

In 1877 it was made a co-operative association, with the view of carrying the Mutual Benefit principle to the advantage of total abstainers. On the 3rd day of October, 1878, Pioneer Council No. 1, was organized in the city of Toronto, Ont., by the founder of the order, Cyrus K. Porter, through the efforts and influence of James H. Clark the present G. V. C. of the Grand Council of Ontario, and rapid progress has since been made. This progress has been due partly to the efficiency of the organizer employed, and partly to the completion of a union with the United Temperance Association. This Union connects with the R. T. a large number of non-beneficiary members organized in what are called Subordinate Councils, and doing a great and good temperance work. Canada has now a Grand Council and two Provisional Councils, 140 select Councils with about 3000 members, and over fifty subordinate Councils with a membership of about 1700.

Steps were taken at the organization of the Grand Council of Ontario to obtain separate Beneficiary Jurisdiction for Canada, and as fast as this can be safely accomplished it is being conceded. Practically, all that now remains to be done is the adjustment of business details, and Canada will be able to manage its own Beneficiary department according to the general principles of the order.

THE OBJECTS OF THE ORDER,

briefly stated, are as follows: To promote temperance, industry and morality among all classes; to prevent, by all just means, the growth of intemperance, by discountenancing the manufacture, sale and use of all intoxicating liquors; to save the young, lift up the fallen, strengthen the weak, visit the sick, bury the dead, protect the widow, and assist the orphan; to provide a sure and substantial benefit to the heirs or dependents of a worthy deceased member, and to aid members during disability from sickness or accident.

The Order is strictly a Temperance organization, as no person can pass its threshold and obtain its benefits who does not believe in a Supreme Being and will not sign, and faithfully maintain, a pledge of Total Abstinence; and it seeks the entire overthrow of the liquor traffic by legal prohibition. The most rigid medical examination is required for beneficiary membership, every medical examination being carefully reviewed by the Supreme Medical Examiner before a certificate can be issued.

As a Benevolent Order we have been no less successful, our assessments only averaging nine per year. No deaths or sickness from intemperance—that slow but sure system of moral and physical suicide. Benefits are collected on the mutual assessment plan; the amount of assessment being graded according to age, and based upon the American Life Expectancy Tables, and not upon guess work. Males and females are divided into two classes respectively, each class meeting its own assessments. The amount of benefits are: \$500, \$1,000, \$2,000.

The amounts paid at each assessment are for a

		DEATH BENEFIT		
		of \$500	\$1,000	\$2,000
Class A, from 16th to 25th birthday,	- - - -	\$0 25	\$0 50	\$1 00
“ B, “ 25th to 30th “	- - - -	0 28	0 55	1 10
“ C, “ 30th to 35th “	- - - -	0 30	0 60	1 20
“ D, “ 35th to 40th “	- - - -	0 34	0 67	1 35
“ E, “ 40th to 45th “	- - - -	0 38	0 75	1 50
“ F, “ 45th to 50th “	- - - -	0 43	0 85	1 70
“ G, “ 50th to 55th “	- - - -	0 50	1 00	2 00
“ H, “ 55th to 60th “	- - - -	0 63	1 25	2 50

And remain the same as long as membership is kept in good standing. In case of PERMANENT total disability for life, one half of the death benefit is advanced during life, and the remainder payable at death.

THE INDEPENDENT ORDER OF GOOD TEMPLARS.

It is a little more than thirty years since the Independent Order of Good Templars was instituted. It was originated in the State of New York, has since spread over the whole civilized world, and now claims to be the largest Temperance organization in existence.

The I. O. G. T. is one of the secret societies. Admission to its membership is obtainable only by a regular form of proposal, ballot and initiation. All its members are bound by a solemn obligation to abstain from the beverage use of all intoxicating liquors, to work for the advancement of the temperance cause, to promote each other's welfare, and to keep secret the private signs and tokens by which they recognize each other. The objects of their efforts are, as stated in their ritual, "To lift up those who are sunk low in the scale of human degradation, and restore them to family, friends and society, to save the young, pure and virtuous from ever falling into the snares of the tempter, and to hasten the hour when the means of intoxication shall be driven from our midst."

Lodge business is transacted according to correct parliamentary rules, devotional exercises open and close every meeting, time is set apart for social intercourse, literary and musical entertainment, &c., &c., and the whole proceedings of these meetings are carefully planned, with a view to moral, social and intellectual improvement. Want of space will not permit us to give details of the Society's plan of organization, the duties of the various officers, and other matters with which many of our readers are doubtless already familiar.

The Right Worthy Grand Lodge is the supreme head of the Order. It is composed of representatives elected from 78 Grand Lodges, and these in their turn represent upwards of 6,000 subordinate Lodges, with an aggregate membership of about 300,000, besides a large number of children who are receiving special temperance teaching in what are called Juvenile Lodges. Canada has six Grand Lodges, having jurisdiction over about 450 subordinate Lodges, with a total membership of about 20,000.

This Order is specially strong in the United States. It is doing excellent work in England, Ireland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Egypt, South Africa, China, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Sandwich Islands, the Bermudas, Jamaica, and other countries; even the high seas float prosperous lodges on board ships of both the British and United States navies, all working in one fraternity, under the same obligation, and with the same laws, customs and recognitions of membership. The ritual of its beautiful and impressive ceremonies is published in eight languages, and calls are being made for other translations, to supply still further extensions of its activity and usefulness. The I. C. G. T. seeks to confer its privileges upon all whom it can benefit. It was the first organization to put women on an equal footing with men in eligibility to all the privileges and rights of membership and official position. All ranks and colors enjoy its benefits. It labors for the alleviation of sorrow, the suppression of wrong, and the better recognition by humanity of its cardinal teaching, "The Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

The following are the present Officers of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge:

R. W. G. T.	John B. Finch, Lincoln, Neb.
R. W. G. C.	Dr. Oronhyateka, London, Ont.
R. W. G. V. T.	Mrs. S. A. Leonard, Boston, Mass.
R. W. G. S.	D. P. Sagendorph, Charlotte, Mich.
R. W. G. T.	Uriah Copp, jr., Loda, Ill.
R. W. G. Chap.	Rev. H. F. Chreitzberg, Sumpter, S. C.
R. W. G. M.	P. J. Chisholm, Truro, Nova Scotia.
R. W. G. D. M.	Ella S. Mason, Biddeford, Me.
R. W. G. I. G.	Sallie T. Embrie, Marshallton, Pa.
R. W. G. O. G.	W. T. Greenwood, Baltimore, Md.
C. S. J. T.	Miss Gertrude Cushman, Ohio.
P. R. W. G. T.	G. B. Katzenstein, Sacramento, Cal.

The next Annual Session will be held at Toronto commencing May 26th, 1885.

DEBATE ON PROHIBITION.

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, OF CANADA.

(From the Official Reports.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS, OTTAWA, March 5th, 1884.

MR. FOSTER Moved,

That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good, and by an equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

That the traffic in alcoholic liquors as beverages is productive of serious injury to the moral, social and industrial welfare of the people of Canada.

That despite all preceding legislation, the evils of intemperance remain so vast in magnitude, so wide in extent, and so destructive in effect, as to constitute a social peril and a national menace.

That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinafter set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for those evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

He said: I do not think it necessary to offer any apology for asking the attention of the House to this Resolution. I think it will be generally agreed by the members of this House, that the functions of Parliament are of two kinds. It is, of course, the duty of Parliament carefully to scrutinize and supervise the details of all enactments upon subjects that come under its purview; and it is equally the important duty of Parliament to investigate as carefully, and to discuss as thoroughly, the principles upon which its legislation is founded in order that such legislation may be as effective and as salutary as possible. Subjects for legislation, sir, do not often take their rise in Parliament itself; but they generally arise from the wishes, the necessities, or the grievances of the people outside of Parliament, and after a course of agitation in the public mind, they find their way to Parliament where they demand consideration, discussion and settlement. I am here to-day to state that in my humble opinion there is no stronger feeling in the hearts and minds of the people of this country upon any subject whatever than the feeling with reference to the traffic of intoxicating liquors, and the best means of mitigating the evils arising therefrom, or of doing away with them altogether so far as possible; and I desire to-day to give expression, so far as I possibly can, to what I think are the wishes, the feelings and desires on this matter of at least a very large portion of the people of Canada. I know that however feeble and hesitating my words may be, there will be in them a striving for expression of the thoughts and convictions of a very large portion of the people of this country in reference to this subject.

I am not going to say how large, or how general, or how multitudinous are the demands of the people for legislation against the liquor traffic, but I know this much, that about ten years ago there appeared on the floors of this Parliament a most eloquent though silent plea in reference to this same matter, and in the line of the Resolution which has just been read. At that time there were laid upon the table of the House petitions signed by tens and scores of thousands of earnest men and women; I think there were petitions signed by Municipal Councils, by the officers of great religious bodies which were fairly influential and representative in their character; and if I mistake not, resolutions were also laid upon the table from at least two or three of the Provincial Legislatures of this Dominion, and the prayer of all these petitions and resolutions was in the line of the Resolutions which I have just presented to the House. So much with reference to the constituency which is interested in this matter.

I think I may also safely say that during the ten years which have elapsed since then, this feeling has not grown less, but on the contrary it has grown broader, and more intensified. Not only is there a large constituency of persons in Canada who, I believe, are demanding that the traffic in intoxicating liquors should be prohibited by legal enactment, so far as this Parliament has power to do so, but I am emboldened to say a few words to-day in behalf of this Resolution because of the importance of the matter itself. We are here, sir, as legislators sent by the people from the different constituencies of Canada. We spend three or four months in the year in discussing and enacting legislation upon such subjects as demand legislation at our hands. We have spent a great deal of time and a great deal of energy in discussing matters of tariff and revenue. The object of these discussions and the consequent enactments is twofold: First, to raise, as easily and lightly as possible, a sufficient revenue for the wants of the country; and in the second place, to make the conditions of labour as favourable as they can be made, and to devise means for the greater development of our resources. And yet, during the seventeen years which have elapsed since Confederation, I think I am within the mark in saying that the money which has been spent by our people in the liquor traffic would, by many millions, exceed the average of the revenues which have been gathered by this Government over the whole Dominion. I think I am also within the mark when I say that the conditions of labor, and the development of the country have been materially hindered and retarded by the operation of this same traffic.

An important subject of legislation is that which concerns immigration, and the policy of bringing in people from abroad to settle our new country, and by their labor, to develop its resources, and by their industry and virtue, to contribute to the permanency and the beauty of the civilization we are building up; yet I think, sir, I am within the mark when I say that during the seventeen years which have elapsed since Confederation, the result of the liquor traffic in this Dominion, from its eastern to its western limits, in the idleness it has produced, the crime it has excited, and the waste of resources which it has caused, has gone far to nullify the good results of our immigration policy, and has taken out of the productive industries of this country and rendered useless for its development, almost as much brain and muscle as have

been brought into it by the immigration policies of all Governments from Confederation to the present time.

Sir, we are concerned with the development and good government of our country as well, and it is the object of our deepest and best consideration that such legislation should be placed upon the Statute Books of this country, so far as our powers extend, as will contribute to the development and prosperity, to the continued peace and good order of the communities which make up this country, and yet I am within the mark when I say that the evils resulting from the liquor traffic in the Dominion have done more to retard the prosperity of the country, and to sow germs of disorder and discontent, than any other evils probably with which this country has been afflicted. So I say, sir, if we look at the importance of this question, we may be sure that this Parliament is not going beyond its duty, and that hon. members are not going beyond their privilege when they venture to call the attention of the House to the best means of dealing with, and of mitigating the serious evils which result from this traffic.

Sir, if the object of good government be to protect what is good, to prevent what is evil, and to develop, so far as we can, the best in society and in the nation. I do not know of any question which towers higher, which comes nearer, which appeals more strongly for solution, than the one we have under consideration to-day. And, sir, if we regard, on the one hand, the magnitude and dearness of those interests which are affected by it, and if we regard on the other hand, the magnitude of the mischiefs which are, and which have been, wrought by it, the wonder is, not that this request has come to-day into Parliament, but that it has not sooner come, that it has not been more constantly and more importunately preferred. If we look into the country, and see what has taken place there within the last twenty years; if we look at the hold this question has taken upon the best heart and best brain of the Dominion, if we watch the forces in all their departments, which are displayed, and the activity at work with respect to this great question,—I say if we look at this we will come to the conclusion that this is no idle demand which has been made, and is now being made of this Parliament, but that it is a deep and wide-spread current of feeling and thought which is setting in towards the doors of Parliament, and is no idle and no vain thing. Therefore, I move these Resolutions this afternoon, feeling that a very large constituency of the people of Canada are in sympathy with them, and feeling as well that the importance of the subject demands the very best and most serious consideration that any body of men in any deliberative assembly can give to it. And, sir, I hope this will be the initial step in an agitation already begun and carried on in this country, an agitation begun, and which I hope will be carried out in Parliament, which will not stop until the strongest possible moral sentiment from without, shall have been aided and supplemented by the very strongest possible legal enactment from within the halls of Parliament.

The Resolution which I move to-day is a simple one. It has to do in the first place with intoxicating liquors as a beverage only. It has nothing to do with the manufacture, importation or sale of intoxicating liquors considered as articles of use in chemical, mechanical or scientific ways. It simply brings down the matter to a discussion of the method upon which legislation should proceed with respect to the

sale, manufacture and importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. And if any hon. gentleman asks me why it is I have proceeded by Resolution rather than by any other method, I state that out of several reasons I think these are good and sufficient: In the first place, a Resolution is within the competence of any member of this House, and places this question, so far as the discussion of the principle is concerned, solely upon its own merits, taking it out of the ranks of party and out of the feelings which are excited when party warfare takes place. In the second place, the Resolution will do this, and is destined to do this: It is to raise a discussion in Parliament upon a principle, a discussion which will challenge the attention of the country and produce an interest throughout the country, as having been started and carried on in Parliament, which probably could be reached as well in this as in any other way. Again, Sir, it will test the strength of the principle of prohibition in Parliament, and if it be found that the strength of the prohibitory principle here is not commensurate with the strength of the feeling outside, it will give the people of Canada an opportunity of exercising the constitutional method of bringing up within the halls of this Parliament the measure of strength to the support of this principle which is warranted and called for by the measure of the strength of this principle in the country without. Again, the Resolution is introduced mainly and chiefly for this reason: That in a resolution we are cut off entirely from a mass of details which would otherwise cumber it. The moment that an enactment is proposed before a deliberative assembly, it must run out into details, and these details will strike minds in different ways, and immediately differences and divergencies of opinion take place. This is not hampered by any details. It is simply a question of principle to be discussed and to be decided on its merits; and I think in a matter of such importance as this, it is of the very first significance that in all succeeding legislation with respect to this subject, before it takes place we should have set ourselves deliberately, honestly and candidly to discuss and settle, if possible, the proper principle which should guide that legislation.

I may be met at the very threshold of the discussion with this question, "Why is it that you prefer to adopt a different course with respect to the trade in intoxicating liquors from that which you adopt with respect to any other trade?" You have, for instance, factories in this Dominion; there are certain dangers which are incidental to the running and working of those factories. Now it may be said to me, "You do not rise in Parliament and ask, that because there are certain evils and dangers incidental to factory life, therefore, a Bill should be introduced to prohibit factories in the Dominion; but you simply set yourself to work to guard against evils, which may come from them, and make everything as secure as possible, and when you have done that you feel you have done the best for the industries as well as for the people among whom they are carried on. Why, then, it may be asked, do you propose to adopt a different course towards the traffic in intoxicating liquors?"

Now, Sir, I am bound to say that I believe that that is an honest question, and I think it deserves an honest and a candid answer. I say that we propose to adopt a different plan of treatment with reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, because necessity demands a different mode of treatment from any other of the industries of the country, that we can think of. And if you ask me proof of that I cannot give you

better
Govern
fifty ye
that tra
tude?
streng
'Govern
more i
watch
checks
of legi
the tre
been r
Govern
restric
ment
Govern
traffic
also t
in An
presen
that r
wron
such a
Bu
increa
feelin
or a s
so rep
centu
to so
popul
expre
attitu
Hous
ago—
amon
"
to sig
be re
S
utter
"
their
peop
here

better or more practical proof in the beginning than this, that the attitude which Government and popular mind has assumed towards the liquor traffic in the last fifty years, is one of the best indications that there is something radically wrong in that traffic, otherwise such an attitude would not be assumed. What is that attitude? It is an attitude of opposition, of aggressive opposition, of continued and strengthening repugnance and hostility. I ask you to think of any Anglo-Saxon Government to-day which during the last twenty years has not set its face more and more in a position of determined hostility with reference to the liquor traffic, has not watched it as an enemy, has not looked upon it as ruinous, has not hampered it by checks and restrictions, by limitations and prohibitions. Sir, I say that the history of legislation within the last fifty years in all Anglo-Saxon countries, with reference to the treatment of the liquor traffic, has been a history in which these two things have been marked: First, suspicion and the open expression of hostility to the traffic from Governments; and in the second place, the aggressive nature of the limitations and restrictions and prohibitions which have been thrown around it. I make the statement here to-day, which I think is a moderately fair one, that there is no Anglo-Saxon Government which would dare to sweep away all the restrictions upon the liquor traffic, or if it did sweep them away could live six months after having done so. I also think I am right in making the statement, that there is no Government or party in Anglo-Saxon countries to-day which can take away a single restriction which at present is put about the traffic without the loss of party prestige and public favor by that relaxation. I think this proves at least that there must be something radically wrong in the traffic when these are the attitudes of Governments towards it, and in such an aggressive and continued way.

But if the attitude of Government has continually shown a repugnant and an increasing hostility to the traffic, much more can this be affirmed of the popular feeling of the Anglo-Saxon race. Sir, I do not know of a single public legalized evil, or a single evil legalized or unlegalized, which has drawn forth so strong, so wide and so representative expressions of disapproval as has this same traffic within the half century which has just passed by. Allow me, Sir, to call the attention of the House to some of these expressions which have just leaped up from the deep sea of the popular feelings of the Anglo-Saxon world, which have chrystallized themselves into expressions, which are living and will continue imperishable as an index of the attitude of the popular mind with reference to this traffic. Long ago in the British House of Lords—I think nearly two centuries ago, certainly more than one century ago—Lord Chesterfield in speaking of the prohibition of the traffic in ardent spirits, amongst other things, said these memorable words:

"Let us crush these artists in human slaughter, who have reconciled their country to sickness and ruin, and spread over the pitfall of debauchery such a bait as cannot be resisted."

Sir, in 1839, Lord Brougham, that man of great brains, and great purposes as well, uttered these words:

"To what good is it that the Legislature should pass laws to punish crime, or that their Lordships should occupy themselves in trying to improve the morals of the people by giving them education? What could be the use of growing a little seed here and plucking up a weed there, if these beer shops are to be continued to grow

seeds of immorality broadcast over the land, germinating the most frightful produce that ever has been allowed to grow up in a civilized country, and I am ashamed to add, under the fostering care of governments."

Rowland Hill, a man of note and nobleness, said :

"Public houses—the bane of the country—excite the strongest indignation in my mind."

Dr. Chalmers, that noble and representative Scotch minister, said :

"For ourselves we would have rejoiced if by an entire stoppage of the distilleries, the beastly intoxication of Scotland had been suspended."

Oliver Goldsmith, witty and versatile, gave expression to this truth :

"Ale houses are ever an occasion of debauchery and excess, and either in a political or religious sense it would be our highest interest to have them suppressed."

Lord Bacon, an epitome of terse and pregnant wisdom, said :

"All the crimes on earth do not destroy so many of the human race or alienate so much property as drunkenness."

Richard Cobden, that reformer in the people's best interest, stated :

"Every day's experience tends more and more to the conviction that the temperance cause lies at the foundation of all social and political reform."

John Bright, the eloquent and noble tribune of the people, said :

"A monster obstacle is in our way—strong drink, by whatever name the demon is styled, in whatever way it presents itself, this prevents our success; remove this one obstacle, and our course will be onwards, and our labors will be blessed."

The London *Times*, as far back as 1853, stated :

"It is a peculiarity of spirit drinking that the money spent in it is at the best thrown away. It neither supplies the natural wants of man nor offers an adequate substitution for them. No way so rapid to increase the wealth of the nations and the morality of society could be devised as the utter annihilation of the manufacture of ardent spirits, constituting as they do an infinite waste and an unmixed evil."

At a later date it said :

"The use of strong drink produces more idleness, crime and misery than all other causes put together. . . . Drinking baffles us, confounds us, shames us, and mocks us at every point. It outwits alike the teacher, the man of business, the patriot, the legislator. Every other institution founders in hopeless difficulties, the public house holds its triumphant course."

Cardinal Manning, that representative and beloved Catholic English clergyman, states :

"I wish well to all trades, but with a reserve. I hope the baker may bake and sell more bread as long as he lives. I hope that every clothier may sell more yards of broadcloth and make more coats every year that passes over his head. I hope that every farmer may sell more wheat. But I cannot say in my heart and conscience that I hope the brewer will brew more beer, or the distillers distil more spirits, or the publicans sell more of both. (Cheers.) There is a limit to my good wishes. I wish that all trades may prosper except one. The prosperity that I wish to that one trade is that it should cease."

Again he says :

"The evil ought not to be permitted to grow in order that the police may be called in to repress it. (Cheers.) Prevention is not only better than cure; but prevention is a duty, and cure is a lame halting attempt to undo an evil which we have wilfully permitted."

And yet again :

"Of this he was perfectly certain, that if the great drink trade expanded itself every year, and continued its activity in intoxicating and poisoning the men of this country they would be every year losing their power of self-government and the safety which came with it, and those very centres that ought to be their safety would become their chief dangers."

Sir, in 1877, the British Parliament appointed a Committee of the House of Lords who went into a long two years investigation with reference to the evils coming from intemperance, and there is this pregnant sentence which occurs in the beginning of this report :

"When great communities, deeply sensible of the miseries caused by intemperance; witnesses of the crime and pauperism which directly spring from it; conscious of the contamination to which their younger citizens are exposed; watching with grave anxiety the growth of female intemperance on a scale so vast, and at a rate of progression so rapid as to constitute a new reproach and new danger; believing that not only the morality of their citizens, but their commercial prosperity, is dependent upon the diminution of these evils; seeing also that all that general legislation has been able to effect has been some improvement in public order, while it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance, it would seem somewhat hard when such committees are willing, at their own cost and hazard, to grapple with the difficulty, and undertake their own purification, that the legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to entrust them with the requisite powers."

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury states :

"There is one dreadful evil overspreading the whole land, which makes havoc of our workmen—the evil of intemperance. Unless you make distinct and positive efforts against it you will be neglecting an evil which is eating out the very heart of society, destroying domestic life among our working classes, and perhaps doing greater injury than any other cause that could be named in this age."

Goldwin Smith, our own, I suppose I may call him, profound and philanthropic thinker, says :

"It is too clear that the rapid extension of this system of saloon drinking is threatening the very life of the community; that it is producing a physical and moral pestilence more deadly in the deepest sense than any other plague which stalks the infected cities of the East; that it is bringing great masses of our working classes into a self-imposed bondage, more complete and more degrading than slavery itself; that it is not only filling the present with unspeakable misery and vice; but blighting the prospects of labor for the future."

The London *Telegraph* says :

"Our revenue may derive some unholy benefit from the sale of alcohol, but the entire trade is nevertheless a covenant with gin and death."

The New York *Tribune*, which, of all papers of this continent, might be expected to say the least stirring and pointed thing with reference to the liquor traffic, in its issue of Feb. 20th says :

"Many people who pride themselves on their practicality are wont to sneer at the opponents of the liquor traffic as mere 'sentimentalists.' No doubt there is much sentiment in that opposition, but it is sentiment based upon the hardest of facts. The truth is that if all the other evils that afflict society are put together they will not nearly equal in weight and sinister effects the one enormous and universal mischief of intemperance. Whenever we turn, in short, we encounter this subtle and sinister agency. It is a blight which lies heavy upon our civilization, and which will have to be cleared away before that civilization can become an object of just pride and satisfaction."

The Right Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, that grand old man and most noted statesman, stated in his place in the House of Commons in 1880 :

"It has been said that the greater calamities are inflicted on mankind by intemperance than by the three great historical scourges—war, pestilence and famine. That is true for us, and it is the measure of our discredit and disgrace."

And, sir, as the last indication of that feeling which I will cite, let me ask the attention of this House to a paragraph which appeared, of all places, in the Queen's speech in Great Britain last year, when her Ministers put into her mouth these words

"After a succession of unfavorable seasons in the greater portion of the United Kingdom, the produce of the land has, during the present year, been for the most part abundant, and trade is moderately active. The growth of the revenue, however, is sensibly retarded by a cause which must in itself be contemplated with satisfaction; I refer to the diminution in the receipts of the Exchequer from the duties on intoxicating liquors."

Sir, I consider that as one of the most conclusive indications of what the popular feeling with reference to this traffic is that can possibly be adduced. Would such a sentence as that have been put in the Queen's speech if the cotton industry or the iron industry had been depressed—if there had been a falling off in the revenue from any other industry? No, sir, the only item with reference to which a falling revenue could call out such a paragraph as that is the one whose failure is an indication of the advancing sobriety of the people—an indication that the stream of intoxicating liquors which has been poured out with such deadly effect in Great Britain for centuries past has at last shown some sign of becoming more shallow and less heavy and destructive. Sir, I hold that these expressions, strong, forcible, and widely representative, occurring as they do through two centuries of Anglo-Saxon history, are fair indications of that feeling of repugnance and hostility which lies deep down in the best heart and the best brain of the Anglo-Saxon world, and which is rapidly leavening that unto its own measure and its own quality. Sir, I think that the two pivotal points on which this whole question turns are these: First, is this traffic in its nature and its results such as to demand legal suppression? And secondly, are the rightness and efficiency of prohibition capable of proof? If we can establish the affirmative of these two propositions, our course is clear. This principle agreed upon and established, legislation must proceed upon that well-established and true principle.

Well, sir, if you will allow me, let us, then, take up this first question: Is this traffic, in its nature and its results, such as to demand total legal suppression? I do not know, sir, where we can better go for proof of this than to science, physiological science, economic science, social science—and finding out what is the answer of these three, come to a pretty fair conclusion as to whether the nature and results of this traffic are such as to demand its suppression at the hands of the State.

And first, sir, with reference to physiological or medical science, what is its voice with reference to alcoholic liquors? Alcoholic liquors may be said to be made up of two great constituents—alcohol and water, in varying proportions. I hold in my hand an analysis of three or four kinds of alcoholic liquors which will show the fact. For instance in an Imperial pint of English Ale, which weighs 22½ oz., it is found that 18 oz. are water, 2 oz. are alcohol, and 2½ oz. other material. It is found

that the
alcohol
weight,
that ex
ing 20
Gin, w
materie
we app
that th
necessa
nizant
alcohol
we go
the Ho
attitud
great l
Englan
"V
povert
as bev
cating
the mo

La
tific m
their v
"I
none a
forth
Britai
the m
believ
medic
bility.

"2
of a la
spring
our ci
"3
—whi
medic
Th
and S
world
New
medic
"4
opini
"5
duce

that the same quantity of port weighing $21\frac{1}{2}$ oz. contains 16 oz. of water, 4 oz. of alcohol, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of other material. The same quantity of brandy, $20\frac{1}{2}$ oz. in weight, contains $9\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of water, $10\frac{1}{2}$ oz. alcohol, and $\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of other material. Rum, that expressive, but not very classically named liquor, in the same quantity, weighing $20\frac{1}{4}$ oz., has 5 oz. of water, 15 oz. of alcohol, and $\frac{1}{48}$ oz. of other material. Gin, weighing 20 oz., has 12 oz. of water, 8 oz. of alcohol, and nothing of other material. These figures go to show the make up of these liquors scientifically, and if we apply the analysis to all the different kinds of alcoholic liquors, we shall find that the principle constituents are alcohol and water. Now, Sir, it is not at all necessary for me to speak of the results or good qualities of water; we are all cognizant of them. What we have to do then is to ask what is this substance, alcohol, which makes up the chief basis of all alcoholic liquors? To whom shall we go for an answer, if we do not go to the medical and scientific men, and I wish, if the House will allow me, to read a statement, short as I can possibly make it, of the attitude and the opinion of medical and scientific men as shown by the utterances of great bodies of these men on this matter. In 1847, two thousand and upwards of England's eminent medical men signed and published a declaration to this effect:

"We are of opinion:—That a very large proportion of human misery, including poverty, disease and crime, is induced by the use of alcoholic or fermented liquors as beverages; that total and universal abstinence from alcoholic liquors, and intoxicating beverages of all sorts, would greatly contribute to the health, the prosperity, the morality and the happiness of the human race."

Later still, one hundred and upwards of the representative physicians and scientific medical men of New York signed and published the following declaration of their views:

"1. In view of the alarming prevalence and ill effects of intemperance with which none are so familiar as the members of the medical profession, and which have called forth from eminent English physicians the voice of warning to the people of Great Britain, concerning the use of alcoholic beverages, we, the undersigned members of the medical profession of New York and vicinity, unite in the declaration that we believe alcohol should be classed with other powerful drugs; that when prescribed medicinally, it should be with conscientious caution, and a sense of grave responsibility.

"2. We are of opinion that the use of alcoholic liquor as a beverage is productive of a large amount of physical disease; that it entails diseased appetites upon offspring; and that it is the cause of a large per centage of the crime and pauperism of our cities and country.

"3. We would welcome any judicious and effective legislation—State and national—which should seek to confine the traffic in alcohol to the legitimate purposes of medical and other science, art and mechanism."

This is signed by the President and the Professors of the College of Physicians and Surgeons; it is signed by Willard Parker, M. D., a man eminent in the medical world, and by upwards of one hundred others of the representative medical men of New York. Not many years ago ninety and upwards of Montreal's foremost medical men gave expression to their sentiments in this form:—

"We, the undersigned members of the medical profession in Montreal are of opinion:—

"1. That a large portion of human misery, poverty, disease and crime, is produced by the use of alcoholic liquors, as a beverage.

"2. That total abstinence from intoxicating liquors, whether fermented or dis-

titled, is consistent with, and conducive to the highest degree of physical and mental health and vigor.

"3. That abstinence from intoxicating liquors would greatly promote the health, morality and happiness of the people."

This was signed by G. W. Campbell, A.M., M.D., Professor of the principles and practices of Surgery and Dean of Faculty of McGill, Montreal, and ninety others. In 1874 the Medical Association of the United States met in Detroit and gave expression to this opinion:—

"That we are of the opinion that the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage is productive of a large amount of physical and mental disease; that it entails diseased appetites and enfeebled constitutions upon offspring; and that it is the cause of a large per centage of the crime and pauperism in our large cities and country."

In 1876, there was held a great International Medical Council in the city of Philadelphia. It was one of the largest and ablest medical bodies ever convened, and their deliverance upon the subject is as follows:—

"1. Alcohol is not shown to have a definite food value by any of the usual methods of chemical or physiological investigation.

"2. Its use as a medicine, is chiefly that of a cardiac stimulant and often admits of substitution.

"3. As a medicine it is not well fitted for self-prescription by the laity, and the medical profession is not accountable for such administration, or for the enormous evils resulting therefrom."

Such was the deliverance of medical men with reference to this substance, alcohol, which forms the basis of the two alcoholic liquors which are the whole stock in trade of this traffic in alcoholic beverages. Science strips herself free from every prejudice, she frees herself from every old custom, she has gone into her laboratory and dissecting room, she has conducted her scientific investigations, and in calm, clear, authoritative tones she tells the people that alcohol has no food value, that as a beverage it is productive of infinite misery in the way of disease, ill-health and death, that it is a poison to be ranked among poisons and labelled as dangerous; and she asks the people to beware of it, as an enemy of the human race. Let me give you some views of representative scientific medical men, individually on this matter. Dr. Carpenter, than whom there is no more noted physician in Great Britain or probably in the whole rank of medical physiologists throughout the world, says:—

"In the average man, the habitual use of alcoholic liquors, in moderate or even in small quantities, is not merely unnecessary for the maintenance of bodily and mental vigor, but it is unfavorable to the permanent enjoyment of health, even though it may for a time, appear to contribute to it."

Sir William Gull, a Fellow of the Royal Society and Physician to Her Majesty, stated in his evidence, in 1877-78 before the Lords' Committee:—

"I should say, from my experience, that alcohol is the most destructive agent that we are aware of in this country. . . . I would like to say that a very large number of people in society are dying day by day, poisoned by alcohol, but not supposed to be poisoned by it. I know it is a most deleterious poison."

Dr. Benjamin Richardson, a very celebrated analyst, says:—

"Finally, to sum it all up, I find that alcoholic drinks give no strength, reduce the tone of the blood vessels, build up no muscle, destroy its powers, and make it less active for work; that these drinks in the most moderate quantity can be of no use to me or any one else as a substance for food. We are sometimes told that it is

fanatical
of men.

be a wor
to conv
able exc
or impr
mind, h
this ear
Drink,

Dr.

Majesty

"I h

physical

that ext

liquors

such as

mental

events,

life dev

Thus, I

painful

which e

drink t

if I ven

habit in

and so

things i

and to

And

known

"As

their d

was no

"C

abuse

have s

up ever

this en

Sir,

before

that, s

science

whole

celebra

to exist

We

this lic

politic

count

bilities

many

sense

fanatical, it is impractical, it is contrary to the interests of individual men, or classes of men, to speak those things and oppose alcohol. Be it so. In another age it will be a wonder that such arguments as those we are obliged to use, were ever necessary to convert an unwilling world. In the meantime, unheeded by any of those plausible excuses, it is our duty, whether it be called fanatical or philosophical, practical or impractical, advantageous to class interests or opposed them, to unite, body and mind, heart and soul, in suppressing this evil at its root, and in endeavoring to make this earth something nearer heaven, by pulling down from its high place the demon Drink, who still reigns so triumphantly in the land in which we live."

Dr. Thomson, a Fellow of the Royal Society and Surgeon Extraordinary to His Majesty the King of the Belgians, and Surgeon to University College Hospital, says:

"I have long had the conviction that there is no greater cause of evil, moral and physical, in this country than the use of alcoholic beverages. I do not mean by this that extreme indulgence which produces drunkenness. The habitual use of fermented liquors to an extent far short of what is necessary to produce that condition, and such as is quite common in all ranks of society, injures the body and diminishes the mental power to an extent which I think few people are aware of. Such, at all events, is the result of observation during more than twenty years of professional life devoted to hospital practice, and to private practice in every rank above it. Thus, I have no hesitation in attributing a very large proportion of some of the most painful and dangerous maladies which have come under my notice, as well as those which every medical man has to treat, to the ordinary and daily use of fermented drink taken in the quantity which is constitutionally deemed moderate. * * * But if I ventured one step further it would be to express a belief that there is no single habit in this country which so much tends to deteriorate the qualities of the race, and so much disqualified it for endurance in that competition which in the nature of things must exist, and in which struggle the prize of superiority must fall to the best and to the strongest."

And as a final evidence I shall quote the words of Dr. Andrew Clark, who is known to some gentlemen in this House as a medical authority the world over:

"As I looked at the hospital wards to-day and saw that seven out of ten owed their diseases to alcohol, I could but lament that the teaching about this question was not more direct, more decisive, more home thrusting than ever it had been.

"Can I say to you any words stronger than these of the terrible effects of the abuse of alcohol? It is when I myself think of all these that I am disposed, as I have said elsewhere, to rush to the opposite extreme to give up my profession, to give up everything, and to go forth on a holy crusade, preaching to all men, beware of this enemy of the race."

Sir, I rest my case, on its scientific aspect, with these testimonies that I have read before this House, and I hold that we have a perfect right to conclude from them that, so far as the voice of science in a medical and physiological way is concerned, science puts in no plea for the maintenance of this traffic: that, on the contrary, its whole plea is that the traffic is an enemy to the human race, in the words of the celebrated Dr. Clark, and as such it ought to be suppressed, ought not to be allowed to exist.

Well, sir, let us next ask, what is the voice of economic science with reference to this liquor traffic? I am not one of those who believe that the doctrines of the political economist are hard cast-iron doctrines, which must be applied in every country and at every age, without reference to the differing circumstances and capabilities of the country where they are sought to be applied. I have not read very many of these books through, but I believe I have arrived at three or four common sense economic rules, which will commend themselves to this House and to the

country; and I am within the bounds of all reason when I state that, other things being equal, the maximum of prosperity in a country is to be reached (1) By the frugal and proper use of all its material resources, (2) by the wise conservation and employment of its labor power, (3) by the prudent and useful expenditure of the earnings of its labor, (4) by having the minimum of non-producing and dangerous criminal elements.

Now, if these four propositions be true—and I do not think it is necessary to say a single word in attempting to prove their truth—let us ask the question, what is the attitude of the liquor traffic with reference to these four propositions? I state unhesitatingly, and I challenge contradiction anywhere, that the traffic antagonizes every one of these simple canons of economic truth. The first one is, that countries will be most prosperous, other things being equal, when the frugal and proper use of all their material resources is ensured.

What then with reference to the liquor traffic and the material resources of the country? Sir, it commences in a waste of the best and most precious material resources of a country. In Great Britain to-day it is estimated by their most eminent statisticians that the quantity of grain destroyed each year in order to make the alcoholic liquors that are consumed in Great Britain amounts to the total sum of between 70,000,000 and 80,000,000 bushels of grain, or of produce equivalent to it; some 50,000,000 or 60,000,000 of it is pure, unadulterated grain. In the United States of America, from 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 bushels of grain are used up in the manufacture of the alcoholic liquors that are taken in that country, and, in our Dominion of Canada, where a partial failure of one of our grain crops has this year produced wide and deeply felt disturbance, we every year give up from 2,500,000 to 3,000,000 bushels of grain, to be made into intoxicating liquors to be disturbed and used through this country. That makes a total, in these three Anglo-Saxon countries, of 70,000,000 and 50,000,000 and 3,000,000—in round numbers 125,000,000 of bushels of grain, which are the material resources upon which the liquor traffic first operates in order to make the wares it has for distribution.

Now, let us for a moment look at that immense pyramid of grain—125,000,000 of bushels, if you please. That can be used in three different ways. We may take it, as God has given it to us, with all the constituents and reproduction of strength in the human frame. We may turn it into the channels of food supply, to feed our men and our cattle, and it will bring forth its results in fruits; for any one will tell us that, if we put it to that use, it will be put to the use that God intended it for, and to the use that will be of the greatest service to the community and to the people. There is another use to which this grain can be put. The torch may be applied to that pyramid of grain, 125,000,000 of bushels, and it may be destroyed by fire. In that case, sir, it is simply wanton and reckless waste. There is another use to which this grain may be put, and that is this, it may be put through certain processes by which its food value is entirely or almost entirely destroyed, it may be turned into what is physiologically and chemically known as a poison, and which is sent broadcast through the community and through the country to do its work and bring forth its results of evil, of disease, and of death.

Mr. Speaker, when I was interrupted in my remarks by your announcing to the House the receipt of a letter from His Excellency's Secretary I was calling the atten-

tion of this House to the waste of material resources consequent upon this traffic in our country, and I had just stated that, in these three Anglo-Saxon countries, at least 125,000,000 of bushels of grain, or of produce of equal value, were destroyed in the manufacture of these liquors. I was proceeding to state that there were three uses to which this grain might be put—the one legitimate use of food supply; it could be burned and so recklessly and wantonly destroyed; or it could be distilled and brewed into a liquid which lost the food properties of the original grain, and which contained deleterious and poisonous qualities such as have been pointed out in the medical and scientific testimony I have read before this House. Now I state this, that if it be a proper canon of economic truth that the frugal and proper use of all material resources is necessary to the maximum prosperity of a country, that traffic which deliberately destroys so much, as 3,000,000 of bushels of grain in our own country, so much as 50,000,000 of bushels of grain in the United States, or so much as 70,000,000 bushels of grain in Great Britain and destroys its food value, and turns it into something which is not valuable as a food but is destructive and deleterious as a beverage, I say that the traffic stamps itself as antagonistic to a country in that economic sense, it offends against the simple rule, the proper and legitimate use of the material resources of the country.

Well, sir, let us go one step further and ask what is the attitude of this liquor traffic to the labor power of a country? For we laid it down as a second rule that the maximum prosperity of a country, other things being equal, was to be reached by a wise conservation and employment of its labor power. Well, sir, I find in the first place that in the Dominion, 1,411 persons are engaged in breweries, 285 are engaged in distilleries, and I have made an estimate which I am sure will not be considered excessive that 10,000 persons are engaged in the distribution of alcoholic liquors. Thus we reach a total of 12,000 persons who are engaged in the manufacture and distribution of alcoholic liquors in the Dominion of Canada. Now, sir, I state this, and I do it calmly and deliberately, believing that it cannot successfully be contradicted, that all the labor of these 1,411 men employed in breweries, of these 285 men employed in distilleries, and of these 10,000 persons engaged in the distribution of alcoholic liquors, is labor which to say the least of it, is lost so far as the proper end of labor—which we always keep in view—is concerned. Suppose for the sake of illustration, that these 12,000 persons were engaged in a legitimate and productive business—a number of them in the fields at farm work, a number of them in the mines at mining, and a number of them in the various departments of building. Suppose, then, I come up and say to these 12,000 men: "Come with me and I will give you work. Leave all the business you are now engaged in, and I will employ you for a year and pay you equal or greater wages." Immediately the 12,000 laborers leave off their work in the field, the mine and the workshops, and I set them to work in this way: I say to them, "Go yonder to the forest, 12,000 of you, and hew down the tall trees that are growing there, carry these to the mills which have been built for the purpose; have these trees all sawn into thin strips, and have these strips cut into still thinner pieces, and when you have done all this, at the end of the year, gather up what you have prepared and apply the torch to it and burn it up." Is it not patent to every person who follows the illustration, that all the labor of

those 12,000 men employed in this way during the year, has resulted in nothing, has been lost to the country; and in the meantime, the field, the mine and the workshop have been lying idle? So, sir, I think, and I do not believe it can be controverted, that the labor of 12,000 persons, employed in the manufacture and distribution of intoxicating liquors, is labor which, for all productive purposes, is lost to the country. And I say the traffic in intoxicating liquors offends that second rule, which we have laid down, that other things being equal, the maximum prosperity of a country is to be found in the wise conservation and employment of its labor power.

Not only is that true with reference to the labor employed in the liquor traffic, but I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, which cannot be left out of view, that the traffic in intoxicating liquors destroys and nullifies a large proportion of our labor power. In 1834, a commission was appointed by the British House of Commons, of which Mr. Buckingham was chairman, and one of the first sentences of the report of that commission was the following:

"The loss of productive labor in every department of occupation to the extent of one day in six throughout the kingdom (as testified by witnesses engaged in various manufacturing operations) by which the wealth of the country, created as it chiefly is by labor, is retarded or suppressed to the extent of one million out of every six that is produced, to say nothing of the constant derangement, imperfection and destruction in every agricultural and manufacturing process, occasioned by the intemperance and consequent unskillfulness, inattention and neglect of those afflicted by intoxication, producing great injury in our domestic and foreign trade."

Now, sir, that is not the statement of a temperance fanatic; that is not the statement of a partizan; it is the statement of a cool conservative committee, who for years investigated this question, and took evidence, and ended by declaring that one laborer out of every six had his labor nullified and destroyed in Great Britain, so far as the production is concerned, as a result of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and that therefore one-sixth of the possible production of Great Britain was prevented by the fact of the existence of this traffic. Sir, I do not pretend for a moment to say that the loss of labor in a new country like ours is at all comparable to the loss of labor in a thickly-settled country like Great Britain, but it is patent to every hon. gentleman in this House that a great deal of labor is wasted in Canada as a direct result of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Suppose as a moderate compensation, that every liquor shop, every distributing centre in Canada, destroys and nullifies the labor of at least two individuals; according to this estimate, in the 10,000 liquor shops of the Dominion the labor of a force of 20,000 men is nullified, destroyed and lost to the country completely, so far as their productive power is concerned, by reason of the liquor traffic which exists in our midst. I state, therefore, that the traffic in alcoholic beverages offends against the second rule which we have laid down, that, other things being equal, a country will be prosperous in proportion to the wise conservation and employment of its labor power.

Sir, let me go a step further and call the attention of the House to the waste of wealth consequent on the liquor traffic. Eminent statisticians in Great Britain and the United States have made most elaborate calculations on that point, but I propose to take the official calculations. It is calculated that in Great Britain the people spent last year, \$650,000,000 for alcoholic beverages; it was calculated that in the United States the liquor bill amounted to \$700,000,000. Well, sir, after

looking somewhat closely into this subject and making, as I think, a fair and moderate estimate, I come to the conclusion, and believe, that the people of Canada spend for alcoholic beverages each year a sum pretty nearly equal to \$40,000,000. So, sir, in this new country of ours, which so greatly needs to husband its resources and turn its surplus wealth into capital for the development of the country, the people spend at least \$40,000,000 per year.

Now, sir, let me call the attention of the House to another illustration which bears upon this subject. Here is a laborer, and we will suppose that he earns \$450 per year. We will suppose it takes \$400 of this amount for the fair and reasonable expenses of living for himself and his family. That man, then, has \$50 surplus left. Now, it is apparent to everyone that the future of that man, so far as this world's goods are concerned, depends upon the disposition he makes of that \$50 surplus. If he places it in the savings bank year after year, he is laying up something for a rainy day and laying the foundation of his own independence. If he invests the amount in real estate and gradually makes for himself a home, he is doing the same thing. But if he goes to a gentleman and gets from him fifty pieces of brown paper and hands over \$50 and then takes those fifty pieces of brown paper and slips them away in a drawer at home, in the opinion of every common sense man he will have uselessly spent his surplus, and he will be as poor at the end of the year as at the beginning.

But let me go a step further with that illustration: Suppose that man goes into one of the low or high dram shops and spends the surplus of \$50 for intoxicating liquors, which does him harm and injures his family as well, every sensible man will agree with me when I say that he has more than wasted his surplus, for he has used it to his own injury and to the injury of his family. It is exactly the same with a country as with individuals, but in a greater degree, and that country which wastes its surplus on alcoholic liquors for beverage purposes, which are of little use and so great an injury, wastes its resources and spends where it should not, and prevents itself from becoming as rich as the productive resources would entitle it to be. So I say the traffic in alcoholic liquors offends against the third rule we have laid down, the prudent and careful expenditure of the earnings of labor.

Let me for a moment call the attention of the House to a third result: We laid it down as a rule, too, that the maximum of prosperity, other things being equal, will be reached in a country which has the maximum of non-productive and of dangerous or criminal elements. What is it, sir, that is one of the first results of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, either in a community or in a country? It is to create non-producers, more or less of them; and every non-producer is a burden to the country and must be maintained by the honest earnings of the people who do work and who do produce. Suppose, for instance, you have five laboring men and their families, and those five men enter into partnership, pool their earnings and the surplus of their earnings as well. We will suppose each to be earning \$400 a year. The five will therefore earn \$2,000. It takes \$350, we will say, for each man's reasonable expenses of living, which gives a total of \$1,750; so that at the end of the year the five persons will have a surplus of \$250. Suppose one of those five men becomes incapacitated in any way from earning; he and his family are still kept

There are, however, but four now earning, and those, at \$400 each, will give a total of \$1,600 a year. But it takes \$1,750 to keep the five families, so that there is a deficit of \$150 because of the throwing out from productive labor of one of those five men. This deficit has to be made up out of previous earnings, or it has to go as a mortgage on future earnings; in either way the fifth man who falls out from productive labor is a drag and a burden on the four who remain in it. So, I say, it is plain and clear that every non-producer in the country is a burden to the country and has to be kept by the honest labor and out of the honest earnings of the people.

Whatever is true in individual cases is true of the nation as a whole, and every one who has looked into the subject knows and is certain that the traffic in alcoholic liquors results in producing a large number of persons who are non-producers, who do not earn their own living, who are thrown on charity, public or private, and consequently retard the progress of accumulation of wealth of this country. It is the same with regard to the dangerous and criminal elements which come out of this traffic as an inevitable result which has been known and appreciated and deplored for centuries, and at no time to a greater extent than at the present day. So that the liquor traffic antagonizes that rule which makes the prosperity of a country amongst other things depend on having a maximum of non-productive and dangerous or criminal elements within its borders, for all those criminal elements have to be cared for, restrained and watched, and this country either from its general or special funds has to pay, and for the cost of this the people are responsible.

So, sir, when a demand is made for a prohibition of the liquor traffic, I say there is no argument that economic science will put forth to withstand this plea: That this traffic commences in a waste of raw material, that it continues in a waste of the labor resources of the country, that it ends in a waste and deterioration of labor power and of human life. So, sir, when we desire that the liquor traffic should be suppressed by legal enactment, we are within the bounds and rules which economic science on every page lays down, and which will join us in declaring that the liquor traffic should be legally suppressed in the best economic interests of the country.

Now I wish to go from this a step higher. We have been talking about physiological science and economic science, but there is something which is higher and more important than that, viz.: The social necessities and considerations which are forced upon us.

Physiological science and economic conditions are worthy of our best attention, but these are only the conditions on which society is built up and the social fabric is constructed, and this is something of far higher import and far more weighty than the others of which I have just made mention. Into human society certain factors enter—some of them for good and some of them for evil. Our educational institutions strive to impart to society that intelligence, that knowledge, that information which will at one and the same time give a guarantee of its permanency and also adorn and beautify it. Art and literature and industry come to help as factors, for the building up and enrichment and beautifying of society.

Invention gives all its contrivances for its comfort; temperance gives all its ex-

plora-
join an
man, s
structu
is of f
econom
what h
detai
interes
necess
the Ho
ing to
to plac
Nov
structu
the fir
drink,
filling
multip
ness pr
ductive
gather
begin
year ar
the id
But
thing v
genius
her by
as good
will be
well.
any ot
liquor
not the
disord
by the
WE
into id
penden
dragg
Go
record
muniti
count

plorations and carrying for its enrichment and its wealth; and all these good forces join and unite themselves to make of society a great edifice in which the power of man, supplemented by the principles and practices of morality, will make a superstructure strong and powerful, and beautiful as well. I say what society demands is of far greater consideration to us than what either physiological science or economic science demands. When the liquor traffic enters into society as a factor what happens? I will make my remarks as short as possible, for I don't want to detain the House at too great length, yet I feel it is not demanded of me in the interests of this subject, and those to whom this subject is dear, that I should unnecessarily shorten my remarks, even though some impatience is manifested in the House; but I submit that the importance of the question which I am attempting to treat warrants me in making my remarks sufficiently lengthy to enable me to place the question properly before the House and the country.

Now, sir, what happens when this traffic enters as a factor into this beautiful structure that we call Society? I shall not make my remarks very long, but I say the first result that comes to our cities and towns, to the distributing centres of strong drink, is the creation of idleness, the taking away of labor from its employment, the filling up of the benches of the idle, and the idleness at every distributing centre, multiplied by the number of these distributing centres, gives us a vast area of idleness produced in the country, of labor taken from its proper employment, of productive power stolen from its proper functions. A vast amount of idleness which gathers about this liquor traffic in all its distributing centres. None of us can begin to compute, not having the personal knowledge, the loss which every year and every hour comes to this country throughout its length and breadth by the idleness which is produced by the liquor traffic.

But not only is idleness produced, but disorder is produced. If there is one thing which civilization specially prides itself upon, it is upon having brought the genius of order out of the wild wastes of savagery and barbarism, and having taken her by the hand and led her along in the van of civilization, says to us that so long as good reigns in civilization there will be permanence, there will be progress, there will be stability, there will be beauty, and there will be strength of civilization as well. I state to-day that there is no more potent seed germ of disorder in this or any other Anglo Saxon country than that which flows out of, and is involved in, this liquor traffic as it flows through this country. None of us can find out, for we have not the scope of mind, the comprehensiveness of mind, to grasp it, the multiplied disorders which arise through the country out of the germ seeds which are sown by the liquor traffic as it flourishes among us from year to year.

What comes next? Pauperism is injected into society; labor is pulled down into idleness, and the inevitable result is, that that which should be wealthy and independent, able to take care of itself, is reduced to a pauper's condition; plenty is dragged out of its seat and poverty takes its place.

Go to the old country, read the record of the Poor Law Unions; read the records, parliamentary investigations, and if we use our eyes, even in our own communities, we will find that there is no more potent cause of pauperism in the country, no more potent cause of criminality than the liquor traffic, by the dispa-

tion which it produces by its taking away the independent aspirations, taking away the desire on the part of mankind to improve their condition, by its tendency to sink a man lower and lower in the strata of Society. Pauperism raises its gaunt form in every one of our villages and cities all over the country. There has been a talk about soup kitchens in Parliament this session. Sir, I make this statement, believing it to be true, that though some people are brought into the condition of recipients of charity because death has suddenly struck down their friends, or because of the visitation of circumstances which cannot be controlled. I say that the great mass of the pauperism and poverty which goes round begging for charity is that which is the direct result of the dram-shop, where the earnings, which should have gone for food, have been wasted in dissipation and debauch. That is the pauperism which forms the mass and weight of the burden in the old country, and that is the pauperism which is growing to be the mass and weight of the burden in this country, and as it is one of the strongest hindrances to the prosperity and progress in this or any country, let us who are beginning to build up a new nationality, let us who are growing up from rural constituencies, from small town and village constituencies, let us look to it that the cause which produced this burthen of pauperism is weeded out of our country while it is still young, so that while we go on to a denser population, we may grow up with less of that pauperism which has afflicted older countries.

What else is injected into society by the liquor traffic and by the distributing centres of that traffic? Crime, sir. There is no more hydra-headed monster that dogs the steps of civilization, none of a more terrible or revolting character than that which shows itself, not only in our great cities and centres of civilization, but in our rural communities as well—one which waits on the footsteps of civilization and Christianity all over the world. Christianity, with its light and beauty takes hold of men's hearts and transforms our whole civilization, but it has behind it the terrible dogging footsteps of that multiplied crime, which is a dark shadow that may set off in greater brightness the civilization which has just advanced, but which is nevertheless a source of disgrace and shame to our country. It is something to which the best legislative minds of this or any other country should devote themselves, and they would raise themselves in the estimation of all the best people if they would put their gigantic powers towards solving it. I say, sir, that this patching up on one side, while this ulcer sore and source of crime is allowed to remain, is not a statesmanlike thing, is not a common sense thing, but is something which experience proves to be wrong, is something which the common sense of man will not much longer tolerate.

Sir, if there be one thing which marks the legislation of to-day as against the legislation of fifty years ago, it is the paternal character of the present legislation. Men have got beyond the idea that they are here simply to recruit soldiers, to gather taxes and carry on war, and let the best interests of the country take care of themselves, and they have come to the conclusion that in the future it is the practical duty of legislators to dig down into the causes which lie at the root of social deterioration, to stamp out these causes of crime and pauperism by proper measures of restriction, and in this way infuse a light and brightness into society which could not be infused in any other way.

Sir, is it necessary for me to go into statistics to prove that crime comes from

that tr
the Ho
abler,
to the

Sir,
1881, t
drunk
were g
drunk
" Th
drunk
11-38 p
total c
the cor
bear to
now be
the th
to the

A C
commo
of whi
In nine
gaols o
conduc
numbe
disorde
this pr
Domin
tional
license
numbe
disorde
all crim
ness ar

I w
been g
temper
the M
wish w
gent, a
wealth
are ord
undert
the use
were th
I fi
show t

that traffic? No, it is not. But still, I feel it is my duty to ask the attention of the House for a few moments, while I give them the results of experience of men abler, perhaps, than any of us to give an opinion upon this question, with reference to the criminality induced and produced by this traffic.

Sir, I take first our own country and I begin with the Province of Ontario. In 1881, the total commitments were 9,229, and of these the number committed for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, was 3,328. In 1882 the total commitments were 9,620; drunk and disorderly, 3,447. In 1883 the total commitments were 9,880; drunk and disorderly, 3,895. The inspector, in his report of 1883, states:

"The most deplorable feature is the very large increase in the commitments for drunkenness, the figures being, in 1882, 3,497; in 1883, 3,995, an increase of 398, or 11.38 per cent. The percentage which the commitments for drunkenness bear to the total commitments is 39.42 against 36.35 per cent, in 1882, showing that, not only are the commitments for this offence numerically greater, but that the proportion they bear to the total commitments is also increased. It is to be hoped that the efforts now being made by the various associations for the promotion of temperance will have the effect of reducing the large number who find their way, through this vice, to the goals of the Province."

A Committee of this Parliament of 1875 reported that the commitments to the common goals of Ontario and Quebec in the year 1870, 1871 and 1872 were 28,289, of which 21,236 were for drunkenness and kindred crimes—80 per cent. of the total. In nine years, from 1875 to 1883, inclusive, the total number of commitments to the goals of Ontario were 98,069, of which 33,444 were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, or 34 per cent. of the whole. In 1881, the nine cities of Ontario had a total number of arrests for all crimes of 13,196, of which 6,926 were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, being 45 per cent. of the total arrests in those nine cities. Sir, this proves that in Ontario, which is in some respects the pivotal Province of this Dominion—one which has as great advantages as any in moral training and educational training—more than that, sir, one which has, I believe, one of the best liquor license laws to be found on any Provincial Statute Book—is shown an increasing number of arrests, and an increasing number of convictions for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. In the city of Toronto last year the total number of arrests for all crimes was 6,636, of which 3,407, or 50 per cent. of the whole, were for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

I wish now to give what I consider one of the most conclusive tests which have been given in any country or in any age—with reference to the crime caused by intemperance. I hold in my hand part of the eleventh and twelfth annual reports on the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor—a very excellent institution—I wish we had a counterpart of it in this Dominion—a body of very able, and intelligent, and industrious men, whose sole duty it is, at the command of the Commonwealth Legislature, to give their whole time to making such investigations as they are ordered to undertake. They were ordered by the Massachusetts Legislature to undertake an investigation with reference to the percentage of crime resulting from the use of intoxicating liquors in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. And what were the results, as shown in their eleventh report?

I find, sir, that the investigations of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics show that during the 20 years, from 1860 to 1879, the total number of senten-

ces pronounced in the Commonwealth was 578,458, of which 340,814, or 60 per cent., were for what the Bureau denominates distinctly rum crimes, that is, crimes which came directly from violations of the license laws, and cases of drunkenness and disorderly conduct, and from excessive indulgence in spirits. Well, sir, that left 40 per cent. of the crime of the State of Massachusetts, and the question came as to what category that 40 per cent. should be distributed into; and so the Bureau of Statistics were instructed by the Legislature to continue their investigations, and to report during the next year, as to what proportion of these crimes would be attributable to the traffic in intoxicating liquors. That Committee went to work—It took Suffolk County, which includes the city of Boston, as its base of operations and it investigated the criminality in that county from September, 1879, to September, 1880. It went about this work in the most methodical manner. It not only had agents who attended every trial during the year, but those agents were instructed to most thoroughly investigate the causes of each crime, and the antecedents of the persons who committed the crime. They went back into their history, they traced up that history to its beginning, and after a most elaborate investigation they penned their report, of which this is the result:

From September 1st, 1879 to September 1st, 1880, there were 16,897 sentences, of which 12,289 were for distinctly rum crimes. That left 4,608 cases, which the Bureau undertook to investigate, and as the result of their investigation they found that of these 4,608 crimes, 2,097 were committed by persons who were in liquor at the time of the commission of the crime, making 12 per cent. of the total attributable, directly or indirectly, to intoxicating liquors. Adding 72 per cent. for distinctly rum crimes to this 12 per cent., we get a total of 84 per cent. of all crime due, directly or indirectly, to the use of liquor, as the result of the investigation of the Bureau. I will give the concluding part of their report in their own words:

"These figures paint a picture, at once the most faithful and hideous, of the guilt and power of rum. Men and women, the young, the middle-aged, and the old, father and son, husband and wife, native and foreign born, the night-walker and man-slayer, the thief and adulterer—all testify to its ramified and revolting tyranny. Therefore, the result of this investigation, in view of the disproportionate magnitude of the exclusively rum offences, and considered in connection with the notorious tendency of liquor to inflame and enlarge the passions and appetites, to import chaos into the moral and physical life, to level the barriers of decency and self-respect, and to transport its victims into an abnormal and irresponsible state, destructive and degrading, calls for earnest and immediate attention at the bar of the public opinion and the public conscience of Massachusetts."

I think that that report, giving the results of an investigation most impartially and most thoroughly carried out, cannot but be very conclusive. It sets forth the preponderating influence which the use of intoxicating liquors has in the production of crime in these countries of ours. I wish, besides, to read to you the opinions of several of the most eminent judges of Great Britain with reference to their experience in this matter. As early as 1670, Sir Matthew Hale, Chief Justice of England, said:

"By due observation extending over twenty years, I have found that if the murders and manslaughters, the burplaries, and robberies, the riots and tumults, and other enormities that have happened in that time, were divided into five parts, four

of these
house d

Lord

"I ca

of homes
islands.

"The

caused b

Judge

"If it

Judge

"Dru

assizes o

Judge

"I fir

indirectl

Mr. J

"His

far as pe

upon tho

could not

and pern

hand."

Lord

"Two

are occas

Mr. F

penal sci

"I an

quiry, tha

drink has

Dr. E

"Aft

populatio

relations.

that are l

of all con

tion to th

upon the

drinks."

The B

"We

tenders th

Gover

"Inter

and dome

Sir Th

W. Laws

"I am

dministe

of these have been the issues and products of excessive drinking—of tavern and ale-house drinking."

Lord Chief Justice Coleridge said :

"I can keep no terms with a vice which fills our jails, that destroys the comfort of homes and the peace of families, and debases and brutalizes the people of these islands.

"There is scarcely a crime that comes before me that is not directly or indirectly caused by strong drink."

Judge Patterson says :

"If it were not for this drinking you (the jury) and I would have nothing to do."

Judge Anderson says :

"Drunkenness is the most fertile source of crime, and if it could be removed, the assizes of this country would be rendered mere nullities."

Judge Wightman says :

"I find in my calendar that comes before me, one unfailing source, directly or indirectly, of the most of the crimes that are committed—intemperance."

Mr. Justice Hawkins declared this :

"His lordship appealed to the members of the Grand Jury not only to repress, as far as possible, the crime of drunkenness, but also to bring their influence to bear upon those who encouraged drunkenness. It was a very serious matter, and he could not express too strongly his opinion that both those who indulged in the baneful and pernicious vice, and those who encouraged it, should be put down with a strong hand."

Lord Chief Baron Kelly said :

"Two-thirds of the crimes which come before the courts of law of this country are occasioned chiefly by intemperance."

Mr. Frederick Hill, late Inspector of Prisons in England, and a high authority on penal science, writes :

"I am within the truth when I state, as the result of extensive and minute inquiry, that of four cases out of five, when an offence has been committed, intoxicating drink has been one of the causes."

Dr. Elisha Harris, of New York, after a thorough inspection of prisons, says :

"After two years of careful inquiry into the history and condition of the criminal population of the State, I find that the conclusion is inevitable that, taken in all its relations, alcoholic drinks may be justly charged with far more than half the crimes that are brought to conviction in the State of New York, and that fully 85 per cent. of all convicts give evidence of having, in some larger degree, been prepared or enticed to the criminal acts, because of the physical and distracting effects produced upon the human organism by alcohol, and as they indulged in the use of alcoholic drinks."

The Board of Police Justices of the city of New York, in their report of 1874, says :

"We are fully satisfied that intoxication is the one great leading cause which renders the existence of our police courts necessary."

Governor Dix, of New York, said :

"Intemperance is the undoubted cause of four-fifths of all the crime, pauperism, and domestic misery of the State of New York."

Sir Thomas Chambers, Q.C., M.P., as Chairman at a meeting addressed by Sir W. Lawson, in Westbourne Park Chapel, London, March 22, 1882, said :

"I am in a position of course to see and to feel the mischief of intemperance, as administering the criminal law at the central criminal court for a long series of years ;

and my experience only confirms and strengthens the view I have held for very many years, that if we could absolutely put an end to the vice of intemperance in this metropolis and in other great towns in the country, we should put an end to nearly all the crimes of violence which are brought before the public tribunals."

Mr. Justice Denman, at the Surrey Assizes, in August, 1882, said :

" I don't know in enforcing the considerations which are placed before the judges as a part of their duty in the proclamation against vice and immorality which has just been read, that any judge can better discharge his duty than by again and again calling the attention of the gentry of the country, as well as inhabitants generally to this fact, that the great bulk, I might almost say the whole of the offences of violence which take place in the counties of this land, are directly ascribable to the habit of drinking to excess."

The Recorder of Dublin, the Hon. Frederick R. Falkiner, Q.C., at the annual Licensing Sessions, held in October, 1881, in Dublin, said :

" I have been for a whole week trying cases such as no Christian judge ought to have to try—cases of outrage and violence in this city, every one of which originated in public houses. The drinking system of Dublin is responsible for three sentences of penal servitude and seven heavy sentences of imprisonment which I had to impose, varying from twelve to twenty-four calendar months. I marked the evidence in every case, and every one of them began in a public house. It is the drink system and the drink alone that leads to all this misery and crime and sorrow."

Mr. Baron Dowse, in charging the jury in a case heard in a Commission Court, Dublin, in November, 1881, said :

" He found that drink was at the bottom of almost every crime committed in Dublin. Even in cases that had no apparent connection with drink at all, if closely investigated, as he himself had done in many cases, they would be found to have their origin in drink."

Such is the testimony, and it is only a small part of the testimony that may be culled from the utterances of criminal judges, from the utterances of judges of Police Courts for the last hundred years, which I offer to this House in support of this proposition, a self-evident one, I know, but one which none the less requires to be supported by this evidence, thus kept alongside of the assertion in order to make the conviction, if possible, deeper and still deeper, but evidence that intoxicating liquor, as it is distributed and used throughout the country, is at the bottom of nearly nine-tenths of all the crime which has to be tried in the various courts of the country, and, if it is at the bottom of all the crime which has to be tried, it is also at the bottom, as the cause of that criminality, of what are the worst influences and the worst retarding causes to our prosperity that possibly a civilized country to-day has to labor against.

Now, will you allow me to sum up the points I have made with reference to the traffic, in its nature and in its results. It is true that physiological science labels alcoholic liquor a poison and pronounces it dangerous, and, in the words of the eminent Dr. Andrew Clark, goes forth on its mission of proclaiming to the world that it is an enemy to the human race; it is true that the plainest rules of economic science, as applied to the keeping and proper use of our material resources, as applied to the wise conservation and proper employment of labor, and as applied to the prudent management of our surplus wealth and to the gaining of that invaluable consideration in any country, a minimum of the non-producing and criminal element, it is true that every one of these rules is antagonized by the liquor traffic, which destroys the material resources of the country, which works against its labor power, renders much

use es and turns much of it into ways which result in no benefit to the community or advantage to the country, which goes against the proper husbanding of the earnings of the country, which ought to be put by in surplus, or put into capital, for the better and further development of the resources of the country; it is true, beyond cavil or doubt, that it is the very bottom cause of that great non-producing element, of that great criminal and dangerous element in our society which has to be watched and guarded and maintained, which, by the opinions of the judges and by the consensus of all men of intelligence, takes a place in our country, and in all Anglo-Saxon countries which is to be deplored, which is to be investigated, and which, if possible, is to be alleviated.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have made good my proposition that the traffic in intoxicating liquors antagonizes all these in its nature and effects, and that as such it demands total legal suppression at the hands of the State.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

March 19th.

MR. FOSTER.—When six o'clock came, on the day upon which I moved a Resolution, respecting the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, I had not finished the remarks which I had intended to address to the House. However, as the time of this House is valuable, and as there are quite a number of hon. gentlemen who are disposed to take some part in this debate, I shall, with your permission, sir, waive any remarks which I had intended to make, until the close of the debate, when I believe I shall have the opportunity of making a reply.

MR. FISHER.—In seconding the resolution moved by my hon. friend, I wish to say a few words, especially as the standpoint from which I view this question is a little different from that of my hon. friend, although we arrive at the same conclusion in regard to the principle at issue. Notwithstanding the able and exhaustive argument of the hon. gentleman who made this motion, I find that there are a considerable number of points which have not yet been touched upon, and it is for this reason that I ask the attention of the House for a few minutes, after which any hon. gentleman who wishes to speak in opposition to the principle before us, may have an opportunity to address you.

First, sir, I would like to have it clearly understood that, in treating of this question, I do not consider that the ordinary use of liquor is at all a crime or a sin. I say this because I know that a large number of people who think as I do, that the use, the manufacture and the traffic of intoxicating liquors in this country should be prohibited, do hold that opinion. But, notwithstanding that I differ from them on this premise, I am happy to say that the conclusion which we draw from different premises arrive at the same end. When I say that, I do not in any way wish to endorse the use of liquor, because I believe that it is inadvisable, that it is contrary to the public good, and that it is contrary to the physical advantage of those who indulge in that use. Unfortunately, however, we invariably find that the use is attended with abuse; and it is because of this invariable fact in the world's history, that I am opposed even to the use of intoxicating liquors. In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as saying that I believe that no individual can use intoxicating liquors without abusing them.

but I believe that if the opportunities are given for using intoxicating liquors, the necessary consequence will be the abuse of them by a very large proportion of those who attempt the use of them.

In dealing with this question, I find that the community may be fairly divided into three classes—those who are already temperance people, those who use liquor without abusing it, and those who, unfortunately for themselves and for the community in which they live, abuse it. The first class it is not necessary for me to appeal to, because I believe all the temperance people are thoroughly in accord with us in regard to the principle of this resolution, and will gladly and heartily endorse any legislation which it may involve. The last class, those who abuse the liquor, I think we have a perfect right, for the good of the country, to restrain from that abuse.

I find, then, that it is necessary for me simply to appeal to those who use liquor without abusing it. In doing so, I will not only appeal to their generosity and their kindness towards their fellow-beings in this Dominion, in asking them to assist in bringing about what I believe to be a great good to the country, but I think I can appeal to them fairly and justly, as well as successfully, on the ground that it is also to their pecuniary and material advantage that such a resolution as this should pass this House, and that a law should be founded upon it.

A great statesman has announced as a principle that it is the duty of a Government to make everything that is right easy for its citizens, and to make everything that is wrong difficult. This perhaps may be considered a self-evident proposition; but I think that we must necessarily include in it the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I would go further and say that not only is it the duty of a Government, but it is the duty of the citizens of a country, to assist in making everything that is right easy, and everything that is wrong difficult. This proposition may be stated in another form. That we should oppose national duty to national selfishness. If the community believe that what I have stated is a duty, they must sacrifice to a certain extent what I acknowledge to be their use of intoxicating liquors to the necessity of restraining the abuse of them by a large number of their fellow-citizens. And, I believe, sir, that this appeal will not be in vain; because we know, as a matter of fact, that a large number of people among those who to-day are total abstainers have not found it necessary, from their fears of the consequences of using liquor in themselves to become total abstainers, but that they have become so owing to what they believe to be the necessary effect that their continuance of the use of liquor would have by way of example upon their fellow-citizens. I have seen it stated in some papers, in which the mover of this resolution has been criticised, that he did not touch a vital point in the argument—the abstract right of Parliament or of the country to prohibit the use of intoxicating liquors. I wish to discuss this contention for a few moments.

Some might say that it is now too late to attempt to make any such argument as that prohibition is abstractly wrong, because we already have parliamentary prohibition; but I find that, even without agreeing in this argument at once, I can quote the opinion of one or two well-known statesmen in support of my contention that this Parliament has the abstract right to enforce total prohibition. First, I will quote a short extract from Mr. Mill, a great English writer on political economy. He says:

“Even in the best state society has yet reached, it is lamentable to think how

great a
neutrali
ed wast
energies
against
that of
and mo

Sure
say we
physica
I have
politica

“T
such so
develop

If, si
the phy
the use
to bring
tion fro
statesm
nation

“It
posal w
were de
their de

From
is resll

But
just as
our Str
can pro
way co
found
evil pu
against
and ce
akin to
tion, a
gambl
as this
the lib
the qu

But
this ar
ciple
are la

great a proportion of all the efforts and talents in the world are employed in merely neutralizing one another. It is the proper end of Government to reduce this wretched waste to the smallest possible amount, by taking such measure as shall cause the energies now spent by mankind in injuring one another, or in protecting themselves against injury to be turned to the legitimate employment of the human faculties, that of compelling the powers of nature to be more and more subservient to physical and moral good."

Surely, in limiting or restricting the traffic in intoxicating liquors, we can fairly say we are compelling the powers of nature to be more and more subservient to physical and moral good. I find also that an able writer, a short pamphlet of whose I have now in my hand, Mr. Wm. Hoyle, a well-known authority in England on political economy and other economical subjects, says:

" True civilization consists, not in the mere amassing of wealth, but in promoting such social and national arrangements as will ensure the physical health, the national development, the social happiness, and the industrial and moral progress of nations."

If, sir, as was shown very clearly by my hon. friend who proposed this resolution, the physical and moral health of the nation will be promoted by its abstinence from the use of intoxicating liquors, we are justified, on this ground alone, in endeavoring to bring to pass the prohibition of the use of these liquors. I will cite also a quotation from Mr. Gladstone, who may, I think, be fairly called one of the greatest statesmen who has ever taken into consideration the internal economy of the greatest nation in the world. He said in the case of Ireland:

" It was agreed that if the sentiment of the public was in sympathy with the proposal with regard to the Sunday-closing Bill, it ought to be assented to. If people were desirous to set aside this temptation, would it not be a cruel thing to refuse their desire?"

From these quotations, I argue that it is a mere question of whether the country is really desirous that the law for total prohibition should be enacted.

But I will go further. We have other things in which the liberty of the citizen is just as much interfered with as it would be in such a law as this. I believe that on our Statute Books there is an Act against the carrying of concealed firearms. Nobody can pretend that, in itself, the carrying of firearms in one's pocket or in any other way concealed on the person is necessarily wrong; but for the public good it has been found necessary, in consequence of the frequency of these firearms being carried for evil purposes, that the carrying of them should be declared wrong, and there is a law against it. We have in our municipal regulations the prohibition of certain trades and certain usages in large communities; we have also, and this is, perhaps, more akin to the present prohibitory law we are advocating, stringent laws against prostitution, against the circulation and the reading of immoral literature, and also against gambling. I think that these are really fair examples of such prohibitory legislation as this for which we are asking, and that since we have in this way interfered with the liberty of the citizen, we have the right to go further and interfere with it also in the question which is now before us.

But even more than this: If we examine the present law we will find that in this and other Acts in regard to the liquor traffic, we have already adopted the principle of prohibition. We find that in England and in Scotland and in Ireland there are laws against the selling of liquor on Sunday, and if it is allowable to prohibi

the selling of liquor on Sunday, it is equally allowable to prohibit the selling of it on other days of the week. If it is not interfering with a man's liberty to say he shall not, on a certain day or during certain hours, go into a liquor saloon or shop to obtain liquor, it is perfectly right that we should say that on other days, and during other hours, he shall not have that privilege or liberty. In our own Statute Books there is a series of laws acknowledging the prohibitory principle. We find the Scott Act and the Dunkin Act, both of which make local prohibition right in this country. If it is right for the Parliament of this country to prohibit the traffic in liquor in certain localities it must be perfectly legitimate and right that that traffic should be prohibited over the whole country. More than this, we find there are clauses in all these Acts, even in the License Acts we have in the different Provinces, which prohibit the sale of liquor in certain times and seasons and places, and if we are not at all to interfere with the rights of the individual to obtain liquor where and when he likes, we should not have passed those laws, and the passing of those laws is, I contend, a sufficient argument to show that we have the moral as well as the legislative right to pass these enactments we are now asking you to pass. Last year, sir, this Parliament passed a License Act. By one of the clauses of that Act the people of the municipalities were allowed to prohibit the sale of liquor within their limits, which is giving to the people the right to legislate according to their desire in this matter; but that Act went further. Not only did it give to the people the right to prohibit the sale of liquor within their own limits, but it went so far, in the Province of Quebec, as to give to the representatives of the people in their municipal councils the right to prohibit the traffic in liquor within their municipal limits. If it is allowable to give a small body of men, such as a municipal council, the right to interfere with the liberty of the people to obtain liquor when and where they like, surely it is the right of this Parliament to decide that the people shall not obtain liquor when and where they choose. We also have in this country, in the North-West Territories, an absolutely prohibitory law. That was passed by this Parliament. That was not passed by the representatives of the people who were to be effected by it, but it was passed by the arbitrary power of the Parliament which ruled that country, as it was thought at the time, for its own good, and as Parliament still, I think, considers, it was done for its good, and it has been productive of good. Then, also, on Government works connected with our railroads, the Parliament of this country passed a law prohibiting the selling of intoxicating liquors, so that these works might be better prosecuted. If I asked for any argument I could not ask for a better than this very Act, to show that it is the opinion of this Parliament, and the opinion of the people of this country, that the liquor traffic in itself is obstructive of good; that it has a tendency to deteriorate the works the people do, and a tendency to interfere with that work. I think that, from these things to which I have alluded, these various laws which already hold in this country, and are already in force in regard to the restraint of the liquor traffic, I may fairly conclude that this Parliament has not only the legislative right, but the moral right, to interfere in this way with the liberty of the individual to obtain liquor whenever he may desire it.

There is another question which has agitated the minds of a good many, and is

looked
allude t
into the
ner, as t
of this t
to see si
of this h
to the h
Palace H
that spee
" It h
Governm
the Dom
I have n
quite sec
The reve
of dollar
Minister
raising a
" Mr.
will accep
many pec
hon. Fina
country w
traffic wor
the gener
well-being
branches
practically
from our
There
hibit. It
prepared f
country fo
prohibitor
extent, tru
happy peri
the very fa
powers in t
ment, we n
to that opin
past moral
Far be it fr
spent their
upon this c
assistant an
of the coun

looked upon as a very serious objection to the passing of a prohibitory law. I allude to the loss of revenue to the country in consequence of this. I will not go into the moral question as to whether this revenue is obtained in a legitimate manner, as to whether it is right or wise for this country to batten upon the proceeds of this traffic, but I will simply quote the authority of a gentleman whom I am glad to see sitting in his seat opposite to me to-night, a gentleman whom a large majority of this House consider to be a very high authority upon financial matters. I allude to the hon. the Finance Minister, who last summer, on August 9th, at Westminster Palace Hotel, in London, made a speech upon Canadian Liquor Legislation, and in that speech he said:

"It has been my misfortune, or fortune, having been a great many years in the Government of my native Province of New Brunswick and in the Government of the Dominion, to hold the post of Finance Minister in all these Governments, and I have never heard but one opinion about the revenue question, namely, that it is of quite secondary importance, though it is, I admit, a more difficult thing with you. The revenue we obtain in the Dominion of Canada is probably five or six millions of dollars a year, and it costs \$20,000,000 in providing it for us. No Finance Minister would remain long in office who would, in this day, propose a scheme for raising a revenue of \$5,000,000 that would cost \$20,000,000 to collect."

"Mr. Speaker, I think that, coming from such an authority as this, this House will accept the view I have propounded, and I do not believe that there are a great many people in this country who would not be prepared for the statement, that the hon. Finance Minister there made. There are not a great many people in this country who would not fully understand, that although direct receipts from this traffic would certainly be expunged from our revenue, still, the improvement in the general commerce of the country, the improvement in the general welfare and well-being of our community, would be so great that the receipts in all other branches of our revenue would be increased correspondingly, and there would, practically, after the first year or so, not be any diminution whatever in our revenue from our taxpayers.

There is another point which I now come to, and that is, when we ought to prohibit. It is generally said that we should not prohibit until the country is quite prepared for that action; until there is not only an evident desire on the part of the country for prohibition, but also that the country should be prepared to sustain the prohibitory measure and to assist in carrying it out. I believe this is, to a certain extent, true, but I believe also, that one of the very best means of obtaining that happy period in the country's history is to commence by prohibiting. I believe that the very fact that a prohibitory law is in existence is one of the very best educating powers in the community. I believe that, by the legislative action of the Parliament, we may have a better influence upon the people of the country to bring them to that opinion than we can in any other way whatever. It is true that in years past moral suasion has been tried, and moral suasion has accomplished a great deal. Far be it from me in any way to detract from the noble efforts of those who have spent their time and labor in trying to improve the principles of the community upon this question, but I believe that, in conjunction with moral suasion, as an assistant and help to moral suasion, it is absolutely necessary that the Government of the country should propose a law, and should assist those who are trying this

moral suasion to carry out that law and to enforce it. What has been the result in those countries where we have a prohibitory law? We find universal testimony to the fact that, in those states and countries where the prohibitory law has been in existence, the people have found the education which it exerted upon the community was the very greatest possible to be imagined. I find that in the State of Vermont, where for some twenty years past there has been absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic, and the use of liquor as much as was possible, Governor Peck, who was an ex-Governor of the State and Judge of the Supreme Court, says:

"In some parts of the State there has been a laxity in enforcing it; but in other parts of the State it has been thoroughly enforced, and there it has driven the traffic out. I think the influence of the law has been salutary in diminishing drunkenness and disorders arising therefrom, and also crimes generally. You cannot change the habits of a people momentarily. The law has had an effect upon our customs, and has done away with that treating and promiscuous drinking. The law has been aided by moral means, but moral means have also been wonderfully strengthened by the law. I think the law is educating the people, and that a much larger number now support it than when it was adopted; in fact, the opposition is dying out. All the changes in the law have been in the direction of greater stringency. In attending a court for ten years, I do not remember to have seen a drunken man."

This testimony, I think, is very strong in the direction of the argument that the law is the best educator of the people. I also have the testimony of Governor Convers, in the same State. He says:—

"The prohibitory law has been in force about twenty-two years, the enforcement has been uniform in the State since its enactment, and I consider it a very desirable law. I think the law itself educates and advances public sentiment in favor of temperance. There is no question about the decrease in the consumption of liquor. I speak from personal knowledge, having always lived in the State. I live in Woodstock, 60 miles from here, and there is no man having the least regard for himself would admit selling rum, even though no penalty attached to it."

"I have here in my hand another testimony to the educating effects of the law. That is the Convention of the State Temperance Union in Rhode Island. Governor Howard, Governor of that State, said:—

"I stopped short without recommending particularly the prohibitory law. I did so because I was not fully convinced that it was the best remedy to be found; but the law was adopted. After a long time we succeeded in selecting such a force of men as was needed to execute those laws; and now, ladies and gentlemen, I am here to-night especially for the purpose of saying, not from the stand point of a temperance man, but as a public man, with a full sense of the responsibility which attaches to me from my representative position, that to day the prohibitory laws of this State, if not a complete success, are a success beyond the fondest anticipation of any friends of temperance. In my opinion, prohibition in Rhode Island is a success, a marvellous success. I felt it incumbent upon me to make that declaration; and I desire that it shall go abroad as my sober assertion:"

I have here shown you briefly what has been the educating influence of this law in those States where it has been enforced. But there are other instances just as significant though not, perhaps, so well known to the people of this country. I find in a very interesting letter from a certain Mr. Balfour to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in which he describes the operation of liquor legislation in Sweden, that many years ago in that country there was absolute free trade in liquors, and that, at the period at which he writes, no less than 175,000 stills were in existence; manufac-

turing intoxicating liquor of the most ardent description in that country. The letter gives evidence that for a long time the crime, the destitution, the immorality in that country were simply enormous and almost inconceivable. Not long afterwards the Government of that country introduced restrictive measures against the liquor traffic, and we have evidence that almost immediately afterwards not only did the traffic itself diminish, but the crime and the poverty and the destitution among the people also decreased. This was not absolute prohibition, but it tended in that direction, and I think the argument is quite clear that, since the people in other respects were just the same during the two periods, that their moral, religious and secular education was just the same during the two periods, the decrease in the amount of crime was attributable to the decrease in the amount of liquor consumed.

I find, in looking over the history of liquor legislation in England, during a great many years indeed, that just in proportion as the traffic was restrained, just in the same proportion did the people benefit by such restrictive legislation; that when the laws were rendered more strict against the traffic in liquor the effects among the people were immediately evident by a decrease in the number of commitments to gaol, in the number of crimes of all sorts, and also by a greatly augmented prosperity. I need not say that at no time was this legislation absolutely prohibitive, but my argument is, that just in proportion as the liquor traffic was restricted was there a decrease in its attendant evils. It has often been said that moral suasion in England has accomplished a great deal towards producing a sentiment in favor of prohibition. Sir, I believe moral suasion has done a great deal in that respect, but it is to be noted that it has been constantly attended with increasing legislative restrictions, and I believe that the increased temperance sentiment in England is as much due to the educating influence of this restrictive legislation as it is to moral suasion.

But there is another argument which we may fairly adduce. It is very inconsistent for the Government of any country to license people to sell intoxicants, and thereby encourage intemperance, while at the same time they pretend to be educating people in favor of temperance. Certainly it is a very ineffectual mode of educating people in favor of temperance by precept, when by practice the Government educate people in favor of intemperance. So long as we may be told that the liquor traffic is perfectly respectable, that it is acknowledged and fostered by the Government, that traffic cannot possibly be considered respectable, or immoral, or wrong. It is very difficult for us to preach when we do not practice, and I think, sir, that it is the duty of the representatives of the people to take the first step in practicing that which they are endeavoring to preach to the people.

Now there is another objection very often urged against prohibition, and that is that prohibitory legislation cannot succeed, and must necessarily be ineffective, and conducive rather to evil than to good. I believe we have not to go outside the limits of our own country to see the fallacy of this argument. I come from a country in which a prohibitory liquor law has been in existence for a long time, and I can emphatically say that, while it has not accomplished all that we desire it should accomplish, while it has not been absolutely and entirely enforced, still it has accomplished so much good that the vast mass of the people in that country would regret

exceedingly to see it repealed. Nay, more, they would strenuously resist and forbid the repeal of that law, and any agitation in favor of such repeal would meet with a most determined opposition. I think I am justified in saying this when I recall the fact that the other day I presented to this House a petition signed by 1200 or 1500 of the electors of my county, asking that this resolution, in favor of which I am now speaking, should be passed by this House. If the Dunkin Act, which has been for many years in existence in my county, had been inoperative, if it had produced more evil than good, if it had not, at all events, accomplished some of the good which was expected of it, it would have been quite impossible that so large a number of the most intelligent electors in my county should have asked for the passage of a resolution in favor of prohibition. Instead of that, they would have sent petitions here asking that this resolution be rejected, pointing out how prohibition had failed in its effect. We know that in a large number of counties in this Dominion the Scott Act also has been in force, and although, no doubt, there are conflicting opinions in regard to its action, still the simple fact remains, that in every district I know of where this law is in force, the liquor-sellers and those who wish to obtain liquor, together with the manufacturers of such liquor, are opposed to such law, is to me a convincing argument that that law has done harm to the traffic. I believe if we could obtain evidence from those counties where prohibitory laws are in force, the evidence would be overwhelmingly in favor of prohibition.

But, sir, we have, as I said a little while ago, prohibitory legislation in the North-West Territories, and I will quote again from the Ministerial benches a witness in regard to its effective operation. I allude to a speech delivered by Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways, last summer, on the same occasion as that on which the speech was delivered by the Finance Minister, to which, a few moments ago, I alluded. Sir Charles Tupper was reviewing the Act which he had the honor of proposing and carrying through Parliament. He said:

"I may say, in reference to that other Act which I had the honor of proposing and carrying through Parliament when occupying the position of Minister of Customs, in 1872, an Act that, as he says, excluded the sale, manufacture and use of intoxicating liquors from a territory nearly as large as that of all Europe, the difficulty to be encountered was comparatively simple."

MR. RAPEL. "Do you say 'use' is in the Act?"

SIR CHARLES TUPPER. "I say 'use,' because, the manufacture and sale being prohibited, it followed that the use was prohibited. The authorities appointed mounted police to have the law observed. Whenever the smallest portion of intoxicating liquors was discovered in the territory, they had authority to destroy it then and there, and thus the use was completely and entirely prohibited throughout the extent of 250,000,000 acres of fertile land. Throughout that extent intoxicating liquors are so completely prohibited that when the distinguished Lord Dufferin was entertained in that territory, on the occasion of his visit, they were compelled to drink His Lordship's health with a mixture of Perry Davis' Pain Killer."

This evidence, sir, is, I think, conclusive that, at all events, a prohibitory law can be enforced by the Government, that a Government wishing to enforce it can, practically and effectually carry it out.

But, sir, I have here another witness in respect to this same matter—the enforcement of a prohibitory law, which, I think, is one of the most conclusive proofs that

can possibly be quoted. I allude to what, no doubt, most members will very well remember, the fact that the *Globe* newspaper, in 1881, sent two correspondents into the state of Maine, that state which has always been quoted as the best example of a total prohibition of the liquor traffic. Those two gentlemen were, one in favor of total prohibition, the other in favor of the liquor traffic, and I will quote to the House, not the evidence of that gentleman who was in favor of total prohibition, but that of the other one who was against it, and I think the evidence which he sums up is conclusive as to the fact that, although certainly liquor is sold in Maine, liquor, no doubt, can be obtained there and is drank there, still, on the whole, the Act is really and practically enforced. This gentleman wrote:

"Our work in Maine is now published, and before commencing enquiries in other States it may be well to sum up my conclusions, while the impressions left by our two weeks sojourn are yet fresh and distinct. I realized perfectly well that the results at which I have arrived will not be apt to please either party. I do not write with the object of doing so, but simply to tell the plain truth, as arrived at from personal observation, interviews with those whose opinions were likely to be of value, and consideration of the question in all its bearings. I shall not attempt a review or recapitulation of details, but present my conclusions in the form of a series of brief propositions, as follows:—

"That in the cities the law has been a partial failure so far as uprooting the traffic, or even the suppression of open bars is concerned.

"That this failure has been greatly exaggerated by quoting exceptional places or periods as typical of the whole State, and by the ingenious perversion of statistics.

"That in the rural portions of the State of Maine, law has suppressed open drinking and reduced secret drinking to a minimum and may therefore be considered as effective as any other measure on the Statute Book.

"That after thirty years, the opinion of the State is so strongly in favor of the law that no political party is willing to risk its future by advocating a reversion to license, and that on the contrary the Legislature is continually strengthening the law by more stringent amendments.

"That the class of liquor sellers who defy the law are the same class of men who, under a license system would sell liquor without a license."

I will not weary the House by reading the whole of his summing up, but I have taken out the salient features, and in omitting the rest I have not left the weaker or poorer paragraphs. I think, sir, that this evidence is such as will successfully refute the assertion of so many people, that it is obviously futile to try and interfere successfully with the liquor traffic.

I have here another quotation which I will not, however, read to the House, a quotation from a book by Hepworth Dixon, on America, in which he alludes to the State of Vermont, and especially to the little town of St. Johnsbury, with which I am myself familiar, and which he there describes as a workingman's paradise. In that little town is the Fairbank's great scale manufactory, and a large portion of the inhabitants are working people, 300 operatives having employment in that factory alone. Mr. Dixon says that those workingmen who are thus employed appear to consider total prohibition as their best friend; that they themselves would be among the last to aid any attempt to have the law repealed; He describes the town as being absolutely and totally a prohibitory one, going so far as to say that when he desired to obtain a glass of beer he had to get a pint bottle from a druggist and secure a medical certificate in order to obtain it. Here is evidence not only that prohibition

does prohibit, but also that people are benefited by that prohibition, and that even the working classes, those who are supposed to be the last to approve such a change, are really those who do appear the most decided that the law shall not be changed. Mr. Fairbank, manager of those large works, attributed to a great extent, the efficiency of his men to the fact that they could not obtain liquor in the town, and were compelled to abstain.

I have also here another quotation, which I will read to the House; it is also in regard to the State of Vermont and the State of Maine. I allude to the report of an English gentleman, who went out to the United States, Hon. Wm. Fox, an ex-Prime Minister of the Colony of New Zealand, who was travelling through the United States, and visited Maine and Vermont for the express purpose of finding out how the prohibitory law worked there. He was, he says, against the principle. He did not believe that such a law could be satisfactorily carried out. But he here says:

"To sum up the whole, and admitting all the facts I could get from Mr. Murray, I believe the conditions of the States of Maine and Vermont to be much as follows: If the House of Lords, and the House of Commons, and all the country justices, Mayors, and Aldermen of Great Britain, and a small number of the lower classes, perhaps 200,000 out of the population of 28,000,000, drank, and all the rest did not, you would have a state of things analogous here to what they are in Maine and Vermont—you would have a very small fraction who would get and use liquor, furnishing those shocking examples which some persons are in the habit of parading before us as existing in those States, but the whole of the rest of the population would be sober. The effect on their general condition is something marvellous—a total absence, externally, at all events, of all those vices and crimes which we meet with amongst drinking populations, which is very agreeable and very surprising. The impression left on my mind by my visit to these States was a full confirmation of the statements made to you by the Hon. Gen. Neal Dow, and the documents which have been put forth—that in Maine and Vermont, on the whole, the prohibitory law has been a great success; notwithstanding that it has been more difficult to carry out, because of its non-permissive character."

Here, sir, I think, is an accumulation of evidence which is quite sufficient to show that in those places where there is total prohibition it has been successfully carried out. But I find, too, that where partial prohibition has been carried out, it has had an extraordinary effect in decreasing the amount of drinking. One of the most curious, and, at the same time, one of the most convincing evidences of this fact, was found in Scotland in 1854, at the time that what was called the Sunday-closing Bill was passed. We have the evidence of the Provost of Edinburgh to show that at that time, in consequence of the operation of that Bill, which stopped the people from drinking for just one-seventh of the time, just one-seventh of the liquor drinking was stopped. We find that in that time about six-sevenths of the liquor was drunk which was drunk before, showing that by stopping the sale of liquor one day out of seven you stop the use of liquor in about the same proportion. I think it is not an illogical inference to draw that if you stop for the succeeding six days, it would almost, eventually and absolutely stop the drinking of liquor entirely.

There is one more argument which I have to bring before you to-night, sir, and that is, why we should prohibit. I am not going into the argument which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) so elaborately discussed the other night, as to the physical evils of intemperance. I am fully and firmly convinced that even the v-

dinary
in it.
prove t
and tha
that liq
a large
ordinar
and not
quence
view it,
to the c
to week
perity, I
that thi
everythi
that a la
waste of
stronges
In tryin
tions. T
read fro
founded,
called th
the place
was able
What he
"The
now find
sidered t
ment. I
usually p
natural a
fail, in a
the abun
from pro
could eas
success d
farm of m
usually th
the unusu
families;
importanc
inclined t
especially
the wife is
grows int
necessary
to this su
Judiciary
the questi

inary use of intoxicating liquors is bad, physically, for the individual who indulges in it. We were shown the other night a large mass of evidence, which tended to prove that the medical fraternity, throughout the whole country, endorses this view, and that they go further, and say that it is absolutely injurious to the public health that liquor should be allowed to be consumed. There is, it is true, on the other side, a large amount of evidence from medical men, to the effect that the moderate and ordinary use of liquor is not injurious, and however much I believe with the former, and not with the latter, still I am not going to make use of this argument, in consequence of the difficulty of obtaining absolute proof in regard to it; but I wish to view it, as nearly as possible, from a practical business standpoint. If we can show to the community at large that by reason of this traffic, from day to day, from week to week, and from year to year we are losing an enormous amount of material prosperity, I think we have the most convincing argument to the people of the country that this traffic should be done away with. In a new country like this, we should do everything we can to assist in building up and developing it; and if it can be shown that a large amount of energy is wasted in this traffic, that it contributes to the waste of an enormous amount of our material and vital energy, I think we have the strongest and most convincing argument that the traffic should be done away with. In trying to show you that this is the case, I will only read one or two quotations. The most important, and I think the most conclusive, is that which I shall read from an article written in *Fraser's Magazine*, in 1875, by the gentleman who founded, and has controlled the extraordinary settlement in the State of New Jersey called the Vineland Settlement. I dare say many hon. gentlemen are familiar with the place and the name. In establishing this colony and working it out so far as he was able to do so successfully, this gentleman took into account the liquor traffic. What he says with regard to it is as follows:—

"The next important question was in reference to the sale of liquor, a subject I now find greatly agitating the British public, and even the Government. I considered the subject solely as it would effect the industrial success of my settlement. I had witnessed the evil effects of the immense number of taverns which usually planted themselves in new places; I had seen very many towns with every natural advantage to favor them, and which at first were highly prosperous, finally fail, in a manner most unaccountable to the ordinary observer; but when I noticed the abundance of taverns, and considered the number of people they would draw from productive industry to carry them on, and the effects on their customers, I could easily account for such enterprises, falling sick and becoming paralyzed. My success depended entirely upon the success of each individual who should buy a farm of me. I had noticed that those individuals who were sober in their habits were usually the successful ones in all pursuits; that those who were intemperate were the unsuccessful ones; that the families, whose heads were sober, were happy families; that where they were intemperate, they were unhappy. It was of vital importance to me that a man's means should be economized, that he should be inclined to labor, and have the health to do it, and that his family should be contented, especially his wife. Intemperance is productive of discontent in families, and when the wife is in a new place, away from her relatives and friends, and the husband grows intemperate, she becomes panic-stricken. Happy, cheerful homes were necessary to the success of Vineland. As the best account of my action in reference to this subject, I will give you an extract from a speech I delivered before the Judiciary Committee of New Jersey, in 1873, which was appointed to examine into the question:—'I am in candor compelled to say that I did not introduce the local

option principle into Vineland from any motives of philanthropy. I am not a temperance man in the total abstinence sense; I introduced the principle because, in cool abstract thought, I conceived it to be of vital importance to the success of my settlement. If I had seen that liquor had made men more industrious, more skilful, more economical and more esthetic in their tastes, I certainly should have made liquor selling one of the main principles of my project. Whilst disclaiming all motives of philanthropy, I cannot deny the feeling of intense commiseration that I have felt for the victims of intoxication."

This, sir, is the cool, dispassionate, business-like statement of a man whose sole energies were devoted towards the business success of his colony. He says, himself, that he was not a total abstainer, that he did not wish, on general principles, to bring that question before his people, but that because the stern logic of facts was so strong he had to bring it before his people. He felt it was his duty to his people to restrain them from drinking any intoxicating liquors, so as the better to bend their energies and efforts to the advancement of his colony, and the success of his undertaking.

I have already alluded, sir, to the quotation from Mr. Hepworth Dixon and others, as to the State of Vermont. I have another very strong testimony to which I am going to allude—that is the testimony of a gentleman, in Massachusetts, with whom I am personally acquainted, and whose opinion on this question I know from frequent conversations. He is the head of one of the largest manufacturing firms in that State. I mean Mr. Ames, of the Ames Manufacturing Works, in Easton, Mass. There, they adopted, for a short time, a total prohibition law. But that law was repealed, and this is what Mr. Ames says in regard to its influence upon his work-people, to whose amelioration and increased efficiency his chief efforts have been for a long time directed. What he says is this:

"We have over 400 men at work here. We find that the present license law has a very bad effect upon our employees."

I may say that the license law succeeded the prohibitory law in Massachusetts. In 1867 they had total prohibition, and 1868 they had a license law. He goes on to say:

"We find, on comparing our production in May and June of this year (1868) with (1867), that in 1867, with 375 men, we produced 8 per cent. more goods than we did in the same months in 1868, with 400 men."

That is to say, under total prohibition, Mr. Ames' manufactory produced 8 per cent. more than it did with twenty-five men more under a license law. This, I think, is strong evidence, not only that the waste that goes on under the use of liquor is bad for the work people, but also that the manufacturers themselves and the whole community through the length and breadth of the land are deeply interested in the suppression of this traffic. Mr. Ames adds:

"We attribute this falling off entirely to the repeal of the prohibitory law, and the great increase in the use of intoxicating liquors among our men in consequence."

I have met Mr. Ames since that law has been repealed and the licenses issued, and I know that it is one of the dearest wishes of his heart that the licenses should be abolished in his town in Massachusetts.

I have several other quotations in regard to the effect of restrictions on the traffic in various places, which, however, I shall not read, as I find that the time has gone much faster than I had any idea it would. But I cannot refrain from alluding to

testimo

I am n

as poss

is calle

and I h

ciple of

wish to

adoptio

report

"Le

large a

fluence

but mo

criminal

being y

who ha

number

ment, t

where l

places.

by pers

influen

tution i

the liqu

tavern b

of vice.

a by-l

perience

places."

This

our very

be biase

Now

gestive t

as wages

out of th

the smal

the man

per cent.

ing estab

31; in cl

ing that

their wor

drink. "

that thes

ment wh

this Hou

Another

of the gr

testimony which comes from nearer home in regard to this traffic in our own country. I am not going to quote the statements of temperance people. I have tried as much as possible to take an unbiased view of this question, and to put aside wholly what is called by a great many, though unjustly, the fanaticism of temperance reformers; and I have endeavored to bring forward the evidence of those opposed to the principle of prohibition rather than the evidence of those in its favor, because I do not wish to be thought to be advocating, without careful thought and consideration, the adoption of the principle proposed to the House. I will read an extract from the report of the Chief of Police of the City of Montreal for last year, in which he says:

"Less crime was committed in Montreal than in any other city comprising as large a population on this continent. This was no doubt greatly owing to the influence of the clergy, and the good moral character of the majority of the citizens, but most certainly in some degree to the vigilance of the police. The number of criminals arrested during the year was less than last year, the greater part of them being young and illiterate, or addicted to drinking; this fact should stimulate all who have the public morals at heart to use their utmost endeavours to lessen the number of liquor shops in the city. According to the returns of the Revenue Department, there are at present in the city 382 hotels and restaurants, and 448 groceries, where liquor is sold. The amount of money paid annually for licenses for those places, added to what is spent in them for liquor, and recklessly squandered or lost by persons intoxicated, would amount to an almost fabulous amount. Some of our influential citizens had lately been devising a scheme for the suppression of prostitution in the city; if they would use their influence for the restriction or abolition of the liquor traffic, they would be thereby dealing a death blow at prostitution, the tavern being to most young people a stepping stone to the brothel and all other kinds of vice. It would be a step in the right direction if the Police Committee would get a by-law passed regarding registry offices for servant girls, in order to protect inexperienced girls from the misleading advice of some unprincipled keepers of such places."

This is certainly very strong testimony of the evil effects of the liquor traffic in our very midst, coming from an authority which has been shown not in any way to be biased in favor of prohibition.

Now, I have some Canadian manufacturing statistics which I think will be suggestive to read. They show the proportionate value of the products which are paid as wages in our different manufactories, that is to say, how much the work people get out of the profits of the goods which they manufacture; and they show very clearly that the smallest proportion of any is made by those who work in the establishments where the manufacture of liquor is carried on. In brass foundries the work people get 12 per cent.; in distilleries, 6½; in foundries, 36; in cordage manufactures, 24; in printing establishments, 28; in cabinet making, 31; in carpentering, 33; in machine shops, 31; in clothing establishments, 31, and in carriage manufactures 34 per cent., showing that the lowest paid work people in the country in proportion to the value of their work in the market of the country, are those employed in the manufacture of drink. This does not certainly show that it is for the benefit of our work people that these manufactories should be carried on, and I think it is a very potent argument why the rank and file of the voters of this country, who have control over this House and the Government of this country, should favor this Resolution.

Another significant circumstance is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, one of the great railroad corporations of this country, use their best endeavors in favor

of temperance among their employees; and I think I am right in saying that they have absolutely commanded that they shall not drink. I have no doubt that this great corporation has at heart the well-being of their employees. But I do not think I am unjust in saying that their chief reason in enforcing this abstinence from drink is the reason that appeals to their own pockets, in consequence of their finding that it renders the work people whom they employ more efficient.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain you longer. I will merely say, before closing, that although this House may treat this question with comparative indifference, although possibly it may be dismissed with a sneer and a laugh, and that a large number of people throughout the country may think that those who have brought this question before the House have been premature and unjustified in so doing, I think there is a sentiment throughout the country which justifies us in the action we have taken. I believe that if not now, at all events at no distant day, that sentiment will press itself so strongly that the representatives of the people in this House will be forced, if they do not do it willingly, to take cognizance of, and discuss, and ventilate most thoroughly, some such proposition as that which you have now before you. If this discussion does not thoroughly ventilate the question, if the hon. members of this House do not thoroughly believe that it is in the interests of the country that such a Resolution should pass, I do not wish them to vote for it; but I think it is time for them to discuss it; I think it is time for them to turn their attention to it, to review it and lay it bare before the whole country to its very bottom, so that the people throughout the country who have not turned their attention in this direction, may be induced to do so, and to judge this question according to its merits. I do not ask, and I do not hope, that we shall obtain any catch vote here to-night, which might perhaps lead the country to believe that the proposition was universally accepted. I trust hon. gentlemen in this House will vote upon this question as they think their constituents would wish them to vote. It is only in that way we can obtain some opinion of the real sentiments of the people on this question throughout the country, and I believe that while we have in view the practical enactment of such a law as is pointed to in this Resolution. One of the greatest inducements to the mover and myself in bringing this Resolution forward, was to test the opinion of this House and the country. If that test is successful, and we find that we carry this resolution, I can promise hon. gentlemen, and the people throughout the country at large, that principle will be put into practice just so soon as we shall be able to carry it through; but, unfortunately, this Session has already advanced so far that probably we may not be able to do anything effective this Session. If, however, we obtain the endorsement of the principle, we shall be well satisfied with our work this year, and trust to a future Session to accomplish the practical part of it.

Before closing, I have one more duty to perform which is at the same time a great pleasure, and that is to publicly acknowledge the kindness of those ladies of Ontario who, a few days ago, sent to the mover and myself an evidence of their earnest sympathy and encouragement in the work we are doing. Knowing the principles of the hon. leader of this House, knowing that at no distant day in the future, those ladies will probably have a voice in the election of members to this House and the govern-

ment
and
now
do it
I tak
M
discu
SI
this n
it wor
but m
first o
M
minut
the H
SI
the ad
MR
MR
ment v
otherw
Mot

On
Mr. Fo
ture an
MR
few min
tions su
generall
greatly
made fo
from the

Thos
concern
have cor
1873 of
other, ir
were pre
favor of
tation of
from the
persons,
whose pla
King's is

ment of the country, I think it is a most decided encouragement to my hon. friend and myself to believe that if the House is not ready to pass the Resolution we have now before us, at all events, at no distant day, those ladies will force this House to do it; and with the expression of the confidence and the hope that we may succeed I take my seat.

MR. ARMSTRONG. After the able manner in which this question has been discussed, it may seem out of place for me to detain the House.

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN. As it is now eleven o'clock and we sat very late this morning and will have to sit more likely very late to-morrow and the next night, it would perhaps be better if the hon. gentleman would not begin his speech now, but move the adjournment of the debate, so that on Wednesday next it will be the first order in Public Bills and he will have the first place in the discussion.

MR. ARMSTRONG. I do not intend to occupy the House more than ten minutes at the outside, and do not feel anxious to speak if the hon. gentleman wishes the House to adjourn.

SIR HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BERGIN. I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

MR. FISHER. If hon. leader of the Government will promise that the Government will not take next Wednesday, I will be very glad to support this motion; otherwise I must oppose it.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

March 26th.

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. Foster respecting the enactment of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, being read.

MR. WHITE (Cardwell). I have no desire, sir, to detain the House more than a few minutes, in presenting an amendment which I propose to move to the Resolutions submitted by the hon. member for King's, N. B. I am sure that the House generally will concur with him in the opinion that the evils of intemperance are very greatly to be deplored, and will agree to any reasonable suggestion which may be made for the removal of those evils and the mitigation of the results which follow from them.

Those who have watched the progress of this discussion, as far as Parliament is concerned, will, I think, be somewhat surprised that a motion of this kind should have come before Parliament at this particular time. We all remember that before 1873 or 1874 there was a very great agitation in the country, from one end to the other, in favor of a prohibitory liquor law, and that a large number of petitions were presented to Parliament, especially during the sessions of 1873 and 1874, in favor of such legislation as would entirely prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of intoxicating liquors. In the session of 1874, if I mistake not, there were from the Province of Ontario alone, petitions signed by no less than some 340,000 persons, asking for such a law. At that time we had in Parliament a gentleman, whose place, as a temperance advocate, I think, I may say, my hon. friend from King's is taking in this House—I mean Mr. George W. Ross—who was looked upon

very great and cannot be done away with without prohibition, I think we ought to do as Mr. Ross did when in Parliament—move simply to declare that so soon as public sentiment is ripe for such a law, Parliament will be prepared to deal with it. We must all admit, I think, that an act of this kind cannot be effective unless public sentiment is at the back of it. We are here, 211 members of this House. I have nothing to do with the private habits of the members of this House; I think we have never had a Parliament so distinguished for sobriety and decorum as this Parliament is; I think I can say that, after having watched the proceedings of Parliament for thirty-two years, either from the press gallery, or as a humble member. But if every member of this House who is prepared to vote for this proposition would really adopt it in his own person—would say, as for me and my house, we will prohibit intoxicating liquors—I venture to say that the moral influence such a step would have on the community at large, in one sense, would do relatively as much good as the passing of a prohibitory liquor law.

We may look at the question as we please, but judged by the drinking usages of the country, it is simply folly to say that there is such a public sentiment outside this House, or such an opinion or sentiment inside this House, in relation to this question, as would justify the passage of a Resolution which ought to be followed by actual legislation. The Resolution, therefore, which I propose to move, is to the following effect: that these words be added to the Resolution already, sir, in your hands:

“And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada.”

These are the exact words of the Resolution introduced by Mr. Ross in Parliament, in 1875, and I do not think we can be accused of going very far wrong from a temperance standpoint, at any rate, when we propose to adopt the words which that hon. gentleman, when a member of this House, thought quite sufficient, according to his intense temperance views. The words at the end may be open to some question, “so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada,” but I think it is desirable that those words should be put there, for the simple reason that the recent—as appears to me contradictory decisions of the Privy Council on the subject of the liquor traffic—leave it an open question as to where jurisdiction—I do not mean exclusive jurisdiction—but as to where jurisdiction exists in this matter. Therefore, I think it desirable, if we have the right at all, that we should wait for a final decision on the question which will be submitted, under the Temperance Act of last year, to the highest courts of this country or the Empire before taking action, and I beg therefore to move that the following words be added to the Resolution:

“And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada.”

Amendment agreed to.

On the main motion being put,

MR. BEATY. With reference to the main motion presented by the hon. member for King's, I would like to say a few words in connection with the principle stated in this Resolution. I am not sure that that principle, as a

practical question, can be adopted in Canada at present, but I have the idea that there is a principle of prohibition that might practically be adopted, and the country would not suffer in any respect. There is now what is called local prohibition, prohibiting in counties or municipalities, which is frequently adopted in both. That is termed local prohibition. The principle which is stated in the Resolution moved by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), is what may be termed total prohibition, for it certainly goes as far as to prohibit the use of every class of liquor of an intoxicating character that is imported and produced in the country—namely: "Respecting the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes." I have an idea, and it has been a matter of conviction with me for a number of years, that if we give practical legislation which shall tend in the direction of what I may term, for the want of a better name, "practical prohibition," that is, the prohibition of spirits, the prohibition of brandy, rum, gin, whiskey, particularly those classes under which these different kinds of spirits are named, it would be useful.

So far as the effect would be felt in some aspects of the question, it would make little difference whether there was a total or partial prohibition. The revenue, for instance, derived from spirits is very large, amounting to nearly \$4,000,000, while the revenue from malt liquors only amounts to about \$400,000, so that the difference in respect to revenue, between total and partial prohibition, would be of little importance.

As a question of practical prohibition, however, as a question of obtaining public assent to legislation of this character, I think partial prohibition would be received by the country at large very favorably, and would be endorsed by nine-tenths of our people. Speaking for my own neighborhood, the City of Toronto and the country surrounding it, with which I claim to be somewhat familiar, I am satisfied that at least four-fifths of the population of the whole country would endorse the proposition, for the purpose of promoting what is thus termed "partial prohibition"—the prohibition of spirits—and I may say that I believe it would be adopted by a large class of the liquor-dealers throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I was invited last fall to a meeting of the liquor-dealers, representative men, for the purpose of stating my views in reference to this question; and, after hearing the statement that I then made, they were prepared to adopt it, and ask the legislative power of Canada to make it the law of the land. That shows there is a tendency in that direction.

From the forcible and eloquent observations which were made by the hon. member for King's, in reference to the disastrous and serious results which follow the drinking customs and usages of the country, and when we consider the great poverty and misery which result from the excessive use of liquor, we cannot but conclude that some measure should be adopted for the purpose of relieving the country from these ruinous results, and enabling the people at large to be protected against them. I will not, at present, go into the question as to the character of this misery and all these results, because every hon. member is unfortunately too familiar with them. Our observations in every direction prove, beyond a doubt, that the result of these drinking usages, whatever may be the cause, whether inherent in human nature or in the article itself—whatever may be the immediate cause, the result is

very injurious to the community at large. In sentiment, I am prepared to go as far as the Resolution goes, but, as a matter of practical legislation, I am not prepared to do that far at present.

There are various difficulties, to my mind, in connection with legislation even to the extent to which I allude—the prohibition of spirits. The first objection we have to meet is the compensation to those who are engaged in the manufacture of this article in the country. I think it is only fair and reasonable, that if legislation should take away from the distillers their occupation and business, they should be, to a reasonable extent, compensated for the damages done to them by such legislation. That is the first principle in connection with these matters. I never felt very enthusiastic about the Dunkin or Scott Act, chiefly because there was no compensation provided for those who were especially engaged in legitimate trade, or, at all events, in legalized trade. I think they ought to be reasonably compensated for such loss as they might suffer at the hands of this Parliament.

Now, that is the first obstacle we have to meet—compensation—and yet that would not be a very great matter, because in Canada, at the present day, there are only seven distilleries. Five of those do not amount to much, as to value or production. Two of them—the distillery at Toronto and the distillery at Windsor—are very large concerns, and would represent, at least, I should imagine, two-thirds of the whole value of the seven distilleries. It was represented to me a year or two ago that the Toronto distillery represented half the value of the whole then existing distilleries, there then being in the country not less than twelve. Since that time—from what cause I do not pretend to say directly, or particularly, but I presume it is from the growing capacity of these two large distilleries—the other distilleries are giving up, and now, instead of twelve, there are only seven in existence, and the probabilities are that, in two or three years at most, these seven will be reduced to three or four, if they are still allowed to go on. The whole value of the property included in this question of distillation would, then, as was represented by one of the Inland Revenue officers, only represent about \$5,000,000, and the Toronto distillery would represent about a half of the whole. So the question of compensation would not be so serious a question, involving only—the interest account being taken as the only practical question—an expenditure to the country of about \$100,000 or \$200,000 a year, as the case might be.

There is also the question of revenue, which is probably the most important one, from our standpoint, as legislators, how we are going to meet that diminution of revenue which would actually arise, at the start, at all events, from legislation of this character, the prohibition of the production of spirits. I will give a few figures—not going lengthily into the question of figures—for the purpose of showing what this revenue is and whence it is derived. Taking the year ending the 30th June, 1882, there was brandy imported into this country, 265,608 gallons, entered for consumption, 265,608; the duty paid on that was \$385,115.66. Under the name "cordials," 3,280 gallons were imported; entered for consumption the same amount, duty collected \$6,233.04. Gin imported, 359,874 gallons; the same amount entered for consumption, and the duty on that \$476,831.11. Rum, 118,620 gallons imported; the same entered for consumption, on which a duty was collected of \$157,263.95.

Whiskey imported, 143,281 gallons, and made in Canada 3,552,817 gallons; representing a total of 3,696,098 gallons; on which a duty was collected of \$3,745,343.03. Of other spirits 1,635 gallons were imported and entered for consumption, the duty being \$2,644.52. The total of imported gallons of spirits was 892,298, and made in Canada 3,552,817, making a total entered for consumption of 4,445,115 gallons, on which there was a revenue collected of \$4,773,431.31. In 1883 there were of spirits imported under the same heads 1,044,083 gallons; made in Canada, 3,848,787; total entered for consumption 4,892,870, representing a revenue of \$5,273,854.29. Of malt liquors there were, in 1882, imported, 248,391 gallons; made in Canada, 11,850,425 gallons; total entered for consumption 12,098,816, from which the revenue collected was \$432,175.14. In 1883 there were imported 346,697 gallons; made in the country 12,587,727 gallons; a total of 12,934,424 gallons, on which there was a revenue collected of \$463,876.51. The imported wines in 1882 were 544,967 gallons, from which a revenue was collected of \$405,505.10; and in 1883, 607,113 gallons, with a revenue of \$437,911.37. So it will be seen, by comparison of these figures, that the revenue from malt liquors and wines is so small that it bears very little comparison with the large amount collected from spirits. But there is another feature—the strength of the liquors which are drank. Brandy is represented in this country to possess from 85 to 90 per cent. of alcoholic strength; rum, the same; gin, 80 to 85; whiskey, 75; beer, 8 to 12; sherry, port and Madeira, 18 to 25, if pure, and 25 to 40 as usually imported; Canadian wines, about the same; French wines, light, 15 to 20 per cent. So we see, by a comparison of the brandy, rum, gin and whiskey, with beer and wines; that the large amount of alcoholic strength is in the whiskey, brandy and rum, as compared with the beer and the wine.

Now, the idea is that this country might go so far as to prohibit the liquors possessing this great alcoholic strength, and allow good beer and wine to be sold, as it is now sold by licensed taverns, in the way in which it is done at present, the adulteration of those beers and wines to be prevented, and the people who may drink them to be protected, so that they shall not be adulterated either by the addition of any alcohol beyond the proper strength, or of any other deleterious drug whatever. In reference to this matter, I have a statement taken from the *Week*, a paper published in Toronto, and I think it is the production of Mr. Goldwin Smith; at all events, I know that he entertains the same view in reference to this question. He says:

“The root of the evil in this country is the production of whiskey. Whiskey is the real poison, and if produced will infallibly find its way, by one channel or another, to the lips of the consumer; so that the only consequence of harassing the respectable retail trade will be here, as everybody says it has been in Maine, the multiplication of disreputable and clandestine taverns. If we want to kill the monster and to do a noble thing at the same time, let us sacrifice the Excise, and having paid due compensation to the distillers, whose trade has been not only recognized but made a source of revenue by the State, shut up the distilleries.”

That expresses the idea which I entertain in reference to this matter exactly, and that is the view we should take if the question comes to practical legislation.

I do think that the motion made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) certainly expresses the condition of things existing at the present day; but there is another view to be entertained in this matter, as we know it is the great alcoholic

stre
and
land
havin
vent
think
migh
whet
safely
I
there
on be
matte
wise,
this tr
ficatio
and th
discor
financ
W
expres
momen
simple
thing
would
country
princip
country
of man
the use
the cou
I ha
in order
again, a
question
what ex
MR.
Cardwel
prohibiti
tion, unt
allow an
doctrine
When
House th
legislatio

strength of the liquors I have named which is the cause which produces the vagrancy and violence and the poverty and misery which are so sadly seen over the whole land, and especially in cities. We find this to be the result in most cases of men having ready access to these strong drinks. The way would be, therefore, to prevent their reaching these drinks, and, if we did this by a prohibition of spirits, we think that, at all events, it would be action in the right direction, and, whatever might be the ultimate result, it would enable us to understand more particularly whether the idea of prohibition could be practically carried out successfully and safely in the country.

I would have moved for legislation in that direction this Session, were it not that there is confusion enough now in connection with this matter. A dispute is going on between the Federal Government and the Local Governments in reference to this matter, and until that is settled, I think it would not be judicious, it would not be wise, to introduce another element of discord into the country in connection with this trade. We know that whatever its influence may be, this trade has its ramifications all over the country. It affects almost every class of trade in the country, and therefore it must be dealt with in a prudent manner, so as not to create that discord and that disturbance in general trade which would be injurious to the financial and social standing of the country.

While I am prepared to support the general principle, the general sentiment expressed in the Resolution, and while I am prepared to stand by it, at the present moment I think it is not the demand of the country that prohibition, pure and simple, total prohibition, should be enacted as the law of the country: that something less than that might be adopted by this Parliament, and if so adopted, it would prove, at all events, whether the idea is practicable in its application to this country and in its enforcement. Certainly I think there can be no doubt that the principle of partial prohibition would have a much stronger support throughout the country than the principle of total prohibition, because it would secure the support of many men who drink their beer and their wine, it may be, but who would forego the use of the stronger drinks if they thought it would produce a beneficial result to the country.

I have felt it my duty to throw out these hints in connection with this Resolution, in order that the country may consider them hereafter when the question comes up again, as I suppose it may, of adopting some practical legislation, when it becomes a question of practical politics as to whether we shall have prohibition or not, and to what extent.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria). The amendment of my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), if I understood it rightly, recognizes the principle of total prohibition, while it postpones the period when we are to enact a law in that direction, until public opinion has unmistakably shown that it requires it. Now, I cannot allow an amendment of that kind to pass without entering my protest against the doctrine of total prohibition.

When the Scott Act was before this House, in the year 1878, having a seat in the House then, I ventured, almost alone, to enter a protest against the passing of such legislation. When the Bill got into Committee, I was followed by a high authority, a

gentleman who occupied the Chair which you now occupy, and who, on the floor of the House, used very strong and very forcible words upon this subject, and which expressed much more aptly and eloquently than I can, the objections which I have against the doctrine of total prohibition. The then speaker (Mr. Anglin) used this language:

"I feel it my duty as one of the representatives of the people, to say a few words on this Bill. I protest most solemnly against legislation of this kind. I regard it as the most pernicious and injurious character that can possibly be conceived, and also of the most tyrannical character. It is a declaration that it is the right of the majority of the population of this Dominion to dictate to the minority of the people what they shall eat and what they shall drink, and what opinion they shall profess, or even what they shall wear. Tyranny more gross than this it is impossible for man to conceive; and, therefore, do I most solemnly protest against this Bill and against the principle upon which it is based."

I will not go on to read the rest of the brief but eloquent speech he delivered upon that subject, but he pointed out that where total prohibition had been introduced into the Province of New Brunswick, from which he came, after a trial of a year or two it was found to be such a complete failure that the Legislature was specially convened for the purpose of repealing it, and it has stood repealed there ever since.

My hon. friend who moved this Resolution is, of course, an enthusiast in favor of total prohibition; it is, if I may venture to use the term, his hobby. But, I do not think it would be right to allow a motion of this kind to pass without entering my protest against it. The addition which my hon. friend from Cardwell has made to the Resolution makes it so innoxious that I think nobody will be hurt by its passing. Therefore I do not think it necessary to say much on the question; but I do feel that it is the duty of any one who entertains as strong and decided opinions as I do, against the constitutionality, against the propriety of the doctrine of total prohibition by legislation, not to allow, even this Resolution, so modified, to pass, without expressing that protest, as I do now.

I quite agree with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Beaty), that if we are to have any kind of prohibition, a prohibition of the production and sale of spirituous liquors would, possibly, do some good in the way of producing temperance and preventing intemperance, and that the public interest would be served by an increase in the production and use of malt and malt liquors, and a diminution in that of spirituous liquors. I find that in the State of New York, with a population of about equal to that of the Dominion, the revenue derived from the production of malt and malt liquors, is over \$6,000,000; while our revenue from malt and malt liquors, according to the Inland Revenue returns, has amounted, on the average in the last four years, to only \$411,173. Now, that shows that malt and malt liquors are more generally consumed in the State of New York, with its population of 4,000,000, than they are in the Dominion of Canada. The revenue return from the United States also shows that the use of malt liquors has increased in the eastern States while the use of spirituous liquors has diminished; I think, therefore, that it would be for the interests of Canada to have such legislation as would tend to foster the use of malt rather than spirituous liquors.

But there is another point of view from which it is important, in the interests of

Canada, that this result should be obtained. Malt is the product of Canada; malt is made from barley, that is largely produced, especially in the Province of Ontario. Spirits are made from corn, which is produced in the western States, and imported into Canada. If we can diminish the use of spirits and the use of corn imported from the States for that purpose, we will increase the use of malt, inasmuch as the American market for the manufacture of malt has been, to a great extent, cut off by the recent alteration of the duties in the United States. It is all the more important in the interests of the farming community of Ontario, at all events, that the use of malt and malt liquors in Canada, should be increased; and by any legislation which will have that result, we are directly fostering and benefiting the interests of the farmers, at any rate, of the Province from which I come.

Then, with reference to the passing of the Scott Act, which my hon. friend from Toronto has reference to. I am informed on very good authority, and I think the returns and reports in the possession of the Department of Inland Revenue will confirm the statement, that in the county of Halton, which has come within the operations of the Scott Act, the use of spirits has immensely increased, while the use of malt liquors has proportionately diminished. That naturally results from the fact that malt liquors are bulky and cannot be carried or handled with the same ease as spirituous liquors. I believe, too, that the Scott Act is greatly abused there; that the practice which naturally prevails of allowing the use of spirits on medical certificates, is abused to such a gross extent that members would be almost horrified at reading the report which is in the hands of the Minister of Inland Revenue, from the officers of his Department, showing that the use of spirituous liquors and the sale of spirits by druggists under the guise of medical certificates now actually exceeds the sale of spirits formerly made by the ordinary licensed tavern keepers. If that be the result of the Scott Act, what is the use of desiring its extension? Are the advocates of temperance furthering their cause before the country by pressing on the people an Act, the practical results of which have been to increase the use of spirits, the most dangerous kind of intoxicating liquor, and to diminish the use of beer and ale, which is the least dangerous kind? Are they not doing an injury to the cause of temperance, instead of a benefit, by forcing this kind of legislation on the public?

I do not propose, at this period of the Session and of the evening, to occupy more time in discussing this subject; but I felt it would not be right, entertaining the opinion I do, to record a silent vote either in favor of the Resolution, if it passes without voting, or against it, and that it was my duty, at all events, as one entertaining a deliberate conviction, that this kind of legislation was improper and could not pass, not to allow the present occasion to pass without entering that protest formally, by giving utterance to the opinion I have expressed.

MR. JAMIESON. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to detain the House at any length in discussing this question. I think the advocates of prohibition can very well rest their case on the able speeches delivered by the mover and seconder of the Resolution. However, since the discussion is likely to become somewhat general, I desire to detain the House for a few moments while I attempt to discuss this question. So far as the question of prohibition is concerned, I may say, at the outset, that I am a prohibitionist pure and simple. It seems to me this question will force

itself on the House ere long. It may be true that the country is not just prepared for the measure at the present time; that may be true, or it may not be true. There are, no doubt, differences of opinion in regard to that matter. I think we can judge the sentiments of the country largely from the votes lately cast when the Scott Act was submitted in several of the counties and municipalities throughout the Dominion.

There are many who support general prohibition, who are not in favor of this partial prohibition, which seems to commend itself to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty). For my part, I have not such strong faith in partial prohibition as some hon. members who advocate the Scott Act have. I think, owing to the very great evils of the liquor traffic, widespread as they are throughout the whole Dominion, the only proper remedy to apply will be that of general prohibition.

I grant that this question is surrounded by very many difficulties. I suppose the Finance Minister, if prohibition were enacted at the present time, would find difficulty in the meantime in procuring sufficient revenue with which to carry on the affairs of the country. However, there can be no doubt that the difficulty arising from that source would be only a temporary one. I think the volume of capital now engaged, and the labor employed in connection with the traffic in intoxicating liquors, if turned into other channels, would very shortly bring about a state of things which would ensure to the Finance Minister sufficient revenue, even though he were wholly deprived of the revenue from that traffic.

We are not discussing the provisions of a prohibitory liquor law here to-night; if we were, I should feel it my duty to state my views at some length in regard to the provisions which such an Act should contain. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), says the great difficulty he has to meet in examining this question is that of compensation. Although I do not admit the principle for a moment, that parties engaged in the traffic are entitled to compensation, still I would be prepared, speaking for myself, to admit the principle of compensation were a prohibitory law framed and submitted to the country, in order to put an end to contention and agitation which might arise if compensation were not conceded. So far as distillers are concerned, it might be conceded to give them compensation, and also in a few other cases. But to apply the general principle of compensation in a prohibitory liquor law could not be allowed for a moment. I apprehend there are hon. members in this House who will recollect when an army of draymen furnished water for the supply of Ottawa. At present it is supplied by the corporation through the city water works. All those men have been deprived of their employment, and if the principle of compensation were admitted, the Corporation of Ottawa ought to have compensated all those men whose employment was taken away from them by the construction of those works, which are of such great importance to the city. But, as I have said, I will be quite prepared to concede the principle of compensation if we are able to get rid of the great evils in connection with the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

It has not been contended by any hon. member who has yet spoken, nor do I apprehend it will be contended by any hon. gentleman who may follow me, that the question of the evils of the liquor traffic is debatable. Every person throughout the land concedes at once the great evils flowing from the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and it seems an astounding fact, that while we can legislate for the suppression of

crime, and of almost every imaginable offence, we cannot apply a remedy to this great evil, which is destroying some of the best and noblest in our land, and which is bringing about the destruction of such a vast amount of property. How are we to arrive at the sense of the country on this question? The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has paid a very excellent compliment to this House by saying this is the most temperate Parliament ever assembled at the capital. I think we ought to be flattered by the opinion which the hon. gentleman holds of us, and I believe I can add my testimony to that of the hon. gentleman, because before I came here I was told that if I occupied a seat in Parliament I would come in contact with a great deal of drunkenness. Now, sir, I am prepared to say that in a body of 211 men, chosen indiscriminately from the different constituencies of the Dominion, we have, on the whole, a body of men here who are noted for their sobriety.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

MR. JAMESON. Now, sir, I do not often occupy the time of this House, and I am sure I will have a candid hearing on this occasion. I think we are discussing a very important and very serious question. I refer to the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who paid a compliment to this House, and I say that his amendment was not in accord with the sentiments which he uttered. I hold, that the character of the representatives sent by the different constituents of this Dominion may fairly and reasonably be taken to be a reflex of the public sentiment upon the temperance question throughout the Dominion; and if it be, sir, the truth that the constituencies have sent to this House a body of men who are deserving of the high compliment which the hon. gentleman has paid them, then, I believe the country is prepared for prohibition.

The next question which will arise, in the event of the Resolution carrying as amended by the hon. member Cardwell, is, how are we to ascertain the sentiments of the people of this Dominion on the question. The hon. gentleman referred to the Montreal convention, a body of men representing the temperance sentiment, the prohibition sentiment, of this Dominion, in 1874. I happened to be a member of that convention, and the question was very fully discussed there as to the proper means of taking the sense of the people upon that question. In my judgment, a very proper mode was arrived at, when the convention, by resolution, gave it as their deliverance that the sentiment of the country should be ascertained by a *plebiscite*. Now, if we ever arrive at the sentiments of the country on this question, I think that is the proper mode in which to arrive at it. I never could ascertain why the Government of that day did not accept the proposition of that convention. I was informed afterward by a report of the gentlemen to whom the resolution was entrusted to carry to the Government, that the answer of the First Minister of that day was, that it would be unconstitutional to attempt to take the sense of the people of this Dominion any such manner. I never could understand why it was unconstitutional. I know that in other countries, such as France, the public sentiment of the country on a given question has often been ascertained by a *plebiscite*, and I think this question is of sufficient importance to warrant the Government of this Dominion in ascertaining the sentiment of the public on the question in that way.

Now, sir, we will no doubt, be told that prohibitory legislation has been a failure

in nearly every case in which it has been tried; and we often hear of the Maine liquor law; we often hear that it has not restrained the traffic in intoxicating liquors, but I would ask you, and through you, the members of this House, whether any effort to repeal that law has ever been successful. On the contrary, from time to time, the people of the State of Maine, instead of taking a retrograde step on that question, having taken an advance step, by making the law more perfect and stringent. We have had a great deal of legislation in this country for the purpose of regulating the traffic in intoxicating liquors; but, it seems to me that that traffic refuses to be regulated. I am credibly informed that on the British Statute Book there are over 200 enactments which have been passed with a view of regulating the traffic in intoxicating liquors. But, sir, it has been found there, as has been here, that it refuses to be regulated, and when we find a traffic refusing to be regulated, a traffic above and beyond the restrictions which the law attempts to throw round about it, it is time that traffic should be prohibited. I know, sir, that perhaps my sentiments will not meet with the approbation of all my constituents, but I am speaking my honest convictions upon this question. I am prepared to do justice to those engaged in the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and I trust before this Parliament is at an end, or at least before many years pass by, we will have legislation upon this question, which will put an end at once and forever to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and in order to do so, for my part, I am prepared to allow any reasonable degree of compensation to those engaged in the traffic—not because I believe they are entitled to it, but just for the purpose of putting an end to the traffic. We may educate our children to the best of our ability, but the evils of the traffic are so great that when they get away from us they may be ruined by the evil influences which flow from it.

I will not detain the House longer on this question. I have expressed my opinions upon it, and though they may be, perhaps, distasteful to a number of those who occupy seats in this House, or if not distasteful, at least in opposition to their views, I believe it is the duty of the people's representatives, of men occupying such positions as we occupy, when such an important question comes before the House, to honestly and candidly state their views upon it, in order that the country and Parliament may know where we stand in regard to it.

MR. McCRAANEY. I had no intention of saying a word upon this occasion; nor should I have risen but for the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), in reference to the operation of the Scott Act in the County of Halton, which I represent. However, I may refer somewhat to the remarks made by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beatty). Speaking with reference especially to the revenue obtained from the traffic, he laid a great deal of stress on the fact that we have obtained a large amount of revenue from it; and he went on to show that we were collecting about \$5,000,000 per annum from this traffic. The hon. gentleman did not take into account the loss which the people of this country sustained from the use and abuse of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I have repeatedly taken the trouble to go over this matter carefully, and I have satisfied myself that there is no comparison whatever between the revenue this country obtains from the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and the loss sustained by it,

through the use and abuse of this traffic. I am satisfied in my own mind, that if you take into account the amount of liquor that is imported and the amount that is manufactured and sold at retail prices, the land used for growing grain, hops and other products used in the manufacture of liquors, the capital and labor employed in the wholesale and retail liquor business, the loss of labor that might be employed in other industries, the destruction of property by land and by water, the theft, bad debts, failures, pauperism, destitution, sickness, insanity and death produced through the traffic, you have a sum of money that will outweigh five times—yea, more—all the amount of revenue obtained from this traffic.

And even supposing, sir, that we do receive a large amount of revenue from it; will any amount of revenue compensate us for, or will it justify, a moral wrong or a social suicide to the people of this country? Will any amount of revenue justify the fact that many of the people of this country are destroying themselves by the use of intoxicating liquors? I have no hesitation in saying, sir, that the amount of loss to this country—absolute loss—worse than loss—resulting from this traffic, amounts to \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 per annum. Why, sir, there would be no difficulty in providing for our public works if this traffic were abolished in the country. I am satisfied that there is not a single individual in this House who does not recognize the fact that enough money is lost by the use and abuse of this traffic in the ways I have indicated, to complete all the public works of this country in a very few years.

Now, sir, I come to a statement made by the hon. member for Victoria, Ontario (Mr. Cameron). I am perfectly astonished at the statement made by that hon. gentleman. Where he has obtained his information I certainly cannot tell; but I have no hesitation in saying that he could not have obtained it from those engaged in the traffic in the county of Halton. I state most emphatically that the statement is incorrect—that the hon. gentleman has been misinformed. I state most unhesitatingly—and I am satisfied I can prove what I say on the testimony of the hotel-keepers themselves—that there is not one-tenth, or one-fifth at most, of the amount of liquor sold in the county of Halton to-day, that there was before the adoption of the Scott Act. The Scott Act is as well administered in that county as any other Act in force there. We all know that in a small county like Halton there are difficulties in the way of enforcing it strictly; we know that individuals are able, to some extent, to obtain liquor. But, sir, the statement that there is as much liquor sold as before the passage of the Act is entirely incorrect; and if the hon. gentleman obtained his information from the Inland Revenue officer, it is something new to me. I asked, in this House, last Session, for a return, showing the number of certificates that had been given by physicians, in the county of Halton, to enable persons to obtain liquor, and very few were returned.

MR. CAMERON (Victoria). I did not state—I wish to correct my hon. friend—that I obtained the information myself from the Department of Inland Revenue; but my information was communicated to me by a party who had himself seen and heard the reports of the officer of Inland Revenue, in the possession of that Department, and I am perfectly willing that the correctness of my statement should be decided by reference to the reports of the Inland Revenue officer, sent into the

Department in the last week or ten days. Those reports, I have no doubt, will confirm my statement that the consumption of spirits in the county of Halton has not diminished under the operation of the Scott Act, but that more liquor is sold on medical certificates than was previously sold by the licensed victualers.

MR. McCRANEY. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would refer him to a meeting of the Dominion Alliance that has just taken place in Toronto, where a gentleman from the county of Halton spoke as follows:—

"Rev. J. M. Cameron said that drinking in Halton had greatly diminished since the Act had come in force. I required a peculiar knock and a special introduction to get a drink. It was a rare thing to see a drunken man in the streets of Milton. The honest farmers got home earlier after selling their grain, while they formerly used to spend their money in treating, which was a prolific source of drunkenness. If the Scott Act was ever voted on again in that county, its opponents would get such a Waterloo that they would never make another attempt to upset it. There was a great improvement in the feeling in favor of the Act. He hoped that it would be carried in the adjoining County of Peel. Their base was safe as it was on the shores of the pure waters of Lake Ontario." (Applause.)

The statement made by this gentleman I can myself verify. Only a few days ago I met a gentleman who has, perhaps, the largest interests in the County of Halton, and who was recently a License Commissioner. He is not a temperance man, and I put the question to him, "What do you think—is the Scott Act working well in Halton? Has it diminished the use of intoxicating liquors?" He stated that it had. I asked him, "to what extent do you think it has?" He said: "I am satisfied there is not one-fifth of the quantity of liquor sold in the County of Halton to-day that there was under license." I asked him how much he thought had been sold before the Scott Act came into force. He said he thought in the neighborhood of \$100,000 worth of liquor had been sold per annum, as there were a large number of hotels—some forty-two; but that his candid opinion was that \$20,000 would safely cover all that was now sold under the Scott Act. As for liquor being sold by the hotel-keepers, I have no hesitation in saying that there is very little sold. In fact, so well is the Act respected at the present time, that the hotel-keepers, I am informed, within the last few days, have put up over their hotel doors notices that positively no liquor could be obtained there. I have also the opinion of a gentleman who came from the County of Halton to-day. He stated that the Act was working well, and that when the time came for the re-passage or repeal of the Act, he had no doubt whatever that the Act would be re-passed, as the people were becoming more satisfied with it, and it was working much better than at the commencement. Our people are law-abiding citizens, and I have no doubt whatever that if a prohibitory law were passed by this Parliament, and one or two years given those engaged in the traffic to get out of the business, the law would be respected and properly carried out. I will not occupy the time of the House further on this question, but will conclude by saying that I have always been in favor of total prohibition, and am prepared to support any measure which has for its object the prohibition of the liquor traffic; and I would like very much to see a division of the House taken on the question, so that we might see how we stand with regard to it.

MR. FOSTER. I shall not take up the time of the House any longer than I can possibly help, but, at the same time, I must make the same remark that I made

a fortnight or three weeks ago in speaking on this subject, namely, that I shall not consider it my duty to shorten my remarks too much. I shall try to do the very best I can in this respect, but I do not consider it consistent with the duty I owe this cause and its friends to omit anything I may consider it desirable to urge in supporting the resolution. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), has stated that he could not allow this to pass without making a protest against the principle to which it would pledge the House. He stated that he took occasion to protest against this principle in 1878, when the Canada Temperance Act was before the House, and that he also took occasion, as I know he did from personal knowledge, to protest against the restrictive parts of the Dominion License Act of 1883. All I have to say with reference to that is, that the hon. gentleman's protest is no more efficacious with regard to this resolution than it was with regard to the Canada Temperance Act and the Dominion License Act of 1883, we have a fair chance of carrying this resolution in the House. The hon. gentleman read an extract from *Hansard*, from a speech delivered in 1878, I think, by a former Speaker of Parliament, and he gave as I understand, his adherence to certain statements that were made by that gentleman. Amongst others was this: that the principle of a prohibitory law was most tyrannical, and that it allowed the majority to dictate as to what people are to think, eat and wear. I must deny most emphatically that a prohibitory law makes any such provision; it does not state what a man shall think or what he shall not think, what he shall eat or what he shall not eat, what he shall wear or shall not wear. A prohibitory law has simply to do with the production and sale of intoxicating liquor, and, as such, is as far removed from that kind of law as we can possibly conceive. I have also to set the hon. gentleman right with reference to the New Brunswick law. He stated, as an argument why prohibition was a failure, that New Brunswick passed a prohibitory law in 1855, and, after it had been on the Statute Book two or three years, it was repealed. As a matter of fact, it came into force in January, 1855, and was repealed in June the same year, so that it practically never went into force, and there can be no argument made with reference to its effects. He protested also against the constitutionality of prohibition, and was kind enough to refer to me as an enthusiast in this matter, and the rider of a hobby.

Now, it somewhat amused me to hear a legal gentleman, in one breath accuse me of being an enthusiast and a rider of a hobby, and then stating in an assembly composed largely of legal men, that he has a very strong opinion against the constitutionality of prohibition. What does he mean by that? That surely can only be determined by a legal tribunal; and is it not within the knowledge of every hon. gentleman here, that the constitutionality of prohibition has been affirmed, over and over again, by all the legal tribunals, great and small, in all Anglo Saxon countries? And when an honorable gentleman, a lawyer, gets up in this House and protests against prohibition as being unconstitutional, he has to protest against the legal decisions of every court, from the Privy Council of Great Britain down to the smaller courts of the British Colonies and in the States of the United States. He stated also that it would be a bad thing for the barley growers, if the brewing interest was destroyed. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman and other hon. members of this House, that wherever the Scott Act has been introduced and voted, that in the forty counties in

this Dominion in which it has been introduced and voted upon, its main support has come from the rural districts, from the farmers themselves. It is not in the rural districts that such a law is unpopular, but it is rather in the cities, towns and villages in the populated centres, that the vote goes against it. Take, for example, the vote recently given in Oxford County; it was in Woodstock town, where the vote was largely against it; but every rural district in that county gave its adherence, in large majorities, to the principle of prohibition, as therein embodied. The hon. gentleman has spoken with reference to the failure of the Scott Act in the County of Halton. but that statement has been very well refuted and met by the counter testimony given by the representative of the County of Halton, from his place in Parliament. I will, however, just call the attention of Parliament to the grounds the hon. gentleman has taken to prove that the Scott Act has been a failure in the County of Halton. How does he attempt to prove it? He states that in the Inland Revenue Report there is proof that will convince any person that more liquor is now sold in that county, under medical certificates, by the druggists, than was formerly sold by the licensed victuallers. Has the hon. gentleman read the pages of the Inland Revenue Report? Can he find out from the pages of any report the amount of intoxicating liquors sold in any county of any Province in this Dominion? It is impossible that such figures can occur or be found in the report in the possession of any Department of this Government. What is the whole ground upon which he bases the failure of the Scott Act? Because medical certificates have been abused, is that the fault of the Scott Act? Not at all; it is the fault of some medical practitioners who, I am sorry to say, have not that feeling of honor which generally characterizes the medical profession, and who are willing to abuse the privileges of their profession for a small consideration or for no consideration. The proper way to cure this abuse is not by getting rid of the Act, but by getting rid of the practices which are done in defiance of the spirit of the Act. I am not at all opposed to either the remarks or the spirit of the remarks which were made by the hon. gentleman from Cardwell. I agree in the main with what he has stated in the Resolution. I did not object to it, and would not have voted against that which was added to the Resolution.

So much, sir, with reference to what has been stated; and now, if the House will allow me just a few moments, I will make a few remarks with reference to the right, the necessity, and the efficiency of prohibition, and then leave the matter for this House to decide upon. While I had the honor of addressing some remarks to this House in the beginning of this debate, touching especially the great importance of this subject, touching the scientific aspect of it, and touching the economic aspects of this question, I believe there were very few gentlemen on either side of this House who were disposed to question what I then stated. The whole practical question comes down to a point of difference between gentlemen who are present, when we come to choose the method for getting rid of the great evils which admittedly flow from this traffic. The question is for us to decide as to whether prohibition is necessary, whether it is right, and whether it has been or can be proved to be effective. This, I say, is the great question.

Now, then, I think the necessity of prohibition is very well proved from two or three considerations, which I will give in very brief space. The first is this, sir:

The
sol
mir
dis
not
qui
ing
obs
cial
seen
befo
ting
ture
in th
thes
the
wha
£84
ily p
and
1831
riser
in 18
show
stric
teach
absol
toxic
when
ting
drinki
and
be in
same
think
talki
sion
const
creas
is not
atten
agitat
I say
atten
inish

That all preceding legislation has failed to diminish the scope of the evils which result from the traffic, and has failed to minimize those evils, as they should have been minimized. And we must take another thing into consideration when we come to discuss that part of the question; we must take into consideration this fact, that not only has law been doing its work for the last fifty or the last twenty-five years quite effectively, but alongside of law there has been also a very strong and increasing force of education and of the spread of information. It will be patent to the observation, and known to all members present, that the last twenty-five years especially, in Great Britain, in the United States, and in the Dominion of Canada, have seen a very great and a very increasing revival in the means for bringing this question before the people in mass, for educating them with reference to the effect of intoxicating liquors, for putting temperance instruction into the books, the paper, the literature and the schools of the country; and the law that has been on the Statute Book in these countries for the last twenty-five years has been most efficiently aided by these moral means amongst the people, which have been working in connection with the law. Take that into consideration, and yet come to the test by results, and what do we find? In Great Britain we find that in 1860 the liquor bill was £84,000,000; in 1882 it had risen to £128,000,000. We find that the cases summarily proceeded against for drunkenness in England and Wales in 1860 were 78,000, and the cases proceeded against in like manner in 1879 were 178,000. We find that in 1831 the liquor bill *per capita* of the people of Great Britain was £2 15s.; in 1875 it had risen to £3 5s. In 1831 the absolute consumption of alcohol was sixteen pints per head; in 1879 it had risen to seventeen pints per head. What do these results show? They show that, along with all the restrictive license legislation, which has been growing in strictness for the last twenty-five years, aided by all the methods of information and teaching that philanthropy and religious fervor could bring about, there has been an absolute increase in the consumption, the cost and the evil results which flow from intoxicating liquors. When we come to ask the reason why, the answer is apparent, when we find that in Great Britain to-day there are 190,000 persons who sell intoxicating liquors from January until December, keeping open places where facilities for drinking and where inducements and temptations are openly put before the people, and as long as this takes place, just so long will the law and the moral suasion itself be insufficient to bring about the good results that all good citizens ask for. The very same thing may be stated with reference to the United States of America, and I think the same thing can very well be stated of this Dominion of Canada, that, taking into consideration all this revival of temperance interest, and all this diffusion of education and of moral effort, we find that, in the Dominion of Canada, the consumption of spirits keeps about the same, that the consumption of beer is increasing, and that the criminality which comes from the traffic in intoxicating liquors is not decreasing to any appreciable degree, and forms a subject which is challenging attention, and is one of the most important factors in producing the deep and wide agitation which at present is going on in this country for relief from those evils. So I say, the necessity for a prohibitory law is shown by the failure of preceding attempts at legislation to minimize the evils which result from this traffic, or to diminish the scope of that traffic sufficiently to meet the wants and the wishes of the people.

But, sir, we can show that prohibition is necessary, as a result from experience in the trial of law. I wish simply to call the attention of this House to one fact, that is, that the principle of prohibition has already been admitted, has already been embodied, has already been acted upon. Take up any license law you have upon the Statute Book of any country, and what do you find the chief and saving element in that license law? It is the amount of prohibition that you have infused into the law. You say by your license laws that liquor shall not be sold on Sundays; that is an application of the principle of prohibition. You say it shall not be sold after seven o'clock on a Saturday night; that, too, is an application of the principle of prohibition. You say it shall not be sold to minors; that is another application of the principle of prohibition. So, when you come to find out the grip and grasp of your license law, is in the amount of prohibition you have infused into it, it is in direct proportion to the extent to which you have applied that principle. Now, the people of this broad country have come to the conclusion that these laws are effective, only as they contain this application of the principle of prohibition, and that they have hitherto not done what the country desires to have done. The country's will is, that this shall be made stricter and stricter; that is, that more of the prohibitive element should be imported into the laws, and I make bold to stand up and declare from my place in Parliament, that this free people in the Dominion of Canada will not cease their agitation, and will not be satisfied until the largest application of the principle of prohibition has been made to a traffic which they know is an enemy to the best interests, material, moral, and social, of the people. I say the tendency of the people, the drift of legislation, which comes from the call and demands of the people, is in the line of a complete and total prohibition of the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

More than that, sir; I wish to point out just a simple fact, which shows how this tendency is making itself felt. Why, I remember when, not long ago, a county by the name of Lennox, not very far from this city of Ottawa, made a turn round with reference to its political complexion, and by a slight majority elected a gentleman who at present sits in this House, that one half of the press of the country heralded it forth that a great change was taking place in the political aspect of the country, and that the change was indicated by this reversal of the vote. I remember also, when the county of York, in my native Province, by a very significant vote, turned round on its former party allegiance, so to speak, and elected my hon. friend who now represents it here by a large majority, it was heralded throughout the country by the other half of the press of the country, as indicating a very significant change.

Let me call the attention of the hon. gentlemen of both parties to other indications of a very significant change. Since the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, has been before the country, it has been submitted in forty counties and cities of this Dominion, and it has been carried in thirty-three of them. It has been lost by a majority of six, while in St. John, the commercial metropolis of my own Province, the vote resulted in a tie and the Act was lost. When I count up the votes upon that Act I find that there were cast in favor of it 45,080, and against it there were 23,606 votes, or as nearly as possible of two to one in favor of the principle of prohibition. Will the hon. gentleman say that that does not sufficiently indicate the temper

of the people of this country, that it does not afford a good ground for us, from our place in Parliament, to say that the principle of prohibition has a strong and entrenched hold in the hearts of the people, and that we are not going beyond what the indications have already given us a right to go.

So much with reference to the necessity of prohibition. A word now with reference to the right of prohibition, as that has been called in question. As I said a moment ago, the legal right to enact and carry out a prohibitory law has been confirmed by the highest judicial authorities and courts in all Anglo-Saxon countries. I think, sir, it is right, and I think so from one or two considerations. Some have stated that this is a sumptuary law, which enacts that you shall not say so and so, that you shall not eat such and such, that you shall not wear such and such clothing. Sir, the principle of prohibition, as applied to the liquor traffic, does no such thing. It simply deals with the public act of the manufacture, importation and sale, an act which is done for the good or to the detriment of the country, and if the country feels that it is done to its detriment, by all the sacred interests which that country guards, and by all the indefeasible rights which inure to every civilized Government, it is not only the right, but it is the duty of that country to have that taken away which is against its best interest. There is the whole question. Is it better for the country it should exist? Then keep it. Is it better for the country it should not exist? Then do not put public patronage and public sanction beneath it, to uphold it by the sacred force of public law.

Now others say this is class legislation. My opinion is that every kind of legislation you make is, to a certain extent, class legislation. The only thing we have to consider is to what class the legislation applies. If it is for the good of the greatest number, then the interests, financial or social, of the smaller number have to go down before it. That is the question we have to look at. Sir, let us look at the present state of legislation. We legislate to keep the distillery, to keep up the brewery, to keep up the liquor shops in our country, who employ altogether some 11,000 or 12,000 persons. Now, there is another class in this country, and that is the 4,400,000 and over, who do not make and sell liquor. The legislation we have at present is in favor of the 11,000, but it is against the best interest of the 4,400,000. By the legislation I propose, the good of the greater number is sought, and if it is admitted that the good of the greater number ought to prevail, then the interest of the smaller number must go down. The supreme object of law and the end for which law ought to exist, it seems to me, is simply that the greatest good ought to be secured to the greatest number.

Sir, it is said that it is in violation of personal liberty. I, myself, am just as strong an upholder of the principles of personal liberty as any man can well be, but I know that it is apt sometimes to take the form of license, and what we denominate by the sacred name of liberty may become an infringement upon the rights of others who wish to exercise their personal liberty. There is a sphere in which personal liberty is sacred and ought to be kept inviolable. When it travels out of that sphere and infringes in speech or action upon the rights, the happiness, the pursuits, the prosperity of others, then it has to be hedged around, restrained and circumscribed by what is for the good of others as well. So personal liberty has its sphere thus

restricted, and within that sphere it ought to be kept inviolable. Sir, do we not infringe upon what some people call personal liberty in our other legislation? There is, for instance, a law upon our Statute Book which states that I shall not purchase a revolver, fill it with cartridges and carry it about the street on my person; if I do so, I am liable to punishment. Now, why is that? Because it is feared that in a moment of provocation or quick excitement, I, having that deadly arm in my possession might use it to the detriment of a fellow creature. The temptation may occur and I may yield to it, and harm would result. But there the law comes down, and public sentiment upholds it, and says, that in the general interest, I should be deprived of what I might consider my personal right. So it is with reference to quarantine, so it is with reference to a thousand other things that I might mention. Wherever they infringe upon public rights and interests, the public cries a halt, and asks that they should be exercised, only in so far as they are not detrimental to the greatest good of the greatest number.

Well, sir, I think, then, without speaking further on this point, that it is competent to a country, by virtue of that preventive power which it possesses, to shield itself from enemies, within or without, by virtue of that protective power which every people has to look after and develop its best interests. We should carefully take away that which hinders their development. From all these considerations, it seems to me perfectly within the right of a people to prohibit a public act which a majority of them consider to be detrimental; therefore, on those grounds the people may prohibit the sale, or the manufacture of strong drink which produces an infirmity or mischief, counterbalanced by an infinitesimal portion of good.

I think hon. gentlemen are sometimes very unreasonable in applying canons to test a prohibitory law which they would not dream of applying to any other law upon the Statute Book. A prohibitory law is but the creation of the people's voice, fallible as all other laws are. Now, sir, do we expect a law to be carried out unless it has a fair chance for its enforcement? Do we expect, in the first place, that law should do more than to minimize the evil against which it is directed? Men cite prohibitory countries and say that notwithstanding the law, people can drink and people can sell, and they quote that as an indubitable proof that the law has been a failure. Sir, that is not a fair test for a law. No law proposes to do more than minimize the evils against which it is directed, and if we are reasonable, as I trust we are we shall not ask that a prohibitory law shall utterly annihilate the evil against which it is directed, any more than we should ask that any other law should utterly annihilate the evil against which it is aimed. We have laws upon the Statute Book, but we have violations of those laws in every community. The test to be applied is, does the law minimize the evil and keep it down? If so, it is useful and ought to be maintained. So much, then, with respect to the test of law. Recollect that it is not to entirely annihilate the evil but to minimize it, to bring it within the smallest possible compass, that we may maintain such laws as advisable; and if you find such laws minimize the evil, they are a success and not a failure. I hope that the same reasonable and fair test may be given to prohibitory laws as is granted by common consent to every other law on the Statute Book.

With respect to the effectiveness of prohibitory laws, I do not propose to enter a

any length into that argument. I merely wish to state that in Great Britain prohibitory laws have existed a considerable length of time, and that the testimony to their good and advantage is unvarying and unimpeachable. There are to-day in the ecclesiastical Province of Canterbury 1,500 parishes, in which there is no dram shop bar room or tavern where intoxicating liquors are sold, and a population of more than 250,000 is living in those parishes. The committee of the House of Convocation made a very careful investigation into these parishes, and reported that the results were such as temperance people were led to expect. There are in the British Isles more than 100 estates, covering large areas of country, in which by the will of the landlords themselves, no intoxicating liquor is sold, and the testimony is unvarying as to the good effect which comes from that restriction and prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors. Sir, the principle of prohibition has been admitted by the British Parliament on several occasions. In 1854 the principle of prohibition was applied to the Kingdom of Scotland for one-seventh of the time and kept in force since then. In 1878 it was applied to the Kingdom of Ireland; and I notice a very significant fact which has occurred within the last few weeks; that whereas, when that law for Sunday closing in Ireland was introduced and passed the first time, it was as a private measure and excluded five of the principal cities and towns in Ireland. Within the last four weeks the British Government have introduced that measure in their own, and extended its promises to the formerly exempted cities and towns. I ask no better proof than that practical test which has been given in Ireland, and the practical results which have followed, that the British Government, after carefully investigating the matter, are so informed and so sure as to the good effects of it, that they have, of their own motion, made the law their own and extended its provisions to the five exempted towns. I will not call the attention of the House to the prohibitory laws which have been passed and are in force in the United States, and with great success.

I will not call the attention of the House at any length to the prohibitory laws passed in this Dominion, which have also had their success. I wish merely to refer to one law, and to quote an authority not unknown to this House with respect to its beneficial effect. In 1875 the Parliament of this country passed a prohibitory law, prohibiting the importation, manufacture and possession of intoxicating liquors in the North-West Territory. That has been kept on the Statute Book ever since, and only this year a very eminent authority, one whom this House will be glad to recognize, Sir Charles Tupper, made the following statement from his place in Parliament:

"It will hardly be necessary for me to allude to the fact, that under an Act which I had the honor of submitting to Parliament when Minister of Customs, in 1873, the Inland Revenue has not much to do, I am happy to say, in the North-West Territories, because, under that Act, we established what is called a Maine Liquor Law throughout the North-West Territories, which prevents the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors in any part of those Territories. The result of that enactment has abundantly justified it. It was with no small degree of satisfaction that I found, when it was proposed to take a section of the North-West Territory within the bounds of old Manitoba, that the people arose *en masse* against it, and protested against being carried into the Province of Manitoba on any other terms than that they could maintain the exclusion of intoxicating liquors, which they then enjoyed

in the North-West, and retain that provision when they became part of the Province of Manitoba."

That is the testimony of the Minister of Railways and Canals, a conclusion at which he arrived, after an intimate knowledge of the operation of the Act in the North-West Territory, for seven or eight years.

I offer no further remarks, to-night, Mr. Speaker. I leave the Resolutions, and the principle which is contained therein to the arbitrament of this House, feeling satisfied that if it will pass these Resolutions in the shape in which they are, it will not only have given an expression of opinion, which will have its effect on a traffic always aggressive and always destructive, but it will also hold out a silver token of hope and inspiration to thousands and hundreds of thousands of people who are earnestly and honestly working in this country to suppress a traffic which has brought about a multitude of evils, with no compensating advantages.

MR. KIRK. I did not intend to say a word on this question, nor do I intend to say much now. We always listen with admiration to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster). On this occasion I have listened to him with a good deal of pain and with a good deal of surprise. I could not understand why he wasted so much eloquence in arguing the question of prohibition when he eliminated, or allowed to be eliminated from his prohibitory Resolutions, anything which was prohibitory in them. I regret that when the amendment, moved by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), was before the House, and was carried by the unanimous vote of the House, I did not object to it. I was looking to the hon. member for King's to rise and divide the House on it. I regret he did not do so. When he accepted that amendment, he spoiled his Resolutions—there is nothing now left. The Resolutions as now drawn are simply the Resolutions passed by this House in 1875. Has not prohibition sentiment advanced in this country? I think it has. In 1878 this fact was proved, for the Scott Act, which is a prohibitory measure, was passed. It was thought by the temperance people, and I thought so, that it was the intention of the temperance men in this House to press in Parliament this Session the square issue of prohibition; but from these Resolutions, prohibition is altogether eliminated. The Resolutions before Parliament, to-day, are simply milk and water Resolutions, with very little milk in them.

Now, sir, the hon. gentleman says that the people call him enthusiastic. Well, I am not surprised at that, when they hear him talk; but when the point comes when action is required, he seems to have very little backbone. I regret this very much, from the fact, that I, as a temperance man, looked upon him as my leader. I am sorry I did not as a temperance man, and as a prohibitionist, object and demand the views of this House when the amendment was introduced. So far as the Resolution is now concerned, I, for one care very little about it. We are no further advanced in regard to it than we were in 1875, and I think the temperance people of the country will feel in the same way with regard to it that I do. Now I have nothing more to say with regard to this question, except to repeat that I regret very much that our leader on the temperance question in this House has thought proper to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell.

MR. FOSTER. Allow me to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

MR. FOSTER. I think I have a right to make a personal explanation, when such a grave charge has been made against me. If I have not, I will move the adjournment of the House. The hon. gentleman gets up in his place, after the time for action on his part has entirely passed, and he speaks professedly—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Is that an explanation?

MR. FOSTER. He makes this grave charge.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to make a personal explanation.

MR. FOSTER. I was just coming to that.

MR. SPEAKER. You must confine yourself to a personal explanation.

MR. FOSTER. I have been accused of giving my assent to an amendment tacked on to my Resolution which entirely takes the sting out of it, and with not having taken a division on that amendment. I wish to read the Resolution and the amendment, if I may be allowed to do so. The Resolution is:

"That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

The amendment which now makes part of the motion is as follows:

"And this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will sufficiently sustain stringent measures, to promote such legislation so far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

I asked for the principle to be sustained in the House. The House, so far as this goes, has sustained the principle and gone one better by adopting the amendment of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White.)

MR. SCRIVER. I crave permission to say a few words on this subject, though I am just as desirous, as I see most of my fellow members are, to have this long debate brought to a close. As one of the temperance men of the House, I was consulted with reference to the propriety of introducing this Resolution at this particular period. I was opposed to it, because I thought it was not a logical outcome of the conclusion come to by the Dominion Alliance, when they met here some time ago. The Dominion Alliance resolved, in the earlier stages of their session here, that a general attempt should be made to introduce and pass the Scott Act in all counties of the Dominion. After that, at the very close of the meeting of the Alliance, a discussion was raised on the propriety of introducing this Resolution into Parliament. It seemed to me it would not be advisable to do so, as it would be a contradiction of the action previously taken by the Alliance; and when a meeting of those interested in the cause of temperance was called here some time ago, I expressed my sentiments to that effect. However, I said if a Resolution was introduced contrary to my views, I should feel bound, as an advocate of prohibition, to vote for it; but I certainly did not suppose then, from the discussion which took place and from the remarks which fell from the hon. member from King's county (Mr. Foster) himself, that he would consent to such an amendment being attached to the Resolution as that proposed by the hon. member for Cardwell. I said to the hon. gentleman and to my friends who

were assembled, at that time, that I thought the objection to such a resolution as this was, would be raised at once, that it was simply an abstract Resolution, and unless it was proposed to follow it up by legislation immediately, it would amount to nothing. The reply made by the hon. gentleman to me was, that it was his intention to follow it up by legislation, and yet he has consented now to the introduction of an amendment which proposes to postpone legislation to some indefinite period, to some period when the public sentiment of this Dominion—to be ascertained in what way I know not—shall be ascertained to be such as will warrant the introduction of such legislation. It may be asked of me, why then did you not oppose the carrying of the amendment. I did so; I believe I was almost the only one who cried out "lost" when you put the amendment. I must say that no one in this House was so surprised as I was, that no voice but my own was raised against the passage of that amendment. I regret very much that the amendment was introduced, and that it was allowed to pass the way it was, for I feel, with the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), that the temperance men are placed by it in a very unsatisfactory position.

MR. ROBERTSON, (Shelbourne.) I move in amendment to the amendment that the following words be added:—

And that this House is of opinion that the public sentiment of the people of Canada calls for immediate legislation to that end.

MR. BOWELL. Is the amendment in order?

Can an amendment to the amendment be put to the House, after the amendment is carried?

An Hon. MEMBER. Yes.

MR. BOWELL. I was asking the speaker, not the hon. gentleman. I have been under the impression that after moving an amendment to a motion it was within the province of other members to move an amendment to the amendment; but can an amendment to the amendment be moved after the amendment is carried, and when it is not before the House.

MR. SPEAKER. It is now an amendment to the main motion as amended, and words may be added which are not contradictory to those adopted by the House.

MR. DESJARDINS. Are not these words contradictory?

MR. SPEAKER. I do not think so.

MR. FOSTER. I do not think, with all due deference to yourself, that these words are contradictory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

MR. SPEAKER. I said I do not think they are contradictory.

Amendments negatived on the following division:—

Yeas.

Messieurs,

Allen,	Foster,	McMullen,
Allison (Hants.)	Gilmor,	Patterson (Brant.)
Allison (Lennox.)	Harley,	Platt,
Auger,	Hilliard,	Ray,
Bain (Wentworth.)	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne.)
Bourassa,	Innes,	Ross,
Burpee (Sunbury.)	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron.)	Jackson,	Smyth,
Cameron (Middlesex.)	Jamieson,	Somerville (Brant.)
Campbell (Renfrew.)	King,	Somerville (Bruce.)
Cimon,	Kinney,	Springer,
Cockburn,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford.)
Colby,	Landry (Kent.)	Thompson,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Vail,

Fairbank,
Fisher,
Fleming,
Forbes,

Macdonald (King's),
McCraney,
McIntyre,
McIsaac,

Vanasse,
Watson,
Wheler,
Wilson,
Wright,

—55

Nays.

Messieurs,

Amyot,
Armstrong,
Bain (Sonlanges),
Baker (Missisquoi),
Baker (Victoria),
Beaty,
Bichard,
Bell,
Belleau,
Benoit,
Benson,
Bergeron,
Bernier,
Billy,
Blondeau,
Bolduc,
Bossé,
Bowell,
Brecken,
Byson,
Bumham,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Cameron (Victoria),
Campbell (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Cartwright,
Casgrain,
Chapleau,
Cochrane,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Cotruoi,
Curran,
Cuthbert,

Daly,
Davies,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Dickinson,
Dodd,
Dundas,
Dupont,
Farrow,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),
Gagné,
Gault,
Geoffrion,
Gigault,
Girouard,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Guilbault,
Guillet,
Gunn,
Hackett,
Hay,
Hesson,
Hickey,
Homer,
Houde,
Haiteau,
Kaulback,
Kilvert,
Kranz,
Lahderkin,
Landry (Montmagny),
Langevin,
Lesage,
McDonald (Cape Breton),
Mackintosh,

MacMillan (Middlesex),
MacMillan (Vaudreuil),
McCallum,
McDougald,
McLenan,
McNeil,
Massue,
Mills,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Orton,
Paint,
Pinsonneault,
Reid,
Renfret,
Kiopel,
Robertson (Hastings),
Shakespeare,
Small,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Tassé,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tilley,
Trow,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace (Albert),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
Wigle,
Williams,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),

—107

MR. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse) in the seat from which he gave his vote.

MR. VANASSE (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the fact is that I have taken the seat of my hon. colleague, Mr. Homer, which is at a distance of six inches from mine.

MR. SPEAKER That is not removing from his seat.

On the main motion, as amended, being put,

SIR LEONARD TILLEY. I desire sir, to have the attention of the House just for a few minutes. Never since I have entered public life have I voted, nor do I intend to vote, against the principle of prohibition. As early as 1855, I introduced into the Legislature of my own Province one of the most stringent prohibitory Bills

that was ever proposed in any Legislature or Parliament in the world. Previous to the introduction of that Bill, we had, as we thought, educated the people of New Brunswick to the point that such a law, if enacted, would be supported and sustained by the people. Reference was made by the hon. mover of this Resolution to the number of petitions presented to the House of Commons in 1877; and if my memory serves me, in the Province of New Brunswick, as far back as 1855, we had more signatures to petitions presented to the Legislature of that Province in favor of prohibition than were signed to the petitions presented to this House from the whole Dominion in 1877. They were brought into the House in the size of rolls of carpet by the hon. members who presented them.

We thought that we had educated the people of that Province up to such a point that if a prohibitory law was passed it would be enforced. We had three-fourths of the people of that Province signing petitions in favor of prohibition. That law was passed by the Lower House, by something like two-thirds majority, and it passed the Upper House by nearly the same majority; and it was passed because of the strong arguments and facts presented, and because of the statistics we had collected as to the effect of the traffic in New Brunswick from 1852 to 1855, and which were so convincing that men who differed from us in opinion gave us their support, and enabled us to carry the measure by the majority stated.

That law went in force on the 1st of January, 1856. I was contrasting the position I occupied at that time with the position occupied by the mover and seconder of this Resolution. Before that law went in force, it was burned in effigy in many parts of the Province of New Brunswick. On the night of the day—on which it came into force, I had the doors of my house broken down by a battering ram, and I did not know but that my life would be taken. I had threatening letters, with death's heads and cross-bones, sent to me; but we carried that law in New Brunswick, and I am satisfied that if such a law was in force to-day, it would be a great blessing to that Province. For six weeks that law was enforced. The saloons and dram shops of that Province were almost entirely closed. Many gentlemen had laid in their stocks beforehand, and had as much liquor as they required; but the drinking saloons were closed, and the result was apparent to every person, even to those who were most prejudiced against the principle of prohibition.

But what took place? Some few individuals had the temerity to violate the law. They were taken before the magistrates for trial. The magistrates, though well informed men, were not legal gentlemen and were not well up in legal proceedings. They tried the cases and gave their verdicts according to the evidence. Appeals were taken, however, until I might say hundreds of cases were before the Judges on appeal; and through some informality in the proceedings of the magistrates, the cases were dismissed and the magistrates mulcted in costs amounting in many cases from \$200 to \$500. These magistrates were honest men, who were discharging their duties to the best of their abilities, and in some cases have assisted to pay the expenses to which they were subjected. This went on until the magistrates became so alarmed that they objected to undertaking them. The result was that the Lieutenant-Governor—who was hostile to the Bill—brought the subject to the attention of the Government, and suggested the desirability of having a new election, in order to test public opinion with reference to this law, which had been in operation only about four months, the Council objected to this course.

This question, although it was not the sole issue of the elections of 1854, was discussed on nearly every hustings and many members were elected upon it. At this time some of the friends of the measure were themselves disheartened on account of the expenses incurred in the courts, and because of the increasing number of the violators of the law, who, there was reason to fear would not be brought to trial. The Governor insisted upon a dissolution of Parliament. The Government resigned because they would not accept the responsibility of this act. They demanded that the law should have a twelve months' trial, at all events; and declared that if then it was found to be a failure, we should be prepared either to amend the law or to ask for its repeal. We were thrown into an election, and very many of those who had signed

the petition went back on us; they voted against this law, and a majority was returned to vote in favor of its repeal.

Under these circumstances, and believing as I do now, that if public sentiment is not sufficiently educated to sustain a prohibition law, the passage would do harm instead of good. Instead of abandoning anything by accepting the original Resolution, even as amended, I hold that if this motion be carried the cause of prohibition will have made a great step in advance.

MR. KIRK. We had the same thing in 1875.

SIR LEONARD TILLEY. I am not quite sure but that some hon. gentleman who voted against this proposition to-day did not then vote for the proposition moved by Mr. Ross. That, however, does not matter at present. I believe in prohibition; I believe it will yet come in Canada; but I believe it would be the greatest injury to the permanent success of prohibition were there such a law enacted to-day, because I know, from the experience of the past, that it could not be successfully carried out. I have the courage of my convictions and am prepared to vote for the principle of prohibition, but I have also the courage of my convictions when I say that the country is not yet sufficiently educated to enable that principle to be successfully carried into operation. What did we find in New Brunswick? We found that men who signed the petition for prohibition, and advocated it publicly, when it came to the vote, voted for its repeal; and until a majority of the people of the Dominion are practically teetotalers, we will have the appetite of the people, as well as the interest of the men engaged in the liquor traffic, working and conspiring to destroy it.

It is because I believe in prohibition that I am prepared to vote for the principle, and to say that when the time comes when it will be desirable to have it put into operation, I will be prepared to support a prohibitory measure, not deterred by any question of its effect on the revenue. Of course the ex-Finance Minister and myself would naturally look to the matter of revenue, but that, in my judgment is but a feather in the scale when compared to the beneficial effects that would follow the practical working of prohibition. I would vote for it most cheerfully and, as Finance Minister, prepare ways and means to make up any deficiency that would arise if we were in a position to say that if such a law were enacted it would be sustained.

I can understand the delicacy of an hon. gentleman voting against the last amendment, as a temperance man and a prohibitionist, because, as such, he would seem inconsistent, and I notice cheers when my name was called as voting against the immediate adoption of prohibition; but I did so because I believe it is in the interest of temperance that we should not enact a law that will not be enforced.

I speak with the experience I had thirty years ago, and have had ever since 1856. When the convention was held in Montreal, I was written to by one of the leading friends of temperance asking my opinion. I was unable to be present, but I wrote a letter in reply, which letter Mr. Ross read at a convention held in Ottawa. What was the opinion I then expressed? I stated that if they decided to submit the proposal to the popular vote they should not suggest less than a three-fifths vote, because if carried by a bare majority and without public sentiment behind it, the law would fail and the cause of temperance would be damaged instead of benefited. That has been my conviction since 1855. I do not hesitate to say that the success of the principle of prohibition depends very much on the judicious enforcement of the Scott Act; that is the judicious selection of the places where the law is to be brought into force.

Take my own Province as an illustration, a county where the Act has been in force for some time, but where it has not been enforced; in that county the cause of temperance has been damaged rather than benefited. If we would select the counties of the Dominion in which public sentiment is really strong enough to sustain the law and enforce it, I am positive the result would be such that it would extend widely throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion the advantages of the prohibitory principle, and by thus educating the country, section by section, a Dominion prohibitory law might be put in force and carried to a successful con-

clusion. Take any county in which the law is in force, but not executed, and you will find that the effect is injurious; but, on the contrary, in any county where the law is practically carried out, the effect is strongly in favor of extending generally the principle of prohibition.

I say that I will be prepared to record my vote on any occasion in favor of prohibition, when we can say honestly that the public sentiment of Canada is so strong that we will be in a position to enforce it. But from my experience of what has taken place in the past, I cannot help being convinced that we are not to-day in that position. If a prohibitory law were enacted to-morrow, I am satisfied it could not be enforced, and nothing could do more damage to the cause of prohibition than the enactment of a law, followed by its non-enforcement and ultimate repeal. It would then take us a century to get back to our starting point. We must carry prohibition step by step, and that can only be done by the judicious enactment and successful carrying out of the Scott Act, through a careful selection of the counties in which public sentiment is strongly in favor of such a law. In such a way, our people will be educated, step by step, and the day will then not be far distant when Parliament will be able to say, wisely and judiciously, that the time has arrived when the Act can be successfully enforced throughout the whole Dominion.

Having a strong feeling on this question, I wish to explain distinctly that my reason for giving this vote is that, at present the public sentiment of the country is not in such a position that we could enforce the law if enacted. I may say I believe that if a vote were taken, a majority of the people would vote for prohibition, but with the social customs as at present, I do not believe that a prohibitory law could be enforced, and I therefore give my vote in what I believe to be the true interest of prohibition and the cause of temperance.

MR. IRVINE. If the statements made by the last speaker be correct, I cannot see the propriety of introducing the Resolution at all. Now, sir, what are the reasons given by the last speaker why the country is not ready for it? Simply that a law was passed some thirty-five years ago, and repealed immediately without giving it a trial at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

MR. IRVINE. I will stand here until I get a hearing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

MR. IRVINE. I will be heard or I will stand here until to-morrow morning. I will not go on as long as there is this noise.

MR. BAKER (Missisquoi). If we are going to make a night of it, permit me to ask what motion is before the Chair?

MR. SPEAKER. The main motion as amended. Shall it be adopted?

MR. IRVINE. Five minutes will do me if I get a hearing. The reason the hon. gentleman has given why the country is not ripe for a prohibitory law is that a law was enacted in New Brunswick thirty-five years ago and repealed immediately. The hon. gentleman is very well aware that when the people of New Brunswick were appealed to enter the Union, which has not been found to be very beneficial to New Brunswick, they declined the proposals then made, but a year or two afterwards they willingly accepted the proposition made to them.

However, I will refer to a State where there is a prohibitory law enacted—that is Maine. Maine enacted a prohibitory law in 1851, the law remained on the Statute Book until 1855, and the people of Maine had the law repealed; the law was again enacted in 1858, and it has remained on the Statute Book from then till now, for a period of twenty-eight years. The people of Maine changed their minds and re-enacted the law which was first repealed, and I do not think there is a party in Maine now bold enough to stand up and ask the Maine Legislature to repeal the law which is the law of Maine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

MR. VAIL. We will have to retaliate on this side.

MR. MILLS. It means a longer session, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CASGRAIN. If you want to adjourn at Easter.

MR. IRVINE. I stated that no portion of the people of Maine can be found to

stand up and ask the Legislature to repeal that law, and for the Finance Minister to state that the fact that the people enacted a law thirty-five years ago and found it unpopular, shows they still enjoy the same view in relation to a prohibitory law, is absurd. I will say now what I have said heretofore, that the sentiment in reference to prohibition in this Chamber is not very strong. I do not think it is quite the reflex of the sentiment of the country. It is very true that, a few years ago, when this country was ruled by another Government, the people of this country were very clamorous for a prohibitory law, and they did not appeal in vain to the Government of that day, led by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. He gave them what is known as—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

MR. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentlemen try to keep quiet for a few moments, until we get to a division on the matter.

MR. IRVINE. He gave them what is known as a local option law, that is, a permissive law, prohibitory in its character when enacted but left to the people, of course, to accept or reject it. We found last year that that law could be amended, and the Alliance which met in this city a year ago, proposed some amendments to that law, and it is very well known that a committee was appointed to have those amendments embodied in an amendment to be sent to this Parliament, and we know very well that they never were presented, for the reason, exactly, that the Government of the day, of which the hon. the Finance Minister is a shining light, could not undertake the responsibility of introducing the law in this House to carry it through Parliament—that is, the amendments embodied in the Resolution. So we have abundant proof that the present Government, the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury Benches, are not very favorable to what we call advanced temperance legislation, and I think all that the temperance people of this country ask now is, that we have what we call a fair show: that is, that we have a fair sight to enforce the Scott Act. But we believe—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

MR. IRVINE. We have a fair exhibition of the temperance sentiment of the House to-night. We know on what side advanced temperance principles are. I said in the outset that I believed the temperance people of this country wanted nothing better than the Scott Act, if it received that treatment which it should receive at the hands of the Government, but we are satisfied from what we know, we have reason to believe, that the present Government are willing to see that law frustrated and wiped off the Statute Book.

We know that, notwithstanding that the Finance Minister votes one way and speaks another, the sentiment of the party on the Treasury Benches is decidedly hostile to the temperance movement and to temperance legislation. We know that the temperance question has been the hobby upon which he rode into power, upon which he sits in power now, the hobby which he has always sat upon, in order to advance his own interests.

Main motion as amended, agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS.

Messieurs.

Allen,
Allison (Hants),
Allison (Lennox),
Armstrong,
Auger,
Bain (Soulanges),
Bain (Wentworth),
Baker (Missisquoi),
Baker (Victoria),
Beaty,

Ferguson, (Leeds & Gren.),
Fisher,
Fleming,
Foster,
Gague,
Gault,
Giganet,
Gillmor,
Gordon,
Guillet,

Mulock,
Paint,
Paterson (Brant),
Platt,
Ray,
Reid,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Hastings),
Robertson (Shelburne),
Ross,

Bechard,	Gunn,	Scott,
Bell,	Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Belleau,	Hall,	Small,
Benson,	Harley,	Smyth,
Bernier,	Hay,	Somerville (Brant),
Bossé,	Henson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Springer,
Brecken,	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Bryson,	Holton,	Stairs,
Burnham,	Homer,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Houde,	Taylor,
Cameron (Huron),	Hurteau,	Temple,
Cameron (Inverness),	Innes,	Thompson,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Tilley,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Trow,
Cartwright,	Jamieson,	Tyrwhitt,
Cimon,	Kaulback,	Vail,
Cochrane,	King,	Vanasse
Cockburn,	Kinney,	Wallace (Albert),
Colby,	Kirk,	Wallace (York),
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Watson,
Coughlin,	Lister,	Wheeler,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Davies,	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Dawson,	MacMillan (Middlesex),	Wigle,
Desaulniers,	McCallum,	Williams,
Dickinson,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Dodd,	McDougald,	Wood (Brockville),
Dundas,	McLelan,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Fairbank,	McMullen,	Wright.—122.
Farrow,	Mills,	

NAYS.

Messieurs.

Abbott,	Curran,	Langevin,
Amyot,	Daly,	Lesage,
Benoit,	Desjardins,	McDonald (Cape Breton),
Bergeron,	Dupont,	McMillan (Vandreuil),
Billy,	Geoffrion,	McNeill,
Blondeau,	Girouard,	Massue,
Bolduc,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Burns,	Guilbault,	O'Brien,
Cameron (Victoria),	Haggart,	Orton,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Ouimet,
Caron,	Krans,	Pinsonneault,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Riopel,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tassé,
		Weldon.—40

CONTENTS

Introduction of the Author

The Author's Acknowledgments

The Author's Dedication

Chapter I

Chapter II

Chapter III

Chapter IV

Chapter V

Chapter VI

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE.

I.—That it is neither right nor politic for the State to afford legal protection and sanction to any traffic or system that tends to increase crime, to waste the national resources, to corrupt the social habits, and to destroy the health and lives of the people.

II.—That the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors, as common beverages, is inimical to the true interests of individuals, and destructive to the order and welfare of society, and ought therefore to be prohibited.

III.—That the history and result of all past legislation, in regard to the Liquor Traffic, abundantly proves that it is impossible satisfactorily to limit or regulate a system so essentially mischievous in its tendencies.

IV.—That no consideration of private gain or public revenue can justify the upholding of a system so utterly wrong in principle, suicidal in policy, and disastrous in results, as the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.

V.—That the Legislative Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic is perfectly compatible with national liberty, and with the claims of justice and legitimate commerce.

VI.—That the Legislative Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic would be highly conducive to the development of a progressive civilization.

VII.—That, rising above sectarian and party considerations, all good citizens should combine to procure an enactment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of Intoxicating beverages, as affording most efficient aid in removing the appalling evil of Intemperance.

MAINTENANCE.

The Alliance looks confidently to the public for practical support in the work it has undertaken. Subscriptions to aid this work will be thankfully received, and all information in reference to carrying on will be cheerfully furnished by any of the following secretaries of their respective provincial branches:—

Ontario	F. S. Spence, 8 King Street East, Toronto.
Quebec	Rev. D. V. Lucas, 182 Mountain St., Montreal.
New Brunswick	C. H. Lugin, Fredericton.
Nova Scotia	P. Monaghan, P. O. Box 379, Halifax.
Prince Edward Island	Rev. Geo. W. Hodgson, Charlottetown.
Manitoba	J. A. Tees, Winnipeg.
British Columbia	J. B. Kennedy, New Westminster.