

CANADA CITIZEN

AND TEMPERANCE HERALD

FREEDOM FOR THE RIGHT MEANS SUPPRESSION OF THE WRONG.

VOL. 5.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 24th, 1885.

NO. 43.

OUR LIST OF GLORIOUS VICTORIES.



"If the community has no reason to be surprised at the combination of the Licensed Victuallers, they assuredly have no reason to be surprised at the rise of the Alliance. The ultimate issue of the struggle is certain. If anyone doubts the preponderance of good over evil in human nature, he has only to study the history of moral crusades. The enthusiastic energy and self-devotion with which a moral cause inspires its soldiers always have prevailed, and always will prevail, over any amount of self-interest or material power arrayed on the other side. The Alliance is already powerful and growing in power. It will conquer."—Prof. Goldwin Smith, in a letter on the United Kingdom Alliance.

There has been set on foot in Montreal, with good prospects of success, a great petition movement, the object of which is to induce the Local Legislature to make the license law of the Province still more stringent, reducing the number of licenses, entirely separating the sale of liquor from the sale of other commodities, and providing for a more rigid system of inspection. The movement had its origin with the Catholic section of the community, but is securing the hearty co-operation of all classes who are in favor of temperance and morality.

Rarely have soldiers been called upon to perform great feats of courage and endurance than have been our Canadian volunteers in their journey to the North-West, and perhaps never have such privations and hardships been more successfully gone through. We believe that our brave boys have done more than they could otherwise have done, on account of the wise orders that were given against the carrying with them of any strong drink, and we are very sorry to learn that this order was not general, and that some regiments had liquor on the road. The history of the journey, and the conduct of both drinkers and non-drinkers ought to settle forever the question of temperance among soldiers, from the standpoints of manliness, decency and strength.

There has just been issued by the Citizen Publishing Company a new edition of Hon. J. B. Finch's great book, "The People vs. the Liquor Traffic." This is the best and most overwhelmingly-convincing, popular argument against the liquor traffic that has ever been published in this country. We strongly urge every one of our readers to secure a copy. Concerning it, Hon. S. H. Blake, President of the Ontario Branch of the Alliance, recently wrote the editor:—

"I have read through "The People and the Liquor Traffic," as presented in the arguments of the Hon. John B. Finch. I think the addresses are most admirable. I know of no book that would do us more good in the Temperance Campaign in the Dominion of Canada, than this. The facts and arguments adduced seem to meet exactly the phases of the liquor question and traffic, which are to-day being presented to our people. I wish that we could have a cheap edition of the work in Canada, so that it might be in the hands of every minister and temperance lecturer in our land.

The time is fast approaching when it will be much more pleasant to be abroad than indoors, and it will be a little more difficult than it has hitherto been to get audiences in hot halls and close churches. We would strongly urge upon our friends everywhere the desirability of opening up a grand summer campaign of outdoor meetings. Such meetings have been carried on very successfully in Toronto on Sunday afternoons for many years with most encouraging results, and a similar plan has been extensively adopted by our friends in the United States. People will gather to an outdoor meeting who could never be induced to enter a hall or church, and in nearly every locality a suitable place for such meetings can be readily secured. Let us have a vigorous outdoor summer campaign.

We are very much pleased to see that the Dominion Government has decided to suspend the part of the McCarthy Act that has been declared *ultra vires*, pending an appeal to the Privy Council. The uncertainty caused by the recent state of affairs was very bad, and in many places immense mischief was done by the issuing of Dominion Licenses in localities where the people were strongly opposed to their issue, and where such issuing had been before prevented by the power placed in the hands of the people by the Provincial Legislatures. This was notably the case in Toronto, where unneeded bar-rooms were opened on the Island and in other objectionable places, where our exhibition last year was disgraced through the cupidity of those who ought to have been jealous of its honor and fame, and where the Dominion Commissioners have actually been proposing to grant grocers' licenses for the present year, notwithstanding a municipal by-law abolishing such licenses, ratified by an immense majority of our electors who voted upon the question. The Government has now wisely declared its intention to have this outrage stopped, and to have terminated at once, a state of affairs that was unfair to the liquor-sellers, perplexing to the public, and cruelly deterrent to temperance work, besides all which, it had a dangerous tendency to drag efforts for restriction of the liquor traffic into undesirable entanglement with party politics.

There is a stringent law against the importation of liquor into the North-West Territories. This enactment has worked wonders for the preservation of law and order in that wild country. Reports are now in circulation that some of the volunteers who have gone up there on soldier-duty, have taken liquor along with them; and even that there have been cases of disgraceful drunkenness and consequent vile conduct on the part of some of those who are taking part in the expedition. We trust for the sake of the hitherto unstained reputation of our Canadian volunteers that these reports will be shown to be untrue, and we earnestly hope that every soldier will remember the promptly obeyed the warning that Colonel Otter gave the Toronto boys when they were ready for the march.

From different parts of the country are coming in complaints of the action of some of the Boards of Commissioners in Scott Act counties. The Scott Act provides "that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes or for *bona fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, shall be lawful only by such druggists and other vendors as may be thereto specially licensed," and goes on to specify the restrictions under which such parties may sell. In some places, where the Act comes into force on the 1st day of May next, licenses under the above quoted clauses are actually being granted to people who are now keeping taverns, and who are not at all the sort of people who should be entrusted with such privileges. We request our friends in every locality where this occurs to at once communicate with the Dominion Government and protest against Commissioners being permitted to do anything so manifestly indecent and wrong.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

The heartlessness and meanness of the liquor traffic is not properly appreciated by the general public. It is true that much money is spent in drink by those who are wealthy, but it is also true that there is spent for drink an immense amount of money, for want of which helpless wives and innocent children freeze and starve. Often the means of obtaining liquor is stolen from squalid homes and long-suffering relatives. *It is true that in this Christian land our brewers, distillers and drink-sellers are growing rich on the spoils of the cruelest robbery,—robbery that sometimes involves the brutal murder of women and babes by need ess hunger, neglect and disease.* Some men, who would have the world believe that they would scorn to accept a dollar offered as charity's dole, will promptly pocket the same dollar if it has been first given to a famishing wife and stolen from her by a drink-debauched creature who brings it as the price of his own debasement and sin.

We are urged to sustain the traffic because the traffickers must make a living, but it will cost us less to keep them by charity than it now costs us to keep those who are pauperized by their business. It is the veriest nonsense to talk of men being above accepting alms when they are willing to take the same bounty second-hand, and brought to them by real degradation and crime.

Contributed Articles.

To the Editor of THE CANADA CITIZEN.

DEAR SIR,—A most remarkable advance in the social status of the Temperance Reform is evidenced at the World's Exposition, New Orleans, where a space twenty feet square in the middle of the Women's Department, (which is under the charge of Mrs. Julia Howe), has been assigned the N. W. C. T. U. It is a public and world wide manifesto of the great principles represented by the W. C. T. U. in their creed and confessor of faith, that is thus being recognized by all Christendom to-day, and evidences the fact that the Temperance Reform, both moral and political, has arrived at a position which no longer begs, but *demand*s recognition as a social,

moral and political factor. It is fitting then, that this wealth of Christian philanthropy, the recognized force of one hundred thousand women representing one hundred thousand firesides, should, side by side with the art and commerce of the nations, have a name and a place in the World's Exhibition, illustrating the breadth of their work by beautiful banners from the forty-eight states, and the variety, aims and methods of the thirty-eight departments of work by suitable shields of beautiful significance.

For instance, Iowa W. C. T. U. will speak to the world in this manner:—A banner of white satin on which is printed the Iowa motto, "This is the Victory, even our Faith." Date of Unions organization and incorporation, and statement of its aims as follows:—

"The prohibition of the liquor traffic."

"The Salvation of Our Children."

"The Purity of Home, Society and State."

Its financial progress is chronicled as follows:—"1874—\$39.70; 1884-5—\$5,533.31."

The results are known and read of all men. "A home for fallen women established on a sound financial basis; a prohibitory law enacted for the whole State." The banner representing the "press" department is beautifully suggestive. It is of blue silk mounted on a gold bronze stand. At the base a mountain scene, with hills far and near, a river winding between, in the centre a large white dove, and at the top in gold letters can be read, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings that publisheth peace." The Prison, Police and Alms House Department is represented by a beautiful banner significant of the aims of that department, while the Flower Mission with its poetic and sympathetic influences can be seen through the lacey drapings of the booth:—A beautiful banner rich with roses, pansies, lilies, etc., standing out as the ascetic home life of the aims of the W. C. T. U.—A world more home like "with sweeter manners, purer laws."

Here can be seen Texas W.C.T.U. speaking in this wise:—A banner borne on great horns; above a star, a farm scene below; cotton bales hand-painted. It will be seen from the above that each State Union endeavors to unite in exhibiting the industry and philanthropy peculiar to them selves.

Here can be seen pictures of the National President, Frances E. Willard; the Carey Sisters, in oil; Mrs. Hayes; and Hannah Whitehall Smith, author of "Christian's Secret of Happy Life." Two glass cases contain the crusade quilt from Mrs. Thompson, the leader of the Crusade. There are two counters of free literature, which is eagerly sought for. Near by is a table with the National pledge and register. Three ice water coolers from which hundreds drink daily—the only filtered water on the grounds, and in the centre a small fountain, the finishing touch to the first world's exhibit of temperance and prohibition wares at a World's Fair—the whole as the text of the aims and methods of the W.C.T.U. both national and local; a great protest to every nation, color and clime; a temperance lecture seven days in the week, speaking to hundreds of thousands of people with an eloquence reaching the very verge of civilization, resounding the world around, is the exhibit of the W.C.T.U. at the World's Fair, New Orleans.

Some time ago, a thought suggested itself to me that in this great move for public recognition, the Ont. W.C.T.U. should have a name and a place. The trades, commerce, arts and advancements along with the business lines of the brotherhood of this Province will be represented. The pure Canadian liquors, as an industry of this Province will be represented. Why shall not the Ont. W.C.T.U. speak to the nations in some suitable manner? A whole decade of years have come and gone since God by the Crusade spake to the women of America, and at this time and place it is fitting that when all nations, climes, colors and civilizations are bringing to the view of the world their best offerings. The Ont. W.C.T.U. as the Canadian wing of the White Ribbon Army, should side by side with the sisterhood of the Republic assert itself in all its true significance and power.

The St. Catharines Union feeling this, have sent as their representative, a banner, the centre of which is white satin, the top and base, cardinal plush, and the sides azure-blue velvet. In letters hand-painted is "W.C.T.U."; while on a scroll in the centre entwined with maple leaves bearing the Autumn tints is inscribed the motto "For God, and Home, and Native Land," each leaf representing some work done by the Union—either a Band of Hope or a W.C.T.U. organized. The red, white and blue, as compliment to the W.C.T.U. of the Republic, and the maple leaves as the national emblem of the Canadas, signifying that in this great struggle for the purity of home and country these two countries are a unit, with "one Lord, one faith, one baptism."

MINNIE PHELPS,

Supt. Press Dept.,

Ont. W. C. T. U.

A lady advocating woman suffrage recently brought down the house with the following argument:—"I have no vote, my groom has. I have a great respect for that man in the stables; but I am sure, if I were to go to him and say, 'John, will you exercise the franchise?' he would reply, 'Please, mum, which horse be that?'"

Parliamentary.

In the House of Commons on Monday 21st inst., Mr. McDonald (Kings) presented a petition from the Lieutenant-Governor and Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and 5,700 others, praying that Parliament will give to each Province the right to regulate within its own limits the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, or else to enact a prohibitory law for the whole Dominion.—*Mail*.

Sir Alexander Campbell has introduced in the Senate a Bill to amend the Act prohibiting the sale of liquor in the vicinity of public works. The bill provides that the expression (intoxicating liquor) includes any alcoholic, spirituous, vineous, fermented, or other intoxicating liquor, any part of which is spirituous or otherwise intoxicating, and the expression "public work" means and includes any railway, canal, road, bridge, or other work, and any mining operation carried on by the Dominion Government, any provincial or municipal authority, or by private enterprise, but the Act cannot be put in force in any city. These amendments have been considered necessary in consequence of the recent disturbance on the line of the Canadian Pacific, north of Lake Superior.—*Globe*.

In the Commons, on Monday, Mr. Cameron (Huron) rose to move that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this House such portions of the Liquor License Act of 1883, and the Act to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883, as the Supreme Court of Canada has declared to be 'ultra vires', should be suspended, unless and until the same shall be decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be 'intra vires' of the Parliament of Canada."

Sir John Macdonald said the Government had delayed any action pending the application for leave to appeal to the Privy Council, but, no answer having been received, the Government intended to bring in a measure on the subject.

Mr. Cameron (Huron)—May I ask what he proposes?

Sir John Macdonald—It is in the nature of a suspension. It is in the lines of the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. Cameron (Huron)—Then he will allow the motion to pass.

Sir John Macdonald—I have no objection to its passing.

The motion was adopted.

The resolution was adopted in Committee and read a first and second time.

Sir John Macdonald said he would give an opportunity for the third reading to-morrow.—*Globe*.

THE DEBATE ON COMPENSATION

ON THE 25th FEBRUARY, IN

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

(Continued from last week).

[PROF. FOSTER speaking.]

When we come to inquire why it is that legislators have proceeded upon this plan, without providing compensation for the traffic which has been disturbed, there must be some good reason, some strong underlying reason, to account for it. It cannot be mere whim, or caprice, or sentiment. This matter must have been argued and probed to its bottom, and there must have been found away down there some underlying principles so strong and so secure as to induce this universal action with reference to liquor legislation. And, Sir, what may we find to be some of these underlying sentiments?

NOT A CREATION OF GOVERNMENT.

It is a common argument that you must compensate the traffic because, it is said, it has been created by Government: Government has called it into being; Government has protected it and fostered it; and therefore Government has a duty to do, and that duty can only be paid by compensation whenever the Government takes away its protecting arm from the traffic. Sir, I think the whole history of this liquor traffic will contradict that statement of the case. I stand here to-day to affirm that the liquor traffic is not a creature of the Government; that it is not a pet of the Government, and never has been; that it came out of the ages when ignorance prevailed; that it came out alongside of other abuses which date from ancient times; that it fastened itself upon the country; that it grew strong before the people knew its character; and as soon as the people began to understand its true character, and in proportion as they understood it, the struggle commenced, and went on, and grew greater, to overthrow the abuse which had grown to so much power and strength during these preceding years. So, Sir, it forced itself upon the country, and when the country began to deal with it at all, the country dealt with it as far as it could get the power by restricting it in greater and greater proportion, until at last, in the long struggle, the liquor traffic is being overmastered by the people. And now, when victory will soon perch upon the banners of the temperance people, after these long years of struggle, the traffic comes up and says: Why, you have sanctioned our existence; you have allowed us, under protest, it is true,--but that allowance is equivalent to a sanction. Now, if you want to get rid of us, the only manly and just way to do is to pay us what is involved in getting rid of the traffic. Sir, this involves a much larger question; it involves the question as to how far it is necessary that the people of this or any other age, in dealing with the abuses that have grown out of the preceding ages, should meet them and overthrow them by force, and contest, and the power of legislation, or should compensate them and buy them off from the hold that they have upon the community. If we were to

admit that principle, where should we be landed? There was a time when absolute tyranny had its hold upon country after country. The people were beneath its grasp, and the yoke was laid upon them. Then commenced the struggle, and, after a time, the people became triumphant. Around this absolute tyranny there had clustered monopolies,—vested interests of a thousand different kinds; but when the people overthrew the tyranny, there was no proposition to compensate that tyranny for those vested interests which had grown up about the abuse. So it is with every abuse, every system of tyranny, every system of monopoly, which has been grappled with by the people and overthrown as an enemy. It has not been customary to buy them off, but rather to grapple with them and to throw them off from the body politic.

It would be a fair test of this matter with reference to the creation of the traffic, to take a new country to-day and attempt to establish in it this same traffic that we have amongst us by sufferance. That you could not do. Why, Sir, when the North-West Territory was set apart,—a new country under somewhat different conditions, of course,—it was found that this liquor traffic could not be set up anew in it, and there was an iron-clad prohibition placed upon the introduction of the traffic into that new country. Only the other day the representatives of the great powers of the world met together to lay the foundation of a provisional empire in Africa. The Congo settlement was to be put within its limits, and set out in the race for progress and improvement under a certain Provisional Government. When the proposition was made to introduce this traffic of intoxicating liquors into that new country, it drew forth an almost unanimous expression of disapproval from the Anglo-Saxon world, and the representatives of Great Britain and of the United States of America made their protest so strong that it had its effect, and the proposition was, if not entirely, yet to a large extent, thrown aside. You could not establish that system in a new country, which is a fair proof that it has grown up against the will of the people, and it will be thrown off just as soon as the people's will is strong enough.

REMAINED DESPITE WARNING.

More than that, Sir,—the traffic has grown up despite persistent warning. There is no abuse which the people have tried to throw off,—there is no system of evil which the world has struggled against, that has had longer and more persistent warnings given to it of approaching dissolution than this liquor traffic. Fifty years ago, and more in this country, the first note of warning was raised, and every temperance meeting that has been held since has been a protest against it. Every resolution of a Church Synod has been a warning to it, and every resolution of a Legislature. I think a good many Legislatures have passed resolutions against it. I think the Legislature of Nova Scotia and the Legislatures of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Ontario, and Manitoba have all passed resolutions praying this Parliament to pass a complete prohibitory liquor law. Sir, all these things have been notices to quit, and the traffic should have taken them to heart, and should not have gone on in the face of all these repeated warnings. If it has gone on, it has been upon this principle: Here is a man who comes up and says to himself, What business shall I take? There is the grocer's business; there is the boot and shoe business; and there is the liquor traffic,—which shall I take? He sees that the two former are stated, and solid, and certain; that there has been no agitation with reference to them, no strong wave of public opinion condemning them, while the liquor traffic exists by an uncertain tenure, and goes on in spite of the prayers of the people to Parliament to sweep that traffic away. And what does he say? He says: The gains in this seem to me to promise well. True, the risks are great, but I will take the risks for the sake of the gains. Now, then, if he has taken the risks for the sake of the gains, when the time comes for the risks to accumulate in loss, let him pocket the losses as well as the profits. He has taken the risks against the strong and repeated and continuous warnings that his tenure was not a certain tenure, and might at any day be disturbed. In 1864 the warning was given to him by an Act put in the hands of the people, which might have shut up the liquor traffic in any county at any time the people chose. How many are engaged in the trade who have undertaken it before 1864? In 1878 that position was made doubly strong by the passing of the Canada Temperance Act. How many are in the licensed victuallers' trade to-day that were in it previous to 1878? All that have gone in since those warnings of 1864 and 1878 were given have gone in with the full knowledge of the risk and the uncertain tenure upon which the traffic rested, and if they have chosen to take the risk, they have no right to come here to-day and say: Because we have chosen to take the risk, we want you to compensate us when loss falls upon us. My friend from Grey, I think, who spoke yesterday, made the proposition something in this light; or if it was not he, the proposition was made. Suppose a railway company have a charter for a railway to run through a certain district, and suppose that that railway crosses a man's land, and that it is necessary for the use of that road that the land should be taken, the company have the power, or the Government have the power, to take that land. But do they think of taking it without compensating the owner for the value of it? Not at all; they never could. But I hold that that and the compensation which is talked of with respect to the liquor traffic are two entirely different things, resting upon bases entirely different, and to which entirely different reasoning must in the very nature of the case apply. My hon. friend who was formerly Speaker of the Ontario Legislature (Mr. Wells), and who spoke to us so eloquently, but inaudibly, yesterday, from the other side of the House, said it was laid down by Chancellor Kent that when property was taken for public use that property should be paid for. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer; I do not know all that Chancellor Kent says or does not say; but I am willing to submit four propositions to the good sense of this House, and to ask this House if those propositions will not stand.

FOUR PROPOSITIONS.

The first is this: Whenever private property is taken for public use, the public ought to pay for that property; it is an injustice if payment is not made. Second: Whenever private property which is not to be put to an injurious use, so far as the public is concerned, continues in that state of not injuring or harming the public interest, the Government has a right to protect it, and it has a right to claim the protection of the Government. Third: Wherever or whenever private property devotes itself to the injury of the public, the Government and the public have a right to inhibit that use of the property, and, if that fails, to confiscate the property. My fourth proposition is this: That wherever general legislation is needed for the public good, even though that general legislation affects private investments injuriously, that private property must stand it, and it must pay its own loss, as it does, even though that private property is used, not against the public good, but in accordance with the public advantage. I see that an hon. member shakes his head to that proposition, and as he did not shake his head to the three preceding propositions, I conclude that I have three-fourths of him at least. Let me see if I cannot get the other quarter. The principle I laid down last was this, that the Government has a right to legislate for the general good irrespective of individual loss and without compensation, even though private property used to the public advantage may be injuriously affected thereby. Has it or has it not? Let me go back, Sir, to the time of the Corn Laws in Great Britain. Let us ask what was the bold question before the people then. It was this: Whether the public advantage should be helped by having the tax taken off corn, or whether, on the other hand, the landed interest should be kept with larger profits and more exclusive markets for corn, even though the public advantage should be lessened thereby. The Corn Laws were abolished, and the landed interests had to suffer; but there was no talk of compensation. That is an illustration of the principle that, if legislation is for the general good, private property, even though it be injuriously affected, has to sustain the loss, and gets no compensation. Let us take fiscal regulations. There is scarcely a regulation with respect to fiscal matters which will not injuriously affect some department of trade or of business. You cannot make tariff legislation without injuring and harming some certain interest; and yet it is never contended that, in the making of those fiscal laws, there should be the idea of compensating the interests which suffer thereby. If they suffer, they must stand it. The general good of the country is supposed to require the legislation. Again: I take railways and steamboats. Here is a railway which runs from Montreal to Toronto. There are a number of small towns along the route of the railway; towns which, before the road was projected or built, had in prospect, and also in essence, a trade, and prospectively a larger trade, in connection with the navigation of the lakes. The railway was built; it took the traffic, and instead of the lake traffic continuing to grow, it has gone down, and some of those towns to-day are feeling the effects of the railway construction, and are not enjoying those special advantages which they were enjoying in essence and in prospect at that time. Yet not one of those towns comes here for compensation, although each suffered in its private town interest; yet the general good was enhanced, and private interest had to suffer for the public good. Take factory legislation; and I call the attention of the hon. member for Grey to this matter. Suppose this year, or last year, a factory went into operation under the existing law, and suppose that this year there was introduced factory legislation which made it necessary for the factory owner to do certain things. The inspector goes down to the factory, and he says: Have you fire-escapes properly organized in your factory? No. Legislation which has been passed since you entered into your business says you must have those, and you must put them in and pay the expense yourself. Have you the machinery properly protected? No. The recent legislation plainly says you must have it so protected, and you must pay the expense yourself. Now, Sir, the factory man has no right or reason to come to this Parliament, and put his argument thus: I engaged in my business under certain conditions, made so by existing legislation; I took it with those conditions in prospect; I calculated what the profit would be after paying the expenses required to meet the existing conditions. Now you have gone to work and disturbed those, and by new legislation brought a great deal of expense upon me, and I demand that you should compensate me for that additional trouble and expense involved on me on account of the change you have made in your legislation. No such thing happens. My hon. friend says that Parliament does not take his factory from him. Now, I wish to put this point to my hon. friend: I say that in justice and in truth it does not make the least difference in the principle whether you so legislate as to completely take away all the profits from that factory, or whether you simply legislate to take away ten dollars profits from that factory. The principle is exactly the same, if you are talking of principle. The principle is, on its broad foundation, simply this: That where you legislate to the detriment of a trade or interest, you are bound to pay a reasonable compensation for that detriment; and on the grounds of justice it makes no difference whether the legislation gives a loss of \$100,000 or a loss of \$10. If you go to the ground of expediency or to other grounds, you may find a difference, and you may apply some different rule. But we are arguing, as we heard yesterday, on the ground of even, honorable justice; and on this ground the amount of loss that is entailed makes no difference with reference to the principle.

ON WHAT THE QUESTION TURNS.

Now, the whole point between those prohibitionists who are in favor of compensation, and those others, be they prohibitionists or not, who are not in favor of compensation, hinges entirely, it seems to me, on this: Is the private property which is invested in the liquor traffic, from first to last, invested in that which works to the

public injury or to the public good? If it be invested in that which works to the public injury, on the principle which we have laid down, and which my hon. friend did not contradict, and I think will not contradict, the State has a right to inhibit that particular use of that property and that investment; it has the right to do it in the interests of the public, and on the ground that injury is being done as the outcome with reference to this traffic. If you contend that the investment in the traffic is not being used to the injury of the public, then you have a basis or ground for demanding compensation; but if, as we hold, this investment is for the injury of the public, we have good ground for which to contend that the State has a right to inhibit that use of it, and pay no compensation therefor. And I think I can challenge the production of a single instance in which property has been taken away by legislation, or the use of it inhibited, where that use was for the public injury, — a single instance where such legislation has taken place in which any compensation whatever has been given by the Government or Parliament which passed the legislation.

The fundamental principle, then, to be looked at is the difference in kind between this traffic and every other traffic. If this traffic were the same as the flour traffic, then, Sir, there would be a claim for compensation which no Parliament, no body of people, could overlook. Let us take the miller. There is the farmer who raises the grain; there is the carrier who takes it to the mill; there is the miller who grinds it; and from the time the farmer puts his first ounce of labor on it till it comes out as bread on the table of the consumer, every bit of labor put upon it has added real, actual value to the thing, and the product is increased in value by the labor which has been put on it. And when the consumers get it, they get that which is food, from which they make brain and muscle, out of which they produce again larger quantities and greater results than is merely represented by the value of it. And, Sir, in the train of this business there is no extraordinary disease; no extraordinary death, no extraordinary burdens of pauperism or crime that are entailed on the community.

A DESTRUCTIVE TRAFFIC.

But when we come to the liquor traffic there is a difference from first to last. From the time the farmer sows his grain until it is set before the consumer, I contend that every ounce of labor which is expended on it is labor which is wasted. It is labor which is worse than wasted, Sir. It is labor which is put on something which, in the end, is not only wasteful, but is worse — is destructive. And so there is no parallel between the miller's business and the distiller's business, so far as the rationale of the two businesses is concerned. Then what happens besides in this second business? Last year 2,384,424 bushels of grain were consumed in making the beer and alcoholic liquors consumed in this country. Can it be contended that the result, as it went into the hands of the consumers and was consumed, could at all be comparable for sustaining life and giving brain and muscle to the food which had been destroyed in order to make the substance itself? More than that — the labor was drawn from other and productive fields in the making and distribution of this product. More than that — ten thousand waste-banks were set up in this country in which the people of this country deposited of their earnings \$30,000,000 or thereabout, and from which the depositors took no principal home, and they got no interest for their deposits. It is so much money taken out from the people, and they get nothing that helps, and much that does incalculable injury, in return for it. Not only that, Sir, but the labor is destroyed and illness is produced as the direct result of this whole traffic. It is contended that in Great Britain, and it was contended on the authority and as the result of a Royal Commission to inquire into this matter, that one-sixth of the labor power of Great Britain was lost to the country because of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. That serves to show that a vast deal of labor is lost to the country because of the traffic. Now, I do not pretend to say how much it is in this country, but suppose we make a calculation which cannot be impugned on the ground of extravagance. Suppose that ten thousand drink-selling places in the course of a year take away the work of five thousand laborers or its equivalent. Suppose that the ten thousand places for the sale of intoxicating liquors take out of the productive labor of the country labor which would equal that of five thousand persons, and I think that is not an excessive estimate. — Those persons' labor is certainly worth in each case \$400 per year, and the five thousand multiplied by \$400 makes \$2,000,000, which will serve to show, on this low basis of calculation, the productive labor power destroyed by this traffic in each year. More than that — we know from vital statistics, from the results of researches which have been made by eminent scientific men and scientific bodies, that a great deal of life is sacrificed every year because of the traffic. Suppose we make the estimate that in the Dominion of Canada three thousand lives are sacrificed annually to this traffic, and that from these three thousand men ten years of prospective life is taken away from the country, which life they would have lived and in which they would have labored had it not been for their being prematurely cut off as the result of the traffic. Those ten years' life of three thousand persons is equivalent to thirty thousand years' labor; and that, at the same value of \$400 per year as before, would make a loss in labor-power of \$12,000,000 to this country each year. I am persuaded that any man may take these estimates, and though he may criticize them in many ways, he certainly will not have as the burden of his criticism that the estimate is too high. I present them merely to emphasize this fact, that the labor-power of the country has a serious drain put upon it as the result of this traffic.

More than that, Sir, — the burden of poverty and of crime which is laid upon the country, as a direct result of this traffic, is great. I wish to present just the barest outline of last year's statistics in Ontario alone with reference to that matter. I find that in the Province of Ontario last year there were committed to the common

jails 9,880 persons, with a cost of maintenance of \$44,783; that in the prisons there were 995, with a cost of maintenance of \$32,190; that in the Boys' Reformatory and Mercer House there were 321 and 303 respectively, with a cost of maintenance of \$26,120 and \$21,568 respectively, making, altogether, a large amount of money which was paid out for the maintenance of criminals of this class in the Province of Ontario alone. The report of the Bureau of Statistics in Massachusetts, after exhaustive researches, makes the calculation that 84 per cent. of the criminality is due directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. Then, 84 per cent. of that cost of maintenance in Ontario amounts to \$105,515 every year, which, at a low estimate, the Province of Ontario pays out for the maintenance of that portion of its criminals in gaols, prisons, and reformatories, which is found, as we may conclude after proper investigation, to be caused by the liquor traffic. More than that, Sir, the asylums in Ontario had in them last year 2,890 inmates, and the cost of their maintenance was \$283,040. The Earl of Shaftesbury, who for a long time served on the Commission of Lunacy in Great Britain, and who was, I think, for about twenty years, its chairman, gave as his opinion that three-fifths of the insanity of Great Britain was due directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. I am assuming here but 50 per cent., showing in the case of Ontario the sum of \$130,520. Adding that to the cost of the maintenance of criminals due to the liquor traffic gives \$242,035 as the cost of the maintenance of crime and insanity in Ontario paid for by the Ontario Government as the proportion of cost which is due to the liquor traffic. Sir, it cannot be said of any other traffic or business in the world that it is responsible for anything approaching that amount of crime, and for the burden of crime which is placed upon the different countries in the world for its maintenance, its watching, and its punishment. More than that; in 1881, Sir, we find that the arrests in all the cities of Ontario footed up to 13,196; and of those the arrests for drunkenness and drunkenness and disorderly conduct alone numbered 6,926, giving 45 per cent. of the total criminality in the cities of Ontario in that year as being for drunkenness, and drunkenness and disorderly conduct alone. You may go outside of that, and find that all the crimes which come from this as a proximate or indirect cause; but that is sufficient, and it will show you that the vast burden entailed upon our Provinces and our cities for the watching and guarding and maintenance of criminals comes directly from this traffic, and it comes from no other traffic which we have in this country. It is upon that ground, Sir, that prohibitionists are able to contend that they have a right to stop the use of property which is devoted to a purpose the ultimate outcome of which brings so many burdens and entails so great an expense on the community. The traffic is not a traffic of our creation. It has usurped control against the protests of the people; it has remained in spite of the warnings of the people; it has fed and grown rich by the spoliation of the people. The property in it is not required or to be taken for public uses, and therefore should have no compensation. The property, as the ultimate outcome shows, is devoted to the injury of the body politic, and consequently the people and the Government have a right to curtail it, destroy it, and give it no compensation in return.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for the attention you have given to these remarks. I wanted to have this discussion go on, and wished to lay before the House my views with reference to this resolution from one standpoint, so that if they are wrong, they may be refuted. All we want in this country is to get at the right idea, and we can only get at right ideas and conclusions by persistent discussion; and I believe the people of this country, and the Parliament of this country as representing the people, will, as the ultimate outcome of this discussion, do what is just and honest and fair; but we shall never get at the truth by refusing to discuss the question or by shelving it in any way. We have to discuss it and decide upon it, and it is best, in the ultimate interests of justice and even-handed fair play, that it should be discussed thoroughly and generously; and then time should be given to the people to make up their minds with reference to it.

FOR WHAT ARE WE TO PAY?

In conclusion, I would like just to leave one thought which may be elaborated, if any person thinks worth while to elaborate it, and which may perhaps form an element in the discussion and in the ultimate decision. It is this: What are we asked to compensate the traffic for? Are we asked to compensate it for any prospective profits it might make? I think no person puts forth so absurd a claim as that. I do not think the resolution of my hon. friend contemplates that at all. Then we may put that out of the way. The prospective profits, what might be made in the long years to come, we do not propose to compensate them for, and it is not asked that we should. What are we asked to compensate them for, then? The capital they have accumulated? Whence does the capital come? Most of this has been laid up from profits, and put from their profits into capital and stock; and this property and stock it is not proposed to take from them or to touch. No person proposes to confiscate their past profits. The stock they have to-day in liquors no one proposes to confiscate. Every honorable man and every reasonable man proposes to give them long enough time to get rid of their stock, if any measure of prohibition is passed, so that when the measure of prohibition comes into actual force, they need not have one single dollar's worth of their stock on hand to be a loss to them. Are we to compensate them for their buildings and real estate? All the buildings and real estate have come out of the profits of the traffic of preceding years, and for such I think they have not very much claim upon us for compensation. These are the accumulations of years of the profits of their traffic, and the country says and can say truly: Whilst you have had these profits and have amassed this accumulated capital, we have had all the disadvantages of the trade, we have had all the burdens to bear, and we have had to bear the losses and to take care of the burdens which have come as an indirect or direct result of the traffic.

A PRACTICAL QUESTION.

Who is to pay this compensation? I will put a practical question to my hon. friend the mover of this resolution. Will he take with him the 130 brewers and distillers and go down to any county in this Dominion, call the hard working people together in assembly, and stand up before them on the platform, and looking into their faces over which have passed years of experience, say to them: Here am I and these poor brewers and distillers who want compensation; you propose, now, not to allow them to brew or distill any more, and we propose, now that they have a capital of five, six, or twelve million dollars, to call upon you, poor, hard working people, to put your hands into your pockets and compensate them. How many votes does my hon. friend suppose he would get from the hard-working men of this country in favor of such a proposition? They would reply that all these men had acquired all they had accumulated in years past, had first passed through the hands of the workingmen, had been wrested from the fruits of their hard toil; they would say that there had been no tribute laid upon this country so heavy as this which they paid out of their homes and their earnings; they would reply, that they did not propose to add to the burdens they had already borne this unnecessary burden to compensate men who are now rich, and whose riches had been accumulated by means of this traffic. They would say: We forgive you the past; we ask no restitution for injuries done us; but leave us the future, and let us live happily and prosperously and become independent, without having this abuse from past ages, this worst of all tyrannies, this slavery than which no slavery is so grinding, or so far-reaching in its effects, further perpetuated.

Mr. JAMESON said—When I say that I do not propose to touch the principle involved in this resolution, it would be obvious to all that I have no intention of making a speech. I have but a remark or two to make in the line taken by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), whose amendment I had the honor to second. I think his view of the question is a very proper one. I am prepared to admit at the outset that the question is a very important one, and ought at the proper time to receive proper consideration; but for my part, and I think I speak not only my own views but the views of several hon. members of this House, and also the views of a very large portion of the electorate of this country, I think this question is one that properly ought to be considered when the question of prohibitory legislation is brought before the House. For my part, I do not feel disposed to commit myself to any resolution, but I will say that when the Government of the day or this House, in its wisdom, thinks proper to enact a prohibitory liquor law, and that law has embodied in it the principle of compensation to the class of persons referred to in the resolution of my hon. friend, I for one will be prepared calmly, honestly, and candidly to consider the question of compensation, and perhaps will go so far as to say that at the present moment I would concede it. I am not disposed to go so far as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Possible he may be right. He opposed in toto the principle of compensation. Well, I think there may be circumstances in which compensation might be ceded, and at the proper time, when this question of prohibition comes before Parliament, there is a large class of temperance men, both in this House and out of it, who will fairly discuss the question of compensation. I do not think it would be right to discuss that question when it does not come up in a practical way. Now I hold that we cannot discuss it in a practical way in advance, because we do not know what the circumstances of the country or the circumstances of the traffic may be at the time that a prohibitory liquor law may be submitted to this House. If the votes which have been given on the Canada Temperance Act during the past year can be taken as an indication of public sentiment, and I have no doubt that such votes are an indication of public sentiment, it will be a very short time before this House will be called upon to deal with this question. It has forced itself upon this House and the electorate of this country, and I have no doubt it will force itself upon the members of this House more strongly when they go back to their constituents for the election at the next general elections. This is all I have to say upon the question. I simply rose to say that I was not prepared, and there are a great many members in this House who are not prepared at the present time to discuss the question, and I do not feel disposed to be committed to the view, although perhaps the hon. member who has just sat down is correct which he holds on this question to-day. I believe that the people in favor of prohibition in this country are prepared at any moment, when this question is brought in a practical shape before the House, to meet the case of the men whose interests would be affected by prohibition in a fair and reasonable way, and I have no doubt that many of them would accede a fair degree of compensation, although I, for my part, would not accede it for any great extent.

Mr. FAIRBANK said—I would say with the last speaker that I do not feel there is one member of this House called upon at this time to discuss the question of compensation. I do not understand that the question of compensation is before us. As between the resolution and the amendment to it, the question seems to me to be what is the proper time to consider the question of prohibition; and to my mind it is clear and conclusive that the proper time will be whenever the question of prohibition is before us. Has the Ministry at present brought before us any measure dealing with prohibition? I believe they have not. When we will be called upon to consider that question, or when, as is more likely, some future Parliament will be called upon to deal with it, it will have been fully considered by the people, our masters, and probably we will have received instructions in that direction. It seems to me that to enter upon this question at the present time is like giving judgment before hearing the evidence. It seems to me as if we were called upon to constitute ourselves a grand jury and to instruct the petty jury, who will hear all the evidence and decide upon it what to do. I do not think we ought to assume that we have all the wisdom of a future Parliament; I do not think we ought to assume that, when the question

will be considered, it will not be considered by a Parliament elected especially for that purpose. Is there any new distillery proposed to be constructed, in the hope, perhaps, of being enabled to throw an anchor or two to windward? Is there any consideration at this time to show this question is not prematurely brought before us? I do not think we can assume that we have all the wisdom of the past and of our successors. When the question of prohibition comes before us, the question of compensation will naturally arise with it, and then I think is the time to decide, and the question before us is not the question of prohibition and this is not the proper time to consider the question of compensation.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Fisher:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "the time that Parliament proceeds to discuss the details of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, will be the proper occasion on which to discuss the question of compensation to the manufacturers of such liquors, as may come under the operation of such law."

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allen,	Dundas,	Mackenzie,
Allison,	Dupont,	Mackintosh,
Amyot,	Edgar,	Macmaster,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Auger,	Farrow,	McIsaac,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	McLean,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fleming,	McMullen,
Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Mills,
Barnard,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Béhard,	Gagné,	Mulock,
B H,	Geoffrion,	Paint,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Berner,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gordon,	Ray,
Blondeau,	Gunn,	Reid,
Bourassa,	Hackett,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Harley,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hickey,	Seriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Taylor,
Casey,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Catudal,	Jenkins,	Townshend,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Trow,
Cochrane,	King,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Kimney,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Cook,	Landry (Kent),	Watson,
Daoust,	Langelier,	White (Renfrew),
Davies,	Laurier,	Wigle,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Wilson, and
Dickinson,	Macdonald (King's),	Yeo.—105.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Abbot,	Girouard,	Orton,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Quimet,
Benson,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Hall,	Pope,
Billy,	Hesson,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Irvine,	Rykert,
Burns,	Krauz,	Scott,
Caron,	Landerkin,	Small,
Chapleau,	Landry (Montmaguy),	Springer,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Sprouk,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Stairs,
Coursol,	Livingstone,	Tassé,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Valin,
Desaulniers (Maskanongé),	McCarthy,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	McDougald (Pictou),	Weldon,
Desjardins,	McDougald (Cape Breton),	Wells,
Dodd,	McGreavy,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McNeill,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,	Williams,
Fortin,	Moffatt,	Wood (Brockville).—74.
Gaudet,	O'Brien,	

The amendment was agreed to.

The main motion, as amended, was agreed to.

—Official Report.

PROHIBITION IN LIVERPOOL.

Something like a quarter of a century ago D. Roberts & Son and the Earl Sefton owned a tract of land about two miles square in the southern part of Liverpool, England, which they laid out in town lots, inserting in all leases and deeds a clause prohibiting the sale of liquor in any shape on the ground. At the present time there are living in this district, under the despotism of a law that some of our American politicians would have us believe would sap the very foundations of free institutions, about fifty thousand people. Let us see what has been the effect there, in a city next to London in size. The death rate in Liverpool has always been large, ranging from 25 to 35 per 1000 yearly, while that of London is 23, and New York 26; in the prohibition district of Liverpool the death rate is 10 to 12 per thousand. The number of paupers in this district is less than one for each 2000 inhabitants, and they are found on the border, across which licensed liquor casts its baneful shadow. In an adjoining district where grog shops are thicker than the places where bread is sold there is one pauper to every thirty inhabitants, and the death rate appalling. The poor rate tax has been reduced to a minimum, with the prospect of wiping it out entirely. No fault is found with the prohibition clause. Houses are in constant demand at higher rents than in the district adjoining, while many houses have been deserted in the regions where liquor is sold by parties preferring to live with restricted liberties in a peaceful neighborhood. On four occasions a big brewer who attempted to plant beer stands within the prohibition era was driven out by popular uprising of the people. The place has often been quoted in discussions on the liquor question in Parliament and elsewhere. Certainly legislatures would not need statistics to convince them of the value of prohibition could they look with open eyes on the community and the free liquor district referred to above which lies contiguous thereto.—*The Mirror.*

Good Templars.

MAINE.—The Grand Lodge of Good Templars of this State met in annual session in the Y. M. C. A. Hall, Portland, on Wednesday and Thursday of last week.

The G. W. Secretary reported for the year ending January 31, 1885, as follows: There have been 62 lodges instituted; three reorganized; there are 324 lodges at present; 9,487 members gained; 121 deaths; 24,811 present membership. Fifty lodges have 100 membership. Cash received \$3,873.42; Grand Lodge property estimated to be worth \$351.50. There are 14 district lodges. The *Record* published monthly is fully devoted to Good Templarism.

The G. W. Treasurer reported a balance of \$690.82 in the treasury, and Superintendent of Juvenile Temple reported 79 Temples in the State with 5500 members.

The officers elected for the ensuing year are:—G.W.C.T., Rev. H. C. Munson, Portland; G.W.C., M. J. Dow, Brooks; G.W.V.T., Julia F. Pressy, Lewiston; G.S., George E. Brackott, Belfast; G.T., Joel C. Pease, Corinna; G. Chap., J. R. Clifford, Camden; Gen. Supt. Juvenile Temples, Mrs. E. G. Premer, Kennebunk; G.W.M., R. H. Murphy, Portland; G.D.M., Mrs. E. E. Knight, Deering; G.W.I.G., Miss Amelia Osborn, Waterville; G.W.O.G., A. S. Bangs, Augusta. Representatives to Right Worthy Grand Lodge—Rev. H. C. Munson, F. H. Dexter, Mrs. J. F. Pressy, Mrs. I. A. Hodgdon.—Alternates—C. A. Maxwell, J. T. Mason, W. A. Caine, M. G. Prentiss, J. F. Pressy.

NEW YORK.—There was an immense Sunday afternoon meeting recently held under the Good Templars auspices at Chickering Hall. The audience was very large and enthusiastic. Addresses were delivered by W. Martin Jones, G.W.C.T., New York State, and Hon. J. B. Finch. From the *Voice's* report of Mr. Finch's great speech we clip the following extracts:—

"I believe the Independent Order of Good Templars is the best temperance organization in the world. If you believe some other organization is the best, we will not quarrel. The only honor which temperance men have to struggle for is to try to stand as near the front of the fight as possible. I am in the Order because I want to accomplish a certain object as a temperance man, and because I believe the Good Templar organization is the best instrument. But I certainly am not a partisan. I cheerfully testify to the great worth and importance of kindred societies, such as the Sons of Temperance, seeing that they, like us, seek nothing but to be in the thick of the fight. We are all against the dramshop, determined to fight until the accursed thing draws its last gasp. If we fail, we fail, but God helping us, we shall not fail. [Applause.]

"As my brother of New York has just said, the Good Templars are prohibitionists out and out. We ask no political questions of our members, only this one: "Do you vote for Prohibition or for license?" If a man is for license instead of Prohibition, he is none of us. We make no compromise. We will accept no half-way measures, because we do not believe in half-way measures. Another thing on the political question, and that is a proposition that I stand by and that I expect all other Good Templars to stand by. *We don't propose to forget those political cowards who are afraid to antagonize the grog-shop; no—these men deserve, and I believe will receive at the polls, the hostile discrimination of all who call themselves Good Templars.* But with regard to the general question of Good Templarism and politics, I stand here to say as the head of the Order, that we embrace men of all parties and work for the end of temperance reform purely as a society.

"The battle is fairly joined, and we must either cringe before the liquor power and let it crack its whip over our heads and call us its slaves, or throttle the accursed life out of it!"

Continuing, Mr. Finch graphically described the evils of the liquor traffic, particularly its blighting effect upon the homes, and the miseries which innocent women and babes suffer through it. "I love babies, on general principles, if nothing else," said he; and then quickly added, "Not big babies, though, who get beaten in political contests and go around mad for six months. As for such fellows, if the devil doesn't get them, then the devil is a failure!" [Great laughter.]

MICHIGAN.—The Supreme Court of Michigan has decided that an innkeeper having sold a pedlar liquor, and the pedlar, being drunk upon the liquor bought and drunk at the innkeeper's bar, lost his pack, the latter is liable for the value of the pack. The Court held that the innkeeper was certainly liable if he got the pedlar so drunk, as was shown, as to be unable to look after his property. If all liquor-sellers could be held to as strict an accountability for their damaging traffic, liquor-selling would presently become pecuniarily a less profitable business.—*National Temperance Advocate.*

LOUISIANA.—The regular annual session of the Grand Lodge for this State convened at Odd Fellows' Hall, New Orleans, on the 14th inst., with the G. W. C. T. Bro. C. T. Mitchell in the chair.

A large number of the representatives from subordinate lodges were present and many received the Grand Lodge degree.

The following are the newly elected officers for the ensuing year:—W. S. Crawford, G.W.C.T.; E. T. Duckert, G.W.C.; Mrs. M. E. Terroll, G.W.V.T.; Miss K. A. McDonald, G.W.S.; Wm. C. Murray, G.W.T.; Mrs. S. Durward, G.S. of J.S.; J. D. Preston, G.W.M.; Mrs. E. Hanna, G.W.Chap.; O. S. Mitchell, P.G.W.C.T.; Miss Freddie Angell, G.S.; Miss Annie Angell, G.W.I.G.; E. W. Thomas, G.W.M.; E. Watson, W.A.M.; Mrs. C. T. Mitchell, G.W.A.S.

Bro. Hon. Michael Brooks was elected as representative to the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, which is to be held at Toronto, Canada, May 26th, 1885. Mr. J. D. Preston, alternate delegate.

The next session of the Grand Lodge will be held in Baton Rouge, La., second Tuesday in April, 1886.

Campaign Everywhere.

GREY.—The petitions from this county contains 4,489 signatures, a number largely in excess of the amount required by law.

WATERLOO.—A general convention of Scott Act workers was held in Berlin on the 23rd inst., to appoint canvassers for petitions, and make further arrangements for submitting the Act in the fall, after harvest, to the electors of the county.

LEEDS AND GRENVILLE.—In the Grand Jury's presentment occurs the following paragraph:—"We have to express our regret that the use of intoxicating drinks has been the primary cause of all the cases that have come before us, with the exception of one." In his reply His Lordship expressed his great satisfaction in knowing that the liquor trade, to which the blame for so much of the crime in the counties must be given, was soon to be wiped out.—*Leeds and Grenville Independent*.

HALIFAX.—There is a quiet, but persistent influence at work in Halifax City. The object is to obtain a majority in the City Council against the Scott Act and its associate means of reform. It is said to be a systematic and determined movement; aiming at one Councillor for each ward at the very least. Are there not two that can play at that game? With all the warning they have had, will Halifax temperance workers allow this to go by default? Look to your interests!—*Clarion*.

SIMCOE.—The following is a list of the persons who received licenses from the Board of Commissioners under the Scott Act for the County of Simcoe, from May 1, 1885, to May 1, 1886, His Honor Judge Ardagh, Senior Judge County of Simcoe, Barrie; Thos. Long, ex-M.P.P., Collingwood, and Robt. Paton, Warden County of Simcoe, Commissioners:—

John Stewart, Alliston; C. R. Sneath, James Wynne, Penetanguishene; John Woods, Geo. Monkman, Barrie; W. M. Slaven, H. Cook, Orillia; W. T. Coleman, Stayner; Wholesale, M. C. Harkins, Stayner; A. H. Johnson, John Wright, Collingwood; Wholesale, D. M. Best, Collingwood; John Kidd, Athlone; H. E. Macartney, Midland; T. Edmanson, Bradford; R. Wade, Lisle; F. L. Nesbitt, Angus; John Martin, New Lowell; W. C. Lean, Hillsdale; Thos. Stone, Elmvale; C. E. Chantler, Stroud; John Mackay, Creomoro; Chief Inspector.—*Northern Advance*.

BELLEVILLE.—The City Scott Act Executive Committee met in their rooms Tuesday evening last. Mr. Deacon presented a favorable report from his canvass in Murney Ward, while the canvass in the entire city is encouraging. Notwithstanding the war excitement our Temperance workers are on the "war path" earnestly and actively for the coming battle. The W.C.T.U. represented by Mrs. J. W. Dunnet and Mrs. Jas. Curtis, interviewed the Committee with reference to a monster temperance demonstration to be held in the Agricultural grounds on the 25th of May, the 24th falling on the Sabbath. This is a very praiseworthy object, and our Temperance ladies deserve great credit for their untiring efforts to make the present campaign a success.

The Hon. G. W. Ross, M.P.P., Minister of Education, is to be engaged for a lecture on the Act some time about the 24th of May.—*Patriot*.

BRUCE.—A grand convention under the auspices of the Bruce County Scott Act Association was held at Paisley on Tuesday last for the purpose of securing the earnest and hearty co-operation of every temperance man in the County to aid in enforcing the Scott Act when it comes into operation on the 1st day of May next.

The following is a complete list as far as heard from of the parties licensed to dispense liquors under the Scott Act in the County of Bruce for the current year:—W. A. Green, H. A. Wilson, Walkerton; G. McKendrick, Dr. Martyn, Kincardine; J. Smith, Ripley; R. C. Bruce, Tara; J. W. Manley, Warton, Grant & Jefferies, Lucknow; W. Thurtle, Tecumseh; G. H. Goulding, Chesley; D. J. Bain, Paisley; M. F. Eby, Port Elgin; T. Holden, Southampton; Mrs. Turner, Tiverton. The Board of Commissioners met on the 20th inst. to complete the work for the county.

HASTINGS.—The petitions for the submission of the Scott Act in this county have been deposited in the office of the Registrar at Belleville for examination. Dr. Cadioux, the famous scientific lecturer, is "stumping" the northern part of the county in favor of the Scott Act. He is very highly commended by the

press and is thoroughly posted on the terrible effects of alcohol. The *Hamilton Times* says: "Dr. Cadioux delivered in the Mechanics' Hall last night, during two hours, the most instructive, logical and powerful address for prohibition ever delivered in this city. At times he held the immense assembly spell-bound. His description of the burial alive of the wayfarer in the quicksand of Normandy, was listened to with breathless silence, while his charge of Cromwell's cavalry and the death of Charles I. was thrilling." He speaks in a large number of places throughout the county.

HURON.—The Board of License Commissioners for the County of Huron, met in the Court House on Thursday, April 9th. Commissioners present: His Honor, Judge Doyle, Chairman; P. Kelly, Esq., Warden; Robert Cornyn, Esq., Inspector; H. W. Ball, acting as Secretary.

The following persons will be granted licenses in compliance with the resolution passed at the last meeting of the Board, which reads:—

"Resolved that persons licensed by this Board to sell liquor under the Scott Act shall carry on the business apart from all others, and in a building entirely separate from a hotel."

R. J. Turner, Brucefield, Stanley; A. Knox, Holmesville, Goderich Tp.; Jno. Dinsley, Wingham; J. P. Fisher, Auburn, E. Wawanosh; Ed. Elliott, Bayfield; Geo. Baeker, Brussels; Jno. Patterson, Wroxeter; A. Stewart, Belgrave, Morris; J. C. Johnson, Bluovale, Turnberry; Wm. Beirnes, Walton, McKillop; D. W. Dulmage, Kirkton, Usborne; L. Campbell, Gorrie, Howick; Mrs. Morley, and Jas. Moore, Clinton.—*Huron Signal*.

TORONTO.—The Ontario License Commissioners were on Friday afternoon last waited upon at Shaftesbury Hall by a large deputation of temperance workers with reference to the grocery licenses and other matters. Rev. John Smith presented a largely signed petition making the following requests:—"That no license be issued to any person or premises which depends mainly for business on the sales in the bar-room, and which cannot be classified as a bona fide hotel for the accommodation of traders or travellers, or is not a public dining-hall or restaurant. That no license be issued to the keeper or proprietor of any public hall, billiard-room, skating rink, or other place of popular resort, or contiguous thereto. That no license be granted for use on the Toronto Island. That the sale of liquors in shops, being now by law disassociated from the sale of groceries or other general merchandize, the number of shop licenses be very largely reduced. That the laws relating to the sale of liquors in licensed houses during prohibited hours, and also to the unlicensed sale of liquors at all times and places, be rigorously and strictly enforced."

Rev. Septimus Jones, Rev. W. Frizzell, Mr. F. S. Spence, Mr. Burgess, Mr. James Thomson, and others addressed the commissioners, urging that no license be granted for the sale of liquor on the Island, and that any violation of the law be prosecuted.

Mr. Thwaite in reply said the petition would receive the most serious consideration of the Commissioners. (Laughter.) They had already decided not to grant any licenses for the sale of liquor on the Island. They would endeavor to see that all licensed taverns had the accommodation required by law. They would see that the law was carried out in regard to shop licenses, and the number would be greatly reduced. They did not intend to do any injustice to those who complied with the law, and those that did not would be without licenses as far as they were concerned. As for the Dominion licenses, their instructions were to prosecute all who sold liquor under those licenses. He then spoke of the difficulty of detecting violations of the law and bringing to justice those who were guilty.

Mr. G. M. Rose said he agreed with the chairman of the Board that they would not do an injustice to anyone. There were a great many places which had not the proper accommodation, and they would be looked after.

Dr. Cassidy said the Commissioners would enforce the law impartially. Whatever they did would be the work of the whole Board, and they would do justice to all concerned.

The deputation then withdrew, after thanking the commissioners.—*Mail*.

The annual public meeting of the Church of England Temperance Society, was held in the Pavilion, Horticultural Gardens, on Tuesday evening. The attendance was very large. His Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, President of the Society, occupied the chair. On the platform were Right Rev. Dr. Sullivan, Bishop of Algoma; Dean Carmichael, Revs. J. P. Lewis, Canon Osler, Dyaon Hague, G. M. Wrong, R. A. Bilkie, H. G. Baldwin, and R. W. E. Greeno; Messrs. F. S. Spence, N. W. Hoyles, Dr. Snelling and others. The following parishes in Toronto, where there are branches of the Church of England Temperance Society, were represented at the meeting—All Saints, St. Anne, Church of Ascension, St. Bartholomew, Christ Church, Dcer Park, St. George, St. James, St. Luke, St. Mark, Parkdale, St. Mathias, St. Peter, St. Philip, Church of Redeemer, and St. Stephen.

The proceedings opened by singing the hymn, "Father, in Thy Great Name we Meet," led by a choir of about sixty voices from the different choirs in the city. Right Rev. Dr. Sullivan, Bishop of Algoma, followed in prayer.

The Chairman welcomed all friends to the second great mass meeting of the society. Since the last meeting the interest in the society has suffered no diminution. According to the report at the last meeting of the Synod, in June, there were 52 branches of the society in operation in 48 parishes in the diocese. The total membership was 5,616, of whom no less than 4,445 were abstaining members, (applause) while the remaining 1,170 were temperate members. There were also reported 24 Bands of Hope with an aggregate membership of 2,629 members. This was one of the most promising features of temperance work. (Applause.) This work had been undertaken with prayer and had been carried on in like manner. It was to these circumstances they could ascribe the success which had attended the movement throughout the British Empire. (Applause.) The membership of the Church of England Temperance Society in England was 550,000. (Renewed applause.) He understood that the Secretary of the Society in Ireland had stated that one-seventh of the Church membership were members of this society.

Rev. D. J. Macdonald said it gave him great pleasure, as a member of the community to be present and say a word of congratulation and encouragement to the Society over which His Lordship presided. Temperance had always been the business of the Church, though it was quite true, it was only recently that it had been made a matter of special organization within the church. He liked, however, for himself to insist upon the position that the Church in all its branches was a great temperance society, (loud applause), that every Christian congregation by virtue of its constitution, was an organization to fight against intemperance as well as against every other sin. (Hear, hear.) He knew something of what had been done by the Mother Church of England Temperance Society, and he knew the whole Christian public in Britain rejoiced in that work which had prospered abundantly from year to year. He liked the basis of the Society to which the Chairman had called attention. They had among them those who used it temperately and those who entirely abstained from liquor. Each branch of the Christian Church would be compelled from time to time to devise better methods of grappling with this evil of intemperance. Sometimes the colors in which it was painted might be too dark, but he thought it was a little difficult to use colors which were too dark. They all knew the direful consequences of this evil. They would find out the causes. One was the hereditary, with which he need not deal. How tremendous was the disadvantage under which a child's spirit came into this world when it was the descendant to the third or fourth generation of hard drinkers. Idleness was also a fruitful source of intemperance. Was it not from the young fellows on our street corners at nights that recruits were found for the bar-rooms and saloons. The old saying again proved true—"Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do." Then another cause was found in anxiety, care, and disappointment. This was the case with many women who had half a dozen children to feed and clothe with very little money to do it. He then referred to another great cause—senseless, social usages, such as treating. He was glad to see very marked improvement in this respect. Intemperance was also promoted by the unhealthfulness of dwellings; the unwholesomeness of food and the general uncomfortable condition of the home. How were they to remedy these things? They should dispose of these fruitful sources of intemperance by measures moral and measures legal. They could sum it up in the words, "Self-control and love." They should encourage counteracting agencies, and in that manner drive out the devil. The Christian women in connection with the society could devote themselves to teaching the women less fortunate domestic economy in matters of cooking and bringing up their children, and in hundreds of other ways, which would greatly add to making their homes more attractive and more influential with the rising generation, and thereby diminish intemperance by fertilizing the children against the evil. (Loud applause.)

Rev. Dean Carmichael, who was received with applause, said that peculiar advantage of the Church of England Temperance Society was its dual pledge; it gave a wide opportunity for the gentlemen to speak on the temperance question from totally different standpoints. He would like to explain his own position as a total abstainer. He felt that he could stand on that platform and distinctively and definitely plead for total abstinence with the fullest powers of his lungs, and the warmest feelings of his heart. He believed in the language of the Apostle Paul, which made unquestionably a total abstainer of him. He believed in the literal power of those words, "If meat make my brother to offend I will eat no meat whilst the world shall last." (Applause.) If drink made him, the speaker's brother offend, he would take no drink while the world lasted. That was his platform this evening, a platform that he felt he could call himself a moderate man and stand upon, and yet speak with all his powers of heart and voice for the total abstinence pledge of this society. The whole question appeared to him, so far as our assault upon this terribly degrading sin, to settle itself on this point. "Does this drink make my brother to offend?" He took the asseurages of intellectual manhood, religious humanity, and put the question to them plump and plain and got a unanimous verdict from every rank and class of men, that if one sin above all others made them to offend, it was this very sin against which the society was so nobly banded. If he went to revelation the great voice of God, he saw this written in startling character that, like the blazing letters on Belshazzar's wall, spoke forth the doom of God anew on how many of our brethren: "No drunkard shall enter into the kingdom of God."

He appealed to the Church of God, to all ministers of the Gospel that ever went down among their fellowmen, and did missionary work among them, and felt sure they would come to a unanimous verdict that, if all the sins they were ever brought in contact with, there was none that so systematically wrecked homes, ruined families, brought sorrow and sickness to the heart, and sapped the vital energies of the Church of God, as the sin this society was banded together to combat. He appealed to the leading political minds of the world that had given utterance to opinion on this matter, and had the words of Mr. Gladstone to fall back on, (loud applause) spoken in sober earnestness in the British House of Commons, that awful as was the misery that pestilence and famine caused in the world, the two together had not done more evil and brought more sorrow than this sin which this society was banded together against. He had been glad to hear the Bishop of Toronto say that this temperance organization was one on whose boards members and representatives of all ages and denominations could willingly meet. They were brought together by a common woe, a woe that struck Presbyterian and Methodist, and Church of England, and Roman Catholic alike, that left none untouched, and none unscorched, and drew them together as brothers simply, (prolonged applause) because there was no other topic of the day on which such a wide suffrage and unanimous verdict could be got as on the question of the desolating influence and sin against which this society was banded together. The question came, how should we in the present day strive to grapple with this sin and overcome it? He believed that if we took a stand upon this ground and surrendered what we believed to be right, we could help others. He himself felt that if he could, by giving up what would never have harmed him, save a man, child, boy, friend, or foe; if he could do that, well might he surrender everything and be thankful to God for the opportunity of doing so. He spoke to men who must know they had influence over friends of theirs who were going astray from this most cursed of sins. They might be dear friends, nay, brothers. He could hardly flatter himself that

all who heard him were total abstainers, but he would to God that he could make every one of them such. For from each one would go forth an influence on their fellowmen whose power it was impossible to realize, not only now, but in the great hereafter in the city of the living God. In closing he would urge on them finally to throw in their lot with the society anyway. If they would not take the total abstinence pledge, take the other, for it would be a step in the right direction. But he would sooner they would totally abstain. He thought it a splendid thing, now our country was in danger. They had not only patriotic persons who spoke eloquently in Parliament, but one minister in Toronto, who, in a perfect illumination of patriotism could rise his congregation to their feet in an outburst of enthusiasm at the sound of God save the Queen. It was a grand thing to know there were these patriot forces in the world—thank God for them—and so in the same way it was a grand thing to have the pledge—thank God for it—it was a tremendous step in advance. But if it was a splendid thing to have these men speaking in Parliament, the thing that went right down to the bottom of every one's heart was to see the brave boys who had gone on to the front—(applause)—and to know that although there might be some who thought them extreme, they were gone to fight their country's battle. Might the God of battle be with them. (Prolonged applause.)

Prof. Foster M.P., congratulated the Society on the appreciation evinced by the large audience gathered. It showed an appreciation of temperance work in general. He thought there might be three extremes, the extreme man on the first and second of the pledges, and the extreme man on the legislative point, and they could all agree to disagree. It was fit for him to speak from the legal point of view. It had been stated that men in Parliament were doing something for the cause. Well, they would do just as much as the people compelled them to do. The temperance movement was not, as sometimes spoken of, a wave or evanescent influence, but it had permanence and continuance, and would not quickly become a thing of the past. For half a century it has been growing in power, and few enthusiasms endured half a century. It was not a fanaticism. It was a methodical, continuous, growing, and purposeful movement, having its base in the needs of the human race, and would never cease in the world till this great cure was eliminated.—Globe.

NEW ZEALAND.—There is a provision in the Licensing Act of the colony which was inserted with this object in view: It provides that if the native owners of any land on which a license for the sale of intoxicating drink has not yet been granted make application to the Governor to have their lands exempt from the operations of the Licensing Act, the Governor in Council shall make proclamation declaring that no license for the sale of drinks shall be granted within such areas. For many months past some friends of the Maori race have been actively exerting themselves to bring the knowledge of this provision before the minds of the natives, and have succeeded in obtaining the cordial assent of the whole people, from Tawhiao down, to have their lands protected from the demon of intemperance; the application has been presented and the proclamation made in legal form. It is interesting to know that, the proclamation once made, there is no provision in the Act for recalling the prohibition from the land, which can only be done by a special Act of Parliament. The consequence of this is that an area of three million acres of the most fertile land in New Zealand, and possessing one of the finest harbours in the colony, has been absolutely dedicated to temperance for ever.—Anglo-New Zealander and Australian Times.

Our Casket.

A caustic wit, in speaking of an impecunious friend, said:—"He settles his debts just like clock work—tick, tick, tick."

"Was Rome founded by Romeo?" inquired a pupil of the teacher. "No, my son," replied the wise man, "It was Juliet who was found dead by Romeo."

"I hope you are not cutting a friend," said a neighbour to a farmer who was scratching the back of a pet pig with a stick. Bristling up with indignation, the farmer replied:—"No, sir, I'm only scraping an acquaintance!"

Fashionable wife—Did you notice, dear, at the party last evening how grandly our daughter Clara swept into the room?

Husband (with a grunt):—O, yes, Clara can sweep into a room grandly enough, but when it comes to sweeping out a room she isn't there.

"Mother," said a little girl, who was engaged in making an apron for her doll, "I believe I will be a duchess when I grow up."

"How do you expect to become a duchess, my daughter?"

"Why, by marrying a Dutchman, to be sure!" replied the little girl.

Young Henry was given the word "oblato." He was to learn how to spell it, find out the definition in the dictionary, and bring to his teacher a sentence containing the word. The slip of paper which he finally handed her contained this sentence:—"John was oblato on election day." "What does that mean?" asked the teacher. "Flattened at the polls."

An intelligent little boy at school gave a novel reason for decorating soldier's graves, which at least had in it the latent element of truth. "Why," asked teacher, do they decorate the graves of soldiers and not yours and mine?" The child thought for a moment or two, and then said:—"Please, ma'am, I think it's because they are dead and we ain't."

Two people were travelling on the train, strangers to each other, in Scotland. One of them let down the window of the railway carriage, it being very warm, when the other person remarked:—"Oh, that's invigorating." "Na, na," rejoined the co-traveller, "it's nae Inverkeithing, but it's Auchterarder. I ken the place weel."

A child two-and-a-half years of age, having heard some complaint in the family about pegs in their shoes, came up to his mother with his fingers in his mouth, and said, "Mamma, me dot pegs tumming in my mouff, and doy hurt me." This was his way of expressing the fact that two teeth were cutting.

The Canada Citizen

AND TEMPERANCE HERALD.

A Journal devoted to the advocacy of Prohibition, and the promotion of social progress and moral Reform.

Published every Friday by the

CITIZEN PUBLISHING COMPANY,

OFFICE, 8 KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.

Subscription, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, strictly in advance.

CLUB RATES.

The Canada Citizen is published at an exceedingly low figure, but as some of our friends have asked for Special Club Rates, we make the following offer:—We will supply

5 copies.....	one year for \$1 00,
12 "	" " 2 00,
20 "	" " 4 00.

Subscribers will oblige by informing us at once of any irregularities in delivery.

Subscriptions may commence at any time.

Agents Wanted Everywhere.

All communications should be addressed to

F. S. SPENCE, - - - MANAGER.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 24TH, 1885.

MEN, WOMEN, AND THINGS IN GENERAL.

The Scottish Land League of America is pursuing to some extent the same objects as the Irish Land League, but it does so by different methods. It addressed recently a formal letter by the hand of its Secretary to Mr. Gladstone, and this document is singularly moderate in tone as compared with the Irish League manifestos. The letter reminds the Prime Minister, in terms of manly appreciation, of his former efforts on behalf of human freedom—specifying the Irish Church disestablishment bill, the Irish Land bill, and the recent franchise bill—and also of the readiness with which he issued a Royal Commission to inquire into the grievances of the Scottish Crofters, and of his promptitude in promising to bring in a measure based on the Commissioner's report. The letter winds up with the following appeal and assurance, which are alike creditable to the men who promulgate them, and honoring to the man to whom they are addressed:—

We are convinced that the time has come to deal thoroughly with the acknowledged grievances of the Crofters, and as we have the utmost confidence in you as a man of sound principle, as a statesman of consummate ability, and as one above all whose life is ruled by the spirit of Christianity, we feel assured that you will not only accept our assurances of good will, but also give due weight to our wishes. Her Majesty's Government may rest assured that the Scottish Land League of America will ever use its influence to consolidate and perpetuate the friendly relations now existing between Great Britain and the United States.

The appeals of the Irish Land League in America are backed up with threats of dynamite, which are apparently connected with such fiendish atrocities as the attempt to blow up the Tower of London and the Parliament Buildings. If the Irish people on both sides of the Atlantic would deal more fairly with Mr. Gladstone and the English Liberals they would win friends instead of alienating them. There are growing signs that their violence is doing their cause very serious injury in America. Many of them abandoned the Democratic party at the late election to support Blaine in the well founded hope that he would not mind giving the British lion's tail a twist now and then to please them. But the solid good sense of the mass of the American people revolted at the prospect, and President Cleveland will give that good sense steady and firm expression for the next four years. By that time, let us hope, the causes which brought the Irish and Scottish Land Leagues into existence will have to a large extent become matters of history, and that Ireland may be entering on a long period of much-needed rest.

If it is true that some Irish members of the English House of Commons were present when the Prince and Princess of Wales were mobbed at Mallow and Cork, and that they were inciting to greater violence the roughs who threw missiles at Her Royal Highness, the facts are not at all creditable to those gentlemen. It was open to the Nationalist leaders to frown on the Royal party by their absence; it was not open to them to take part in annoying them by vulgar insolence. There is good reason to believe that the common people of Ireland, one of the most hospitable countries in the world, would not dream of insulting a lady, and no one denies to the Princess her title to be regarded as one. It is not unlikely that the London journals did exaggerate the cordiality of the Royal reception and base wrong inferences upon it, but that does not justify such undignified rudeness on the part of the Nationalists. That they have injured their cause by it will probably soon appear. The Prince and Princess will go on with their tour, will be alike affable to the highest and the humblest, and will renew their visit next year. If they do, not all the efforts of the Nationalists can keep them from becoming popular as they deserve to be.

I have been greatly amused with the confusion of thought displayed during the past few days by the promoters of the "Liberal Temperance" movement. Their aim is to prohibit absolutely the manufacture and sale of ardent spirits, and to allow under proper restrictions the manufacture and sale of light wines and malt liquors. This policy has been advocated at several public meetings at the West End, and in the columns of the *Week*, which is persistent in its denunciation of the Scott Act as a specimen of "sumptuary legislation."

The first example of the confusion of thought referred to above, which I shall cite, is the wrong use of the term "sumptuary." The writers and speakers who support the "liberal" movement evidently think that any law which in any way interferes with perfect freedom of traffic in what may be eaten or drunk is an exercise of "sumptuary" legislation. Now a sumptuary law is one that aims at regulating the people's eating and drinking on the score of expense only, and without any reference to considerations of police. This is the view taken by such lexicographers as Skeat, Stormont, Ogilvie, Worcester, and Webster. History affords many examples of such laws, and the *Week* is right in asserting that they have proved failures. Any attempt to limit by law the proportion of a man's income which he spends on food and drink must fail, for there is no way in which it can be enforced.

Another example of confusion of thought on the part of the liberal temperance advocates is their failure to see that all restrictive legislation is *pro tanto* prohibitory, and that a license law is as certainly an exercise of sumptuary legislation as the Scott Act. While I contend that neither of them is so, any one can see that if the Scott Act is a sumptuary law the Crooks Act is one also, though of a less extreme character. I can understand the position of one who is opposed to all legislative interference with freedom of traffic in what is eaten or drunk; I cannot understand the position of those who are willing to confine the privilege of selling to a few favored individuals and yet object, as a matter of principle, to what is only a more stringent restriction.

But worse still—the liberal temperance advocates are themselves the most extreme of prohibitionists in so far as ardent spirits are concerned. They would utterly abolish brandy, gin, and whiskey, while they would allow the use of wine and beer. This would be a most absurd and invidious distinction to make, and those who prefer brandy or whiskey to water colored with logwood have good reason to protest against it. Such a law as these people are asking would be more "sumptuary," in their own sense of the term, than a law prohibiting traffic in all liquors containing alcohol, for the latter would treat all drinkers alike, while the former would make fish of one and flesh of another.

One of the liberal temperance advocates rides one of his own confused notions as a hobby, of which he has a monopoly. He thinks it has been proved that alcohol can be assimilated by the human body and that it is therefore a "food." Scientific opinion has surged backwards and forwards about this point for many years, and probably we have not yet heard the

last word on the subject. But even if alcohol may become a "food" in minute quantities and under certain conditions, no well-informed man will pretend that the whole of even a single small glass of whiskey or wine, when taken into the most receptive stomachs, is disposed of in this way. The tell-tale breath goes forth to notify the bystanders that part of the alcohol is not consumed and is returned unchanged to pollute the air they breathe. A very small quantity of wine a day will in the course of years produce that chronic blood poisoning which betrays itself in enlarged veins, enpurpled nose, and bloated features. An infinitesimal part of the alcohol may have been assimilated as food; a larger part of it has certainly been excreted by various organs of the body which have been impaired by the work thus thrown on them; but a third, and by no means insignificant part, has taken up its abode in a system that is unable to throw it off so long as the supply is continued. Alcohol may be properly described as a poison, or a drug. It cannot be described as a "food," except by a gross misuse of the term.

The Scott Act is not a sumptuary law because it does not assume to regulate the expense of people's eating and drinking. It is not even a sumptuary law in the sense in which the "liberal" temperance advocates use the term, because it does not assume to restrict the freedom of the people in eating and drinking. It is not a sumptuary but a police measure, as the judgment of the Privy Council in *Russell vs. the Queen* shows. Parliament, seeing that even restricted traffic in certain substances produced results injurious to society, passed a law to enable people to restrict it still more. That is the genesis of the Scott Act in a nutshell. It does not assume to absolutely prohibit the traffic in alcoholic liquors, much less their manufacture. No so-called prohibitory law ever proposed to do that. The use of alcohol as a drug has always been allowed and probably always will be.

ONLOOKER.

General News.

CANADIAN.

The annual meeting of the Diocesan Church of England Temperance Society was held in the Pavilion, of the Horticultural Gardens, Toronto, on Tuesday evening last.

The number of smallpox patients in the Montreal civic hospital has increased to twenty.

A true bill for manslaughter has been returned against Mitchell, who killed McIntosh at St. Thomas.

Smallpox has broken out near Picton and at Glenora. Three cases have been reported, but the authorities hope to prevent the scourge from spreading.

St. Patrick's street bridge over the Rideau river at Ottawa has been carried away by the present floods. Several other bridges are endangered.

Much suffering has been caused to the residents of the portion of Belleville flooded by the sudden rise of the river last week. The water has now entirely subsided.

Farmers from all parts of Elgin county report that the growing wheat was never in better condition, and the prospects are that next harvest the yield will be the largest for a long time.

The Nova Scotia House of Assembly in Committee defeated an amendment to the Franchise Bill, proposing that voting power be given to unmarried women possessing the property qualification. The amendment was thrown out by a majority of only one.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company are still discharging large numbers of workmen from their shops and yards in different places. The new O. & Q. division of the Canada Pacific Railway being now in competition with the G.T.R., has taken over a good deal of the traffic once monopolized by the latter. Grand Trunk receipts show a decrease of \$34,020 for last week as compared with last year.

At Quebec, a large wooden tenement building was burned down on the 17th, and Jos. Gravel, aged 5, Adelaide Gravel, aged 3, and a 5-year-old daughter of Timothy Lizotte perished in the flames. Mrs. Gravel was out visiting the sick child of a neighbor and left the children playing in the kitchen.

A shocking accident occurred at Kingston on the 19th, by which George Hornbeck, a Kingston and Pembroke switchman, lost his life. He was standing at the switch watching the arrival of the express when a Grand Trunk freight came behind him, knocking him down, when the wheels passed over his neck and cut off his head.

Eather E. Montgomery, school teacher, aged 38, single, drowned herself in the aqueduct between St. Catharines and Merriton on the morning of the 18th. The deceased, who suffered from mental aberration several months, left her sister's house unobserved, was seen to plunge in by some boys, and was dead when the body was recovered. She belonged to a wealthy family and was highly educated.

A young man named Alex. McLellan, aged about 18, attempted to board the train at Chatham station while in motion, but missed his footing and fell

beneath the wheels, horribly crushing both legs from the knees down. He was a resident of London, and leaves a mother and two brothers to mourn his untimely end.

Latest despatches from the North-West bear the ill-tidings that Fort Pitt has fallen, and that the garrison and the refugee settlers withdrew from the place in boats down the river, leaving two policemen dead. Riel is supposed to be entrenched at Batocho, some 40 miles north of Clark's Crossing. It is stated he has 600 half-breeds, and a few bands of Indians, with him. Gen. Middleton is still at Clark's Crossing, but is constructing at that place entrenchments strong enough to fall back on in case of need. A day's march will bring him to the camp of the rebels. He is expected to start any moment. Col. Otter is moving across the country in a bee line towards Battleford. He is making rapid progress considering the difficulties he has to contend with. His supply service is very defective. The first division of the force stationed at Calgary, consisting of the 65th under Col. Hughes, and 20 mounted police under Captain Steele, has started for the front, the remaining divisions, two in number, following immediately afterwards.

UNITED STATES.

The discovery of an extensive tin mine near Glenwood, West Virginia, is reported.

General Grant continues to progress rapidly towards recovery. He was taken for a drive, being out thirty-five minutes. He was able to walk to and from the carriage without assistance.

A league of boy burglars belonging to good families has been discovered and broken up at Antioch, Georgia. Thousands of dollars worth of property had been secured by the young scamps.

At Chicago on April 18, Wm. Hassa, butcher, killed his sweetheart, Annie Neibert, aged 19. He then fired at the girl's aunt, and attempted suicide by firing two shots at himself. The aunt was not hit, and Hassa will recover. He says the girl's relatives would not let her marry him, and that the girl made fun of him.

At Waterford, N.J., large tracts of valuable timbers, cranberry marshes, and a number of buildings have been destroyed by forest fires, which started on the 24th. At Winslow, Camden county, a big fire is raging in a large cedar swamp. Thousands of dollars' worth have been consumed. At Pomona, Atlantic county, thousands of bushels of charcoal and hundreds of cords of wood valued at thousands, have been destroyed. Advices from Williamstown, Gloucester county, state that disastrous fires are sweeping hundreds of acres of growing timber. Several houses are endangered, and great damage has already been done.

At Buffalo the *Morning Express* office was totally destroyed by fire on the 16th inst. The fire originated, at 2.37 a.m., in the composing room of the *Express*, where the porter accidentally dropped a lamp on the floor. The woodwork caught fire, and in less than five minutes the office was a sheet of flames. The fire brigade was soon on hand, but the fire spread with such rapidity that the fine building was quickly in a mass of flames. There were several narrow escapes, the editor of the paper barely getting out with his life, and his son in trying to save him was badly scorched. Absolutely nothing was saved except a handful of copy. The loss altogether is about \$250,000. The *Express* loses about \$200,000, on which there is \$198,000 insurance, and Dunston & Co. lose about \$50,000, also well insured. The fire was well managed, and a general conflagration was fortunately averted.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN.

The Prince and Princess of Wales left Killarney on Monday and proceeded to Limerick, where an address was presented to his Royal Highness. Thence they proceeded to Dublin, where they were very heartily received. It is feared that when they visit Londonderry on Saturday there will be serious trouble between the Nationalists and the "Prentice Boys." On the return to Dublin ten thousand Sunday school children, with banners and music, marched to Phoenix Park, and presented an address to the Prince and Princess of Wales.

Wischnitz, in Galicia, has been burning since Friday. Six hundred families are homeless. 150 houses were destroyed.

It is reported that the natives of the Hermit islands in the Pacific have eaten the crews of two German merchant vessels. A gunboat has been sent out to punish them.

A protocol has been signed for the withdrawal of the Chinese and Japanese troops from the Corea. Japan waives her claim to an indemnity.

It is stated at Hong Kong that there has been severe fighting in western Tonquin between the French and Chinese troops. The Chinese claim to have been victorious, but admit they suffered heavy losses.

It is reported that one hundred of the worst rebels imprisoned at Colon were placed on a steamer by officers of the Colombian Government, carried out into the bay, and thrown overboard and drowned.

A despatch from Cairo states, that the rival Mahdis have met in battle, and that the original Mahdi was defeated, losing two Governors. It is reported that El Obeid has been plundered and burned.

Matters are not yet settled between England and Russia with regard to the boundary question, and the action of Gen. Komaroff in attacking the Afghans at Penjdch. It was expected that satisfactory conclusions had been arrived at some days ago, but the old wound has been opened since the receipt of Gen. Lumsdin's report. His report is almost a complete refutation of Komaroff's statement. He gives the lie direct to every vital assertion of the Russian commander regarding the events preceding the battle on the Kushk, the battle itself, and Gen. Komaroff's subsequent seizure and present possession of Penjdch. This, of course, if Lumsdin is to be believed, shows clearly the perfidy of Russia, and it is now expected that after a little more diplomatic sparring, England will demand the recall of Komaroff, and the evacuation of Penjdch and other points. War preparations are still being vigorously pushed by both nations with unabated vigor.

Tales and Sketches.

ONE WAY TO REFORM, OR AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?

A TRUE STORY.

The Rev. Mr. Keen had nearly completed his regular week's work, his next sermon was mapped out and he had pushed aside his papers at nine o'clock in the evening, and wheeled his lounge in front of the smouldering fire to enjoy an hour's reverie before retiring.

In came his neat and pretty wife with her quiet, busy ways; she brushed up the scattered ashes, gave the charred log a poke and a rap with the tongs, and then picked up the ends daintily, building a latticed pile over the glowing coals through which the bright tongues of flame began to play.

"Come," said the gentle-toned husband, "I want you to help me out with a hard question," and his black eyes deepened and his cheeks flushed with emotion. He was young, not so young as he looked, but earnest, and he knew that his wife was wiser than her youthful air warranted, so there she sat down by him in the closeness of their sympathy to listen and help him out.

"I have been thinking all day, Annie, of Baxter, the lawyer. They say he is drinking himself to death in his study at home, and that his wife and boy have had to leave him there alone; she has gone out of town and sent the boy to his aunt's."

"How could she do that, Bert? I cannot imagine such a desertion. She looks so kind and good, and is a Christian, isn't she? She is a thoroughly ladylike woman in her appearance, but she must be terribly selfish?"

"I don't know about that, Annie. I am told she has stood by him through evil report and poverty and harsh treatment for years, and now he has fairly driven her away and all hope seems to have fled. He is one of the most talented lawyers in the county, but has lately been running down very fast until he has become desperate, and says he is bound to kill himself with drink as soon as possible. He has looked threadbare for some time and his landlord has turned him out of his office, and I suppose his wife was unable to influence him, and took the boy out of the house that he might not witness any longer his father's degradation."

"How dreadful! why don't his friends interfere, and send him to an inebriate asylum, and provide for his wife and child, or put them in a way to support themselves? I should think that would be a good thing to do. Somebody ought to step in and adjust matters for them."

"Well, my dear wife, I have thought somebody ought to take it in hand, but now I am asking myself, why do I not take the responsibility myself?"

"But you don't even know Mr. Baxter, darling, do you? He doesn't belong to our congregation, and why should it devolve upon you? There are so many in the city who have known him for years, his brother lawyers, his old friends and neighbors, his minister and the people of his own church,—surely they ought not to desert him. I have heard that he is a finely educated gentleman, and might have distinguished himself. How terrible that this habit should have mastered him so completely! But really, Bert, there are others much more nearly accountable for him now than you. I hardly see how you could reach him."

"Yet there he sits, a wreck, stranded in the midst of a Christian city, and I sit, a Christian minister, pledged to seek and to save the lost, and I know of his despairing, dying condition. Is it for me to be inquiring whose parish he belongs to, or whether I have been introduced to him? If a man were sighted alone on Devil's Reef in a storm down the bay, who would stop to trump up excuses for leaving him to perish? No, my dear child, I will not delay, I must find him out to-morrow, and see what can be done. The Lord will show me what to do."

"My heart responds to your resolution, Bertie, and I would not have you throw aside your purpose. I would be glad to help you, if there is anything a woman can do in such a case. Don't be afraid to count on me, darling."

"No indeed, Annie, it will strengthen me wonderfully to feel that you are with me. Already I find my heart at rest in my resolution, and I believe that it is of God, though as yet I see not how the way will open. We will lay it before the Saviour's tender heart and wait for His whisper."

So hand in hand they knelt at the divine altar which left upon them every night and morning its benediction of peace and assurance, and the hours glided quietly by while they slumbered.

They slumbered, he only for a while, for his brain had not quite subsided from the pressure of this new responsibility. He awoke to a sense of what he had promised himself and God, and his heart trembled as its embarrassments and perplexities arose before him. What pretext had he for going to a man of that high-strung, proud reserve, and obtruding his presence, his opinions, his faith even? How should he meet the inevitable rebuff, the insulting taunt, the keen satire? How could he save a man who would not be saved? Even his faithful wife had been compelled to leave him, what chance would there be for him? Perhaps he had been a fool to think of it. The beaded drops stood upon his forehead as he

thought of it; his heart sank within him. He got up and glanced out of the window, the world was asleep; why should he not be at peace? But no, his restlessness grew deeper, throbs of agony shook him and he tried in vain to quell the tumult of his thoughts.

At last he partially dressed and left the chamber that he might not disturb his wife, and went down into the long parlor in his agitation, pacing the floor and renewing again and again the uncertain debate between his reason and his conscience. His tossing heart urged him on as he walked the length of his rooms, often renouncing the task as quixotic, then re-adopting it with its heavy weight of questions and vain effort to urge his shrinking heart to its demands.

At last, a voice seemed to break upon the discord. "Am I my brother's keeper?" That was Cain's excuse, no doubt now as to whether it should be his; he came to a stand and reined in the trembling fibres of his heart as he would have some fiery and unmanageable steed. He could no longer waver. His heart was fixed, his loins girt and he would trust in his God to lead him on to the accomplishment of his purpose. So he again laid him down in peace and slept and awoke the next morning as one who hails the light that he may apply himself to a welcome task.

"Now," said wise little Annie after breakfast, "if it is not officious, Bertie, let me tell you what I thought out early this morning before you awoke. I don't see but you will have to take possession of Mr. Baxter, as he is so left alone, and I advise you to get a carriage and get him into it and bring him right here and then I can nurse him and can reform him when we have snatched him out of the jaws of death. Of course he is sick and worn out, and if he stops drinking it will be some time before he can rally from the effects of his reckless course. I will get our pleasant room up stairs all ready and you just bring him home; we must have some careful diet for him, ask Dr. Stacy about it, but rely upon me, you can manage the case only by getting him into a safe home."

"Annie," said her husband with wet eyes, "how you have enlightened me! That is the right thing and we must try it. It was revealed to you by God's spirit, because you trusted in Him. I was awake for two hours in terror and doubt, wrestling with my conscience, until my craven heart was aroused by the answer of Cain, 'Am I my brother's keeper?' after that I was firm."

Within an hour from this talk in the cozy breakfast-room, our minister found himself at the door of the lawyer's house getting out of the carriage which was to wait for him to re-enter it with the wanderer on his way home. He rang the bell in vain twice, then after due delay opened the door and walked in; he hesitated but a moment and then tapped at the library door, which was closed. No answer, so he opened the door quickly and walked in with his hat in hand, saying, "My friend, I came to do what a man may for one who seems to need help. What can I do for you?"

A sudden flash in the haggard eye, and the astonished man rose suddenly, and with an oath and angry gesture called in faltering voice, "Who are you, and by what right do you intrude upon me?"

"I'm a Christian minister and it is my sacred business to search out such a desperate case as yours, my dear sir. I could not sit down at my fire-side in peace knowing why and with what intent you are here alone. I implore you, in the name of God, to come with me and receive such kind care as may restore, and hear of the love of Christ that shall save your soul."

"Let me alone. I am here to die and no one shall save either my soul or my body," and with the expression of a demon and blasphemous mutterings of passion, he sank exhausted into his seat.

"But I have a carriage outside and I shall not go without you. We will drive to my house and there you shall have a room, bed and good nursing. With God's help you shall be restored to life and manhood."

"Never. I will not start from this room for your cursed interference, so begone with your ——— impudent, pious meddling. I am not afraid to go to hell alone, ha-ha!" and an unearthly pallor overspread his thin face and doomed forehead as he tossed back his long hair and shook his quivering hand towards the intruder.

The dauntless servant of the Lord stepped close to him and held out his hand, then laying it upon his shoulder said firmly, "You must go with me. I would leave no brother man in such an extremity."

"But I tell you I will not, hands off. I can knock you down or put a bullet through your head. I am not too far gone for that. You dare not handle me."

"Now, Mr. Baxter, if it come to force, you see how easily I can master you. You shall ride with me to my home. You must be saved despite yourself. I shall not let you go. Come."

At this a tremor seized the forsaken man, tears rushed to his eyes, he yielded and allowed the rescuer to assist him to his coat and lead him to the door. A start of hesitation as he glanced at the undrained glass on the table and a fierce gesture overtook him, but the friendly grasp was too much for him, and before he knew it he was being helped up the staircase of the minister's sunny house, and then sank down into a soft chair, while tears rained down his wan cheeks and passive as a child he submitted himself to the kind services of his host. Soon he was comfortably in bed, hardly breathing from exhaustion, while the hot beef tea which had been

silently handed in by the good angel who had planned all this, was given him from time to time.

With hardly an intermission the minister stayed by his side, and before night words of hope and faith had been spoken, prayer had been uttered, and the broken-hearted penitent had joined his sobs and his beseechings to those earnest appeals to the Saviour of sinners. He had been a backslider from Christian nurture, a scoffer and a skeptic, and a loud-tongued infidel for some time as he slipped down from the path of rectitude. Now he was a child again and his vaunting was gone; his heart cried out to the Lord.

It was the turning point. Comfort, peace, gratitude, crept softly into his soul. Faith and holy ambitions again took up their abode with him. He prayed, he trusted not in himself but in God his Redeemer, for grace and strength to withstand temptation. His friend went out and bought him new clothes, re-engaged his office on his own responsibility, sent for his wife and restored to her a saved husband, placed them once more in their home, spoke a good word for him to his brother lawyers, who came forward with responsive assistance, and as the weeks and months moved on, health and happiness grew apace and now more than a year since that day of despair, he stands among his fellows, honored and tenderly regarded. He accompanies his wife to the church he had so long neglected, and has remained true to his conversion. We can doubt that a man can be rescued if only there is a servant of God who is brave and determined to do it for the sake of that Saviour who has put His work upon his followers to do in faith and not to faint at the task.—*L. P. H. in Union Signal.*

For Girls and Boys.

A TEMPERANCE ANECDOTE.

John Jones began at the age of fifteen to build a monument and finished it at fifty. He worked night and day, often all night long, and on the Sabbath. He seemed to be in a great hurry to get it done. He spent all the money he earned upon it—some say \$50,000. Then he borrowed all he could; and when no one would loan him any more he would take his wife's dresses and the bed clothes and many other valuable things in his home, and sell them to get more money to finish that monument.

They say he came home one day and was about to take the blanket that lay over a sleeping baby to keep it warm, and his wife tried to stop him; but he drew back his fist and knocked her down, and then went away with the blanket and never brought it back, and the poor baby sickened and died from the exposure. At last there was not anything left in the house. The poor heart-broken wife soon followed the baby to the grave. Yet John Jones kept working all the more at the monument. I saw him when he was about fifty years old. The monument was nearly done; but he had worked so hard at it that I hardly knew him, he was so worn; his clothes were all in tatters, and his hands and face, indeed his whole body, were covered with scars which he got in laying up some of the stones. And the wretched man had been so little in good society all the while that he was building, that he had about forgotten how to use the English language; his tongue had somehow become very thick, and when he tried to speak, out would come an oath.

That may seem strange, but I have found out that all who build such monuments as John's prefer oaths to any other word!

Now, come with me, and will show you John's monument. It stands in a beautiful part of the city where five streets meet. Most men put such things in a cemetery. But John had his own and put it on one of the finest lots to be found.

"Does it look like Bunker Hill monument?" asked little Amy Arlott by my side.

Not at all. John didn't want to be remembered that way. He might have taken that \$50,000 and build an asylum for poor little children that have no home, and the people would have called that asylum his monument.

But here we are at the front door. It is a grand house. It is high and large, with great halls and towers, and velvet carpets, elegant mirrors, and a piano, and I know not what all; so rich and grand.

This is John Jones' monument! and the man who sold John nearly all the whiskey he drank lives here with his family, and they all dress in the richest and finest clothes.

Do you understand it?—*Eli Perkins.*

DOES ALCOHOL WARM US?

A patient was arguing with his doctor the necessity of taking a stimulant. He urged that he was weak and needed it. Said he:—

"But, doctor, I must have some kind of a stimulant. I am cold, and it warms me."

"Precisely," came the doctor's crusty answer. "See here, this stick is cold," taking up a stick of wood from the box beside the hearth and tossing it into the fire; now it is warm; but is the stick benefited?"

The sick man watched the wood first send out little puffs of smoke, and then burst into flame, and replied: "Of course not; it is burning itself!"

"And so are you when you warm yourself with alcohol; you are literally burning up the delicate tissues of your stomach and brain."

Oh! yes, alcohol will warm you up, but you find the fuel! When you take food that is fuel, and as it burns out you keep warm. But when you take alcohol to warm you, you are like a man who sets his house on fire and warms his fingers by it as it burns.—*Christian at Work.*

THE FALLEN JUDGE.

Twenty-five years ago a young lawyer, tired of waiting for clients in his native town, opened a law office in the City of New York. As business came in slowly he drifted into politics, and his pleasant manners, aided by his fluent tongue, made him popular with the "boys" who pack ward-meetings and nominate candidates.

In order to make new friends and retain old ones, he visited saloons and bar-rooms, and made himself "hail fellow, well met" with the local politicians. The little money he earned during the day was spent at night in "treating" the men he wished to use as stepping-stones.

Occasionally an old friend met him, and seeing his surroundings and tell-tale looks, dropped a word of caution. "Yes, yes, I know!" he would reply. "But you see, I am making friends; when I carry out my purpose, I will drop them. Politics, you know make strange bedfellows, and when one is in Rome, he must do as 'the Romans do.'"

The "boys" elected him Judge of the Marine Court. When he took his seat, at a high salary, his old-fashioned friends again cautioned him.

"I am all right now," he said. "I am going to drop the 'boys' and do my best to make a reputation. You shall have no cause to be ashamed of the Judge in the future!"

He did remove himself from his bar-room associates, and tried to do his duty as a judge, and a good citizen, but he had formed the habit of drinking, and that he did not eradicate. Instead of visiting saloons, he became a member of a fashionable club, and drank champagne instead of whiskey. The club men were more genteel than the ward politicians, but not more helpful to a man who had promised himself to break away from evil.

When the Judge's term of office had expired, the "boys" resented being dropped. He was not re-elected, and the failure unmanned him. He took up again with whiskey, and became so dissipated that his genteel associates would not recognize him. He sank lower and lower, living in vile lodgings and frequenting vile grogeries.

One morning, a week or two ago, a dozen vagrants and drunkards stood in the "dock" of a New York Police Court. As the Justice looked over the group, he saw the Judge, venerable from his long white locks and beard.

"What! You here again?" he exclaimed, and he shook his head sadly.

"Yes, Judge; and I want to be sent up to the island for the winter. I've no home, no money, and no friends."

He was committed to the workhouse, where he had already served several terms. It is not necessary to give the man's name. The facts of his life are sufficient for the purpose we have in view, which is to show that ruin follows by an inevitable law when men adopt such methods to secure position as this man adopted. To-day his severest punishment lies in the knowledge of what he has lost by his own unwise acts, and from the clear perception of what, but for his folly, he might have been.