

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE

For the Total Suppression of the Liquor Traffic.

THE

ALLIANCE YEAR BOOK,

1885

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF
THE COUNCIL OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE.

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

1885.

OFFICERS OF THE DOMINION ALLIANCE FOR 1885-6.

President :

Hon. Alexander Vidal, Senator, Sarnia, Ont.

Vice-Presidents :

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Hon. S. H. Blake, Q.C., Toronto.
 Right Rev. Bishop Bond, Montreal.
 Right Rev. Bishop Baldwin, London, Ont.
 Sir S. L. Tilley, M.P., Ottawa.
 Sir A. T. Galt, Montreal.
 Hon. James Ferrier, Senator, Montreal.
 Hon. R. W. Scott, Senator, Ottawa.
 Hon. M. A. Girard, Senator, St. Boniface,
 Man.
 Hon. A. R. McClellan, Senator,
 Hopewell, N.B.
 Hon. D. Wark, Senator, Fredericton, N.B.
 Hon. T. R. McInnes, Senator,
 New Westminster, B.C.
 Hon. S. Creelman, M.L.C., Halifax, N.S.
 Hon. J. W. Sifton, Brandon, Man.
 Hon. G. W. Ross, M.P.P., Toronto.
 Lieut.-Governor J. C. Aikins,
 Winnipeg, Man.
 Hon. A. Gayton, Argyle, N.S.
 Hon. Wilfred Laurier, Quebec.
 A. H. Gillmor, M.P., St. George, N.B.
 W. McCraney, M.P., Oakville, Ont.
 J. Scriver, M.P., Hemmingford, Que.
 J. Jamieson, M.P., Almonte, Ont.
 C. Burpee, M.P., Sheffield, N.B.
 G. G. King, M.P., Chipman, N.B.
 T. Robertson, M.P., Barrington, N.S.
 James Reid, M.P., Cariboo, B.C.
 W. H. Allison, M.P., Newport, N.S.
 David Irvine, M.P., Wicklow, N.B.
 Prof. Foster, M.P., Apohaqui, N.B.
 N. Shakespeare, M.P., Victoria, B.C.
 S. A. Fisher, M.P., Knowlton, Que.
 M. Anger, M.P., Roxton, Que.
 John A. Kirk, M.P., Glenelg, N.S.
 A. W. Ross, M.P., Winnipeg, Man.
 A. C. Macdonald, M.P.,
 Montague Bridge, P.E.I.
 J. R. Kinney, M.P., Yarmouth, N.S.</p> | <p>Dr. Ferguson, M.P., Kemptville, Ont.
 J. T. Forbes, M.P., Liverpool, N.S.
 Judge Jones, Brantford, Ont.
 Judge Macdonald, Brockville, Ont.
 E. McLeod, M.P.P., St. John, N.B.
 Rev. Dr. Dewart, Toronto.
 Rev. Dr. Moore, Ottawa.
 Rev. A. A. Cameron, Winnipeg, Man.
 Rev. Dr. Clark, Toronto.
 Rev. Jos. McLeod, Fredericton, N.B.
 Rev. E. Robson, New Westminster, B.C.
 Rev. D. Frazer, Victoria, B.C.
 Rev. J. M. Cameron, Toronto.
 Rev. John Shaw, Peterboro', Ont.
 Rev. W. Scott, Ottawa.
 Rev. Dr. Burns, Halifax, N.S.
 Rev. J. L. McFarland, St. John, N.B.
 Rev. G. W. Hodgson,
 Charlottetown, P.E.I.
 Rev. N. McKay, Summerside, P.E.I.
 Rev. D. L. Brethour, Milton, Ont.
 Rev. Archdeacon Lindsay, Waterloo, Que.
 Rev. Dr. Potts, Montreal.
 Rev. E. W. Sibbald, Belleville, Ont.
 T. S. Brown, Montreal.
 F. W. Hales, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
 Jos. Burrell, Yarmouth, N.S.
 W. H. Howland, Toronto.
 J. R. Dougall, Montreal.
 J. H. Flagg, Mitchell, Ont.
 J. W. Manning, Almonte, Ont.
 W. H. Lambly, Inverness, Que.
 G. M. Rose, Toronto.
 J. T. Moore, Toronto.
 Andrew Cushing, St. John, N.B.
 J. Parsons, Halifax, N.S.
 Patrick Monaghan, Halifax, N.S.
 Richard Snelling, Toronto.
 Jas. Dobson, Toronto.
 John Macdonald, Toronto.</p> |
|---|--|

Chairman of Executive—Prof. G. E. Foster, M.P., Apohaqui, N.B.

Solicitor—J. J. McLaren, Q.C., Toronto.

Treasurer—George May, Ottawa.

Corresponding Secretary and Parliamentary Agent—Rev. John Wood, Ottawa.

Recording Secretary—Rev. A. P. McDiarmid, M.A., Ottawa.

Committee—The members of the Executives of the General Provincial Branches of the Alliance, with the Rev. F. W. Farries, Rev. Dr. Moore; Messrs. E. Storr, J. G. Howe, J. K. Stewart, J. B. Halkett, G. Hay, H. Alexander, T. B. Smith, S. A. Abbott, E. Botterell, J. M. T. Hannum, and John Lamb, all of Ottawa, with power to add to their number.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

—OF—

THE DOMINION ALLIANCE

Held in Ottawa, February 5th and 6th, 1885.

The Council of the Dominion Alliance met, pursuant to the call of the Executive, in the City Hall, Ottawa, on Thursday, February 5th, 1885, at ten o'clock, a.m.

Senator Vidal, the President, called the meeting to order.

Prayer was offered by Rev. A. P. McDiarmid.

On motion of Rev. John Wood, Rev. A. P. McDiarmid was appointed Recording Secretary.

The President appointed a Committee on Business, consisting of Messrs. J. J. McLaren, J. R. Dougall, S. A. Fisher, M.P., F. S. Spence, and W. H. Allison, M.P.

The President then delivered a brief address, alluding specially to the great victories that had been gained in the cause of prohibition during the past year.

On motion of Mr. G. M. Rose, seconded by Mr. J. W. Manning, the minutes of the last annual meeting were taken as read.

The Secretary, Mr. F. S. Spence, then read his annual report, which on motion of Rev. J. Wood, seconded by Rev. Mr. Jamieson, was adopted.

The following is the

ANNUAL REPORT.

OTTAWA, Feb. 5th, 1885.

Mr. President and fellow-members:

Your Secretary respectfully submits the following statement of work done since last annual meeting:

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

met immediately after the close of the Convention. It was ordered that an annual announcement should be at once issued calling upon our friends in the different parts of the Dominion to open a vigorous campaign for the adoption of the Scott Act in their respective localities. The committee also ordered the preparation and publication of a year book for 1884.

DOMINION ALLIANCE.

Hon. Messrs. Ferrier, Vidal, and Girard, and Mr. Foster were appointed a committee to prepare a form of prayer to be used at the annual meeting.

The Secretary immediately prepared and sent out, as instructed, 5,000 copies of the following :

ANNUAL ANNOUNCEMENT, FEBRUARY, 1884.

At the annual meeting of the Dominion Council of the Alliance, held at Ottawa, on January 31st and February 1st, a resolution was adopted in favor of an immediate agitation for the adoption of the Scott Act in every county of the Dominion in which such action has not already been taken.

This course was decided upon for the purpose of (1) Securing in every part of the Dominion the thorough discussion of the temperance question that invariably proves a powerful means of developing and stimulating public sentiment in favor of sorely needed reform, (2) Securing a substantial expression of the strong feeling that undoubtedly exists against the whole liquor system—this would be practically a demand for total prohibition that Parliament would be obliged to recognize, and (3) Securing immediately the extension, over as much territory as possible, of the operation of the Scott Act, which already in some places has produced incalculable good, greatly diminishing the evils of intemperance.

At the same meeting a deputation was appointed to wait upon the Dominion Government, and urge the desirability of providing for the simultaneous polling of the different counties that may petition for the submission of the Act.

In view of the above detailed action the Executive of the Alliance requests all friends of the temperance movement in every part of the Dominion to at once set to work unitedly, determinedly and vigorously for the circulation in their respective localities of petitions praying for the submission of the said Act. The time is opportune; and the necessity for some check to the terrible ravages of drink is daily becoming manifest and imperative; and the loyal workers who have hitherto upheld the cause so nobly and unflinchingly are earnestly called upon to rally again in support of this movement. It has been decided upon, after mature deliberation, as the only hopeful course now open, and the most certain to secure real progress towards prohibition.

To succeed in this work it is specially desirable that there should be formed, at once, in every county and city, a strong central committee of active temperance workers, including representatives from the different local organizations, to plan and direct combined energetic action. It is also desirable that there should be formed in every locality a branch of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. This Society has proved an invaluable agency for the work in every part of the Dominion.

Further information, directions for procedure, forms of petitions for signature, etc., may be procured from the Secretaries of the Provincial Branches of the Alliance, who are as follows :

Ontario, F. S. Spence, 8 King Street East, Toronto.

Quebec, Rev. D. V. Lucas, 182 Mountain St., Montreal.

New Brunswick, C. H. Lugin, Fredericton.

Nova Scotia, P. Monaghan, P. O. Box 379, Halifax.

Prince Edward Island, Rev. Geo. W. Hodgson, Charlottetown.

Manitoba, J. A. Tees, Winnipeg.

British Columbia, J. B. Kennedy, New Westminster.

It is expected that during the present Session of Parliament there will be introduced in the House of Commons a resolution in favor of total prohibition, and it is requested that electors everywhere will urge upon their respective representatives their duty to give it a cordial support.

Signed on behalf of the Dominion Council.

A. VIDAL, President.

J. R. DOUGALL, Chairman of Executive.

F. S. SPENCE, Secretary.

N. B.—It is requested that newspapers will kindly give publicity to the above circular, and that all friends of the temperance cause will aid in giving it a wide circulation

was unpr
counties
ment will
temperan
on in five

In every

polled on
and the a

Prince Co
Yarmouth
Oxford, C
Arthabas
Westinor
Halton, C
Simcoe, C
Stanstead
Charlottet
Dundas, S
Peel, Ont
Bruce, Ont
Huron, Ont
Dufferin,
Prince Ed
York, N. I
Renfrew,
Norfolk, C
Compton,
Brant, Ont
Brantford
Leeds and
Kent, Ont
Lanark, O
Lennox an
Brome, Qu
Guelph, O
Carleton,

Total

were broug

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL.

THE RESPONSE TO THIS CALL

was unprecedented in extent and vigor. Agitation was begun in a large number of counties and energetically pushed to a successful issue. Fuller details of this movement will be laid before you in the reports from the different provinces. The anti-temperance party endeavored to check the progress that was being made by bringing on in five Scott Act districts

AGITATION FOR REPEAL.

In every one of these cases the Act was sustained.

THE TOTAL VOTES

polled on the Scott Act during the year, the dates on which the pollings took place, and the aggregate result of the voting are shown in the following table:—

PLACE.	VOTES POLLED		MAJORITIES.		DATE OF ELECTION.
	For	Ag'nst	For	Ag'nst	
Prince County, P.E.I.	2939	1065	1874		Feb'y 7, 1884
Yarmouth, N. S.	1300	96	1204		March 7, "
Oxford, Ont.	4073	3298	775		March 20, "
Arthabaska, Que.	1487	235	1252		July 17, "
Westmoreland, N.B.	1774	1701	73		Aug. 14, "
Halton, Ont.	1947	1767	180		Sept. 9, "
Simcoe, Ont.	5712	4529	1183		Oct. 9, "
Stanstead, Que.	1300	975	325		" 9, "
Charlottetown, P.E.I.	755	715	40		" 16, "
Dundas, Stormont, and Glengarry, Ont.	4590	2884	1706		" 16, "
Peel, Ont.	1805	1999		194.	" 23, "
Bruce, Ont.	4501	3189	1312		" 30, "
Huron, Ont.	6012	4357	1655		" 30, "
Dufferin, Ont.	1904	1109	795		" 30, "
Prince Edward, Ont.	1528	1653		125	" 30, "
York, N. B.	1184	661	523		" 30, "
Renfrew, Ont.	1748	1018	730		Nov. 7, "
Norfolk, Ont.	2781	1694	1087		" 11, "
Compton, Que.	1132	1620		488	" 26, "
Brant, Ont.	1690	1088	602		Dec. 11, "
Brantford (city)	646	812		166	" 11, "
Leeds and Grenville, Ont.	5058	4384	674		" 18, "
Kent, Ont.	4368	1975	2393		Jan. 15, 1885
Lanark, Ont.	2433	2027	406		" 15, "
Lennox and Addington, Ont.	2047	2011	36		" 15, "
Brome, Que.	1224	739	485		" 15, "
Guelph, Ont.	680	511	169		" 22, "
Carleton, Ont.	2440	1747	693		" 29, "
Total	69058	49859	20172	973	

Total number of contests..... 28
 Carried in favor of Prohibition..... 24

In favor of license..... 4.

Net majority for the Scott Act in the 28 contests..... 19,207

RESOLUTIONS IN FAVOR OF PROHIBITION

were brought forward in the House of Commons at its last session, in accordance

with a resolution passed by the Alliance at its last meeting. On March 5th, Professor Foster moved

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

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

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

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

These resolutions were seconded by Mr. Fisher, and supported by other members.

On March 26th, Mr. White (Cardwell,) moved the following amendment:—

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

This amendment was accepted.

Mr. Robertson (Shelburne,) moved the addition of the following:—

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

The amendment was negatived on a division—Yeas, 55; Nays, 107.

The original resolutions with the first amendment were carried on a division—Yeas, 122; Nays, 40.

THE PUBLICATION OF THE ALLIANCE YEAR BOOK

was delayed until near the end of the year, it being found inconvenient for special reasons to have it issued earlier. The full report of the debate in the House of Commons was then added to other matter usually printed, and the whole forms a document of permanent interest and value.

THE LIQUOR PARTY ISSUED PETITIONS

in the former part of the present winter, and circulated them widely for signatures, praying the Dominion Parliament to so alter the Scott Act that its benefits could only be secured by counties and cities giving a three-fifths vote in its favor. It was also learned that movements were in progress with the object of attempting to have other mutilations of the Act made at the forthcoming session of Parliament. A meeting of the Alliance Executive was at once held in Toronto, and it was unanimously decided to at once get up and present to Parliament a petition praying that the Scott Act be not in any way impaired, and also asking for a law of total prohibition. This was done and petitions sent out to all the provinces for signatures. Many of these have already been laid before the Houses of Parliament, many are now in the office of your Secretary, and others are coming to hand in large numbers every day. This petition movement promises to be a great success.

REPORTS FROM THE PROVINCES

have not yet been received by your Secretary but it is expected that they will be laid before this meeting.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

F. S. SPENCE, Secretary.

The Rev. D. V. Lucas, Secretary of the Quebec Provincial Branch, read the report on the work in his Province as follows :—

REPORT OF THE QUEBEC BRANCH.

In the Province of Quebec the work has not advanced quite so rapidly as in some of the other Provinces. This has not arisen, however, from the lack of a sentiment favorable to prohibition of the traffic in spirituous liquors, but from other causes. In a Province where two different languages are so widely spoken, and where religious and even political distinctions are so marked, harmonious and united action in any given direction is not so easily and so quickly secured as where these peculiarities do not exist. We are glad to know, however, that the truly philanthropic work in which we are engaged so fully commends itself, when thoroughly understood, to the hearts of all Christian people, that all these obstacles are being overcome, and the good cause is daily rising higher and higher above all ecclesiastical and political distinctions. Since the campaign of the summer of 1884 began, the Scott Act has been submitted to four Counties, and carried in three. It is a source of pleasure and encouragement to us to report that in this Province, where so many of our fellow-citizens are of the Catholic faith and speak the French language, that the County of Arthabaska—where the electorate is almost entirely composed of French-speaking Catholics—was the first to adopt the Prohibitory law by a majority of 1,252. During the past year His Grace Archbishop Taschereau, and some of the bishops also, have carefully studied the nature and the aim of the Canada Temperance Act, and the result is that His Grace, as also Bishop Lafleche, of Three Rivers, and Bishop Racine, of Sherbrooke, have declared themselves the warm friends of the Act, and have promised their hearty co-operation. We anticipate, therefore, during the present year a much more rapid advancement of prohibition sentiment and work than heretofore. We are more hopeful in this respect since His Grace has kindly given his consent to allow his *imprimatur* to accompany each copy of an edition of twenty thousand of the Scott Act in the French language. We confidently expect to see large and beneficial results from this action. Our best thanks are due Dr. Marsden, President Q. V. A., for the valuable assistance given our Secretary in this matter. We have, during the year, held in several parts of the Province four picnics, at which addresses have been delivered by many prominent gentlemen, both clerical and lay,—among the latter several members of our Federal and Provincial Parliaments. The numbers attending these gatherings have been large; in some instances as high as 2,500 persons have been present, all of whom, apparently, were deeply interested in the subject almost exclusively dwelt upon—the entire prohibition of the liquor traffic. A few meetings have also been held in several parts of the city of Montreal. By means of our Temperance Literature Depository, kept by Mrs. Gales, several hundreds of volumes of valuable literature have been distributed. We sincerely urge upon our friends throughout the Province to avail themselves of the opportunity which the Depository offers them to secure very useful and reliable literature on the Temperance question at very cheap rates. Mrs. Gales's address is 105 Mansfield Street, Montreal. Our Secretary has, during the year, travelled largely over the Province, attending conventions, assisting in and directing campaigns, and stirring up by lectures and personal visitation an active interest everywhere in our very important and laudable movement. We have been greatly assisted and encouraged by the persevering energy displayed by our sisters of the W. C. T. U. We had, during the year, a visit from two distinguished members of the United Kingdom Alliance, Mr. Barker and Mr. W. Hoyle, who gave us an account of the present state of Temperance work and legislation in the old land, and assured us of the very deep interest taken by the Temperance people of England in our work on this side of the Atlantic, and especially in Canada. They said that our legislation in the direction of Prohibition was a source of strength and encouragement to them and their co-laborers, and a law totally prohibiting the traffic in this country would be a great leverage towards helping them to secure the same desideratum in the United Kingdom.

D. V. LUCAS, Secretary.

DOMINION ALLIANCE.

It was moved by Prof. Foster, M.P., and seconded by the Rev. Mr. Morrow,

“That the report be referred to the Secretary, with instructions that he incorporate a summary thereof in his annual report for publication.”—Carried.

On motion of Prof. Foster, M.P., seconded by Rev. Mr. Jamieson, the Secretary was instructed to obtain reports from each of the Provincial branches, and to embody summaries of the same in his Annual Report for publication.

The Business Committee rendered the following report, which was adopted—

I. COMMITTEES :—

1. *Legislation.*—Messrs. J. R. Dougall, J. J. McLaren, Q. C., and all Senators and Members of Parliament who are members of the Alliance.
 2. *Nominations.*—Rev. J. Wood, N. Shakespeare, M.P., W. W. Buchanan, S. A. Fisher, M.P., Thos. Robertson, M.P., Prof. G. E. Foster, M.P., M. Auger, M.P., S. A. Abbott, Jos. Jamieson, M.P., Geo. M. Rose, and Judge MacDonald.
 3. *Credentials.*—Rev. D. V. Lucas, J. K. Stewart, Rev. Mr. Jamieson, and W. E. Smallfield.
 4. *Resolutions.*—J. W. Manning, Rev. W. Scott, A. H. Gillmor, M.P., Wm. McCraney, M.P., Rev. B. B. Keefer, Senator Girard, and Rev. J. A. Newnham.
 5. *Finance.*—Geo. M. Rose, Geo. May, J. A. Kirk, M.P., J. M. M. Duff, G.S.G. King, M.P., W. W. Buchanan, J. Scriver, M.P.
 6. *State of the Work.*—Rev. C. R. Morrow, W. G. Fee, Rev. D. V. Lucas, Prof. Foster, M.P., Geo. Haddow, A. C. McDonald, M.P., Rev. B. B. Keefer, C. Burpee, M.P., Dr. Ferguson, M.P., and Jas. Dobson.
 7. *Literature.*—Prof. Foster, M.P., Rev. J. Wood, J. R. Dougall, J. T. Moore, Thos. Bengough, W. W. Buchanan, Rev. J. A. Newnham, and W. H. Allison, M.P.
- The President and Secretary to be ex-officio members of all committees.

II. HOURS OF SESSION.

From 10 a.m., to 12.30 p.m. From 2 p.m., to 5.30 p.m. Evening Session, if held, 7.30.

III. SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED.

1. The Enforcement of the Scott Act, at 3.30 p.m., Thursday, to be introduced by Mr. J. J. McLaren, Q. C.
2. Alliance Work, at 11 a.m., Friday, to be introduced by Prof. Foster, M.P.
3. Additional Legislation at 3.30 p.m., Friday, to be introduced by Mr. S. A. Fisher, M.P.

The Council then adjourned to meet at 3 p.m.

THURSDAY, 3 P. M.

The minutes of the morning session were read and approved. The Secretary read the reports of the Ontario and Nova Scotia Provincial branches as follows :—

REPORT OF THE ONTARIO BRANCH.

Early in the year an announcement was issued by the Dominion Council of the Alliance, in which was embodied a call for an immediate advance upon the line of

Scott
March
promp
submi
aged
failed,
than d
in 188
Provin
while
in the
majori
had an
an agg
Counti
only ei

Each
branch
Execut
action
us a m
Execut
were gi
to visit
tests.
at near
takes a
Executi
this con
professi
importa
cost less
tion of

The
entirely
vention
\$150 and
great wo
exclusive
fully pre
seventy
literatur

The
of the fo
Dominion
at his res
an enterp
memo. on
The r
the effect
o into op
legally in
Secretary

Scott Act agitation. The convention of the Ontario Branch, held on the 25th of March, warmly endorsed this proposed policy, and arrangements were made for a prompt and energetic campaign. Before we had completed our arrangements for the submission of the Scott Act in the different Counties selected, the liquor party managed to precipitate a repeal vote in Halton; but their most desperate efforts utterly failed, and Ontario's banner County sustained the Scott Act by a majority of more than double that by which it was first secured. This advantage was followed up, and in 1884, besides the struggle in Halton, there were thirteen other contests in this Province. Out of these we carried ten, our smallest majority in any case being 602; while the largest majority of the Anti-Scott Act party was 194. The aggregate vote in these fourteen Counties was: In favor of the Act, 43,953; against, 32,967. Total majority for the Act, 10,693. Since the commencement of the present year we have had another instalment of glorious victories, carrying four of our best Counties, with an aggregate majority of about 3,500 votes. Our Province has thirty-eight Municipal Counties and ten cities, making, in all, forty-eight Scott Act divisions; and there are only eight of these in which campaigns have not yet been inaugurated.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Early in the year the Toronto Auxiliary of the Alliance was merged into this branch, the Executive Committee of that body being added to the Ontario Branch Executive, and the funds of the Auxiliary were made over for our use. This generous action of the Toronto friends has helped us materially in our finances, and has given us a much stronger central organization. There have been eleven meetings of the Executive, with an average attendance of nine members. The Secretary's services were given free, but the Alliance hired a clerk to assist him, and he was thus enabled to visit different parts of the Province and take part in most of the Scott Act contests. Special efforts were made to have a well-posted representative of the Alliance at nearly every meeting of the inauguration of work, and by this means many mistakes and delays were avoided. Advice upon many legal points was obtained by the Executive, and furnished without charge to the workers in different Counties. In this connection, the Executive would express their great indebtedness to the eminent professional gentlemen who have kindly and freely given their assistance in this important matter. The total work performed by the Alliance during the year has cost less than \$650, including all office expenses, travelling expenses, and the circulation of literature.

LITERATURE.

The furnishing of literature during the past year has been done almost entirely by the Citizen Publishing Company. It was decided at the last Convention to furnish the "Canada Citizen" free to subscribers to the Alliance funds of \$150 and upwards. This paper, edited by the Alliance Secretary, has been doing a great work during the year. It has scattered over the country in its own circulation, exclusive of all advertising matter, about one and a quarter millions of pages of carefully prepared Temperance and Scott Act literature. The company has also issued seventy thousand copies of the "Scott Act Herald," and has furnished campaign literature, including correct legal forms, etc.

F. S. SPENCE, Secretary.

REPORT OF THE NOVA SCOTIA BRANCH.

The first event of importance since the last annual meeting was the death of one of the founders of this Branch, Avard Longley, of Paradise, a Vice-President of the Dominion Alliance, and an active member of the Executive of this Branch. He died at his residence in February last, on his sixty-first birthday. As a temperance man, an enterprising citizen, and a Christian, his loss has been deeply felt. Suitable memo. on his death was transmitted to his family.

The next event was the decision of Judge Thompson, of the Supreme Court, to the effect that as there was no date fixed for the "Canada Temperance Act, 1878," to go into operation in such counties where licenses were not granted, the Act was not legally in force in the counties where it had been adopted. In my report to the Secretary (acting) of the Dominion Alliance, soon after our last annual meeting, I

suggested an amendment to the Act providing that whenever the Act should be adopted by the electors of a County or District in which licenses were not granted, that it should go into effect immediately on the issuing of the Governor-General's proclamation. In a telegram to a member of the Government I made the same and other suggestions. As you are aware, the law was amended by Parliament during its last session, and to the effect that when adopted in Counties or Districts where no licenses are running, it shall go into operation in thirty days after the date of the Governor-General's proclamation.

Owing to a diversity of opinion as to the validity of the "License Act, 1883," and appeals against legal action had thereon in numerous places, the Government decided to amend the law, in order that officials could act leniently with persons who might take out licenses under its provisions, until a decision on its constitutionality could be rendered by the Supreme Court of Canada. This amendment was agreed to by Parliament. The matter has been under consideration of the Court for some time past, but no decision has yet been reached.

The only Counties and Districts in this Province which come under the provisions of the "License Act, 1883," are the City of Halifax; the Counties of Halifax, Guysborough, Richmond, Victoria, Antigonish, and Lunenburg. All the other counties are now governed by the Scott Act.

At a Convention held in this city on the 21st inst., it was decided to have the Scott Act submitted to the electors of Halifax City and County. For submitting it to the county (outside the city), the vote was unanimous; on the vote to have the Act submitted to the electors of the city, there were but two dissentients. The Convention was composed of a respectable number of intelligent delegates, able and active workers in the temperance movement. The discussion occupied the whole time of the Convention, and the resolutions passed after a careful deliberation. It is conceded that there will be a large majority in the county for the adoption of the Act. Some friends of those engaged in the liquor traffic are of opinion that there will be a majority vote in its favor in the city. Respecting the latter temperance men have their own opinion.

Since my last report to the Dominion Alliance, the electors of the County of Cumberland have voted on the Act, and adopted it by a majority of 1,298. The County of Yarmouth has also adopted it by a majority of 1,204. The Scott Act is now in operation in twelve of the eighteen counties of this Province, on a majority vote of nearly 12,000.

Petitions in favor of having the Act submitted to the electors have been circulating in Lunenburg County for some time past, and a similar movement has been commenced in Guysborough County.

Temperance is advancing in Nova Scotia. The Roman Catholic and other denominational organizations are doing a good work, with fair results. The Order of Good Templars has made some progress during the last few months. The Sons of Temperance, with commendable liberality in sustaining their Agency Department, by which they are enabled to keep two agents in the field, and with their official organ and other efficient machinery, have done a grand work during the past two years. It is estimated that there are 45,000 to 50,000 pledged abstainers in Nova Scotia, including many children enrolled in Bands of Hope and other juvenile Temperance organizations.

In a majority of the counties there are County Associations, of which only four are affiliated with the Provincial Branch. We look forward to doing a good work in Nova Scotia during the ensuing year.

PATRICK MONAGHAN, Secretary.

Halifax, N. S., January, 1885.

The Treasurer's report was read, and referred to the Finance Committee.

On motion of the Rev. B. B. Keefer, the reports of the Provincial branches were referred to the Committee on the State of the Work.

Mr. McLaren, Q. C., then spoke as follows on

“THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE SCOTT ACT.”

The subject which I have been asked to open the discussion upon would be one of the most important coming before the Council. The experience of some years ago showed that the Temperance people in the Eastern Provinces and Manitoba knew how to carry the Scott Act. The experience of the last year has shown even more conspicuously than could have been expected that the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec also knew how to carry it. That work is going on so well that there does not remain very much for the Alliance to do in that line. To stir up our friends to secure the passing of the Act in every possible county and city seems to be unnecessary, as they are thoroughly alive to their duties in that respect. The question of agitation, then, may largely be dispensed with at present. He next referred to some of the difficulties which presented themselves to the enforcement of the Act. The doubt about its constitutionality, which hampered the friends in the East and paralyzed their efforts, have been fortunately removed. Other difficulties have been removed by legislation, which has assisted in perfecting the Act as a practical measure. Notwithstanding these improvements, there were matters, which had to be looked fairly in the face, and some difficulties, which the Alliance would be wanting in their duty if they did not call the attention of those who passed the Act to them, in order that they may be prepared to meet them. In regard to temperance legislation, the Parliament of this country has hitherto gone upon an entirely false assumption, in the main. Parliament passed Acts; but it compelled temperance people to enforce them. I have respectfully protested against this state of affairs. (Applause.) Offences against this Act are not offences against Temperance people or against Scott Act people, as such; but they are offences against the dignity of the law, against the community in general, and against society. If any offences against the person or property are committed, the law has recognized officers, whose duty it is to see the law enforced. There are tenfold stronger reasons why Parliament should supply all the machinery for enforcing such a law as the Temperance Act of 1878. (Applause.) Offences against that Act are offences against the dignity and supremacy of the law, and *prima facie* offences against society as a whole. For that reason the exponent of the law (Parliament and Government) should have representatives, whose duty it should be to see to the enforcement of these laws. It would be more reasonable to claim that those people who are particularly opposed to dynamite should not have officials to bring dynamitards to justice. I would lay down the proposition, in the first place, that the Government should supply the machinery for the enforcement of the Act. All friends of good government should insist that there should be appointed in connection with the enforcement of the Scott Act officials who are heartily in sympathy with it. One of the greatest defects that now remains, and which is the greatest obstacle to the satisfactory enforcement of the Act, is the clause relating to the giving of liquor under doctors' certificates. The sessional papers last year showed how that privilege was abused in Halton. In some places the Act was brought into disrespect by hostile and unscrupulous medical men, who, in some instances, it is alleged, actually thrust these certificates on people, in order to bring the Act into disrepute. Some amendments are required in this respect. A penalty should be imposed upon any doctor who should give any bogus prescription to obtain liquor. The question is often asked, Can the Act be enforced? I can only say, in reply, that from recent investigation and inquiry in the County of Halton, and having passed through the late campaign, — having come in contact with many people in the county, notwithstanding the effects of fraudulent doctors' certificates, the Act was effectively enforced in that county. (Hear, hear.) From personal observation I can decidedly affirm that the Scott Act was an enforceable Act,

because it is being enforced in the County of Halton under trying circumstances. He next strongly advocated the sustaining of organizations, in order that the Act, after having been passed, should be rigidly enforced. These organizations, at the outset, should endeavor to appoint a proper official to see to the enforcement of the Act. They should have legal advisers, in order not to make mistakes, as have occurred in some counties. The friends in Lambton and Perth were given considerable trouble owing to want of advice. Those in Manitoba have had to raise \$3,000 for law expenses, because they did not obtain advice in time. The first prosecution should not be taken out unless it is a sure case. When the first, second, and third convictions have been obtained, there is a clear record that cannot be called into question. The consequences of such sure action may be seen in Halton. I would like to pay a high compliment to W. H. Young, the magistrate in that county, who has proved the practicability of the Act. (Hear, hear.) He instructed the friends of the Act to beware of hostile magistrates. In the counties where the Act has been adopted a reliable man should be appointed as a private prosecutor. The share of the penalty derived from convictions would amply repay an inspector for his trouble. It was desirable to have a Stipendiary or Police Magistrate in counties where the Act is in force, as no appeals could be taken from their decisions. When two Justices of the Peace tried a case it might be appealed on the same conditions as other summary convictions. I would therefore advise our friends in all places where they have carried the Act, (1), to keep up their organization and have a fund for its enforcement; (2), to have one or more reliable private prosecutors, who might either be paid from the fines or be paid a salary, the fines being funded for that purpose; (3), to secure the best legal assistance available, at the outset, that convictions might not be set aside for irregularities; (4), where practicable, to obtain the appointment of Stipendiary or Police Magistrates and other officials, who would honestly aid in enforcing the Act. If these precautions were taken, and faithfully followed up, I am satisfied that the Scott Act would be as strictly enforced as any other Act intended to act as a check upon the baser propensities of a considerable portion of the community, and would show to Parliament and the Government that the country was not only ready for the enactment of a general prohibitory measure, but prepared to have it enforced.

An interesting discussion followed, participated in by Rev. B. B. Keefer, Wm. McCraney, M.P., W. G. Fee, J. W. Manning, Prof. Foster, and others.

It was moved by J. R. Dougall, seconded by Rev. Mr. Newnham, and carried:

"That this question of the enforcement of the Act be referred to a Special Committee, consisting of J. J. McLaren, Q.C., Prof. Foster, Wm. McCraney, M.P., Thomas Robertson, M.P., and Rev. B. B. Keefer, to report to this Council."

The President read a communication from the W. C. T. U., inviting the members of the Alliance to a reception to be held in the Dominion Methodist Church, on this, Thursday, evening, at 9.30 o'clock. On motion of J. W. Manning, this invitation was accepted with thanks.

Moved by F. S. Spence, and carried,

"That when we adjourn, we stand adjourned till 10 o'clock Friday morning."

The Council adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

FRIDAY, 10 A. M.

The minutes of Thursday afternoon's session were read and approved. It was resolved, on motion of J. W. Manning, seconded by W. McCraney, M.P.,

"That the Executive Committee be instructed to arrange, in future, for a public meeting on the evening of the second day of the Council's session."

Mr. J. R. Dougall rendered the following report on behalf of the Committee on Literature:—

1. We learn with satisfaction that during the year just passed, a very large amount of Temperance Literature has been distributed through the agencies of the Alliance, the Scott Act Associations, and the W. C. T. Unions. This literature has been of the very best service in the promotion of Temperance and Prohibition.

2. We mention with special pleasure the *Canada Citizen* paper and publications, the *War Notes*, *Messenger*, and leaflets of John Dougall & Son, and the valuable series of Temperance tracts by Prof. Foster, and recommend the still wider use of these very efficient instrumentalities.

3. We recommend each Provincial Alliance to adopt or establish a paper to serve the double purpose of an advocate of its principles and methods of work, and of a bond of union among its membership, and that such paper be given to each subscriber of a certain sum and upwards, to the funds of the Alliance.

4. We recommend the continuation of the publication of the Alliance Year Book, and that it be issued within at least sixty days from the date of the annual meeting.

(Signed),

G. E. FOSTER.

This report was, on motion, received and considered clause by clause. Each clause being duly adopted, the report, as a whole, was adopted.

The Committee on Nominations rendered a partial report recommending that, in future years, the Vice-Presidents of the Alliance consist of the Chairman of each Provincial Alliance, *ex officio*, and two other persons to be nominated from each Province. Rev. J. Wood moved the adoption of this recommendation. Mr. Robertson, M.P., moved in amendment that the recommendation be made applicable to the present year, as well as to the future. It was moved in amendment to the amendment, that the partial report be referred back to the Committee, with the recommendation that the system hitherto existing should be continued. The amendment to the amendment was carried.

Prof. Foster, M.P., then delivered the following address on

ALLIANCE WORK.

In speaking for a few moments upon Alliance work I wish to be as practical and brief as possible. I would recommend,

1. *Improved Business Methods in this Council.*— Without casting any reflections upon the methods previously followed, I think it will be within the knowledge of all of us that these methods could be improved.

Our meeting could and should be more generally advertised, and an effort should be made to give to it a national importance. It should be a representative gathering of the freshest and strongest from the whole field of work, and be looked upon as an event in the yearly history of our movement. The city should be thoroughly advised of the time and place of our meeting, and a public demonstration fitting to the importance of the time and the place should be organized under the auspices of the Council. Members of Parliament should be interested, and made to see that in this gathering could be felt the pulse and spirit of Canadian Prohibition. Invitations from the Executive, sent to all members and Senators, would no doubt gain the attendance of a large proportion of these gentlemen.

I would recommend, also, that we have a public breakfast or supper for members and friends of the Alliance, which should be made a stated incident of this yearly gathering, where in the unrestrained and informal enjoyment and amity of social intercourse we could better learn to understand the oneness and scope of our organization, and in short talks arrive at a better appreciation of the work performed and that which remains to be done. In this way, by a thorough advertisement of our annual meeting, by a thoroughly organized public demonstration, and by the freedom of intercourse and good fellowship developed at the social board, we should give a standing and importance to this representative gathering of the Alliance which it does not now enjoy.

2. *We need, also, a better arrangement of business, and a better execution of our resolves.*— Too much time is wasted in getting to work, and too much breaking up of the meeting by calling committees out during the hours of the sessions. If the session of the Alliance were to begin in the evening, when committees could be appointed who should have their work ready for the regular morning session, or if standing committees would be prepared with their reports for presentation in the early part of the sessions, much valuable time would be saved, and the Council could sooner and more profitably go to its real work.

Then, again, we must have a resolve, and hand our work to our Executive during recess. Often this is not done. There were last year many things recommended, and there has not been a moiety of them looked after. It is of little use for to meet, discuss and come to conclusions, and then allow our conclusions to lie over, unembodied, until we again meet. The Executive should see to it that what has been entrusted to it be carefully carried out.

Then we need a thorough and systematized report of the work in Canada presented to us by the Executive at the beginning of the session. This should consist not of extracts from Provincial reports merely, but should include every event of importance that has transpired in the Temperance movement in our country for the year past.

And, lastly, we should have our YEAR BOOK published as soon after our meeting closes as possible. People wish to get, it when the subject matter is fresh, and care comparatively little about it if it is delayed until the close of the year.

It is of the first importance, too, that in our Alliance work we strive earnestly to

3. *Eliminate all party bias and party rivalries from our organization, here and in the Provinces.*— In our selection of officers, in our organization of committees, in our utterances and discussions, we should always recollect that there are two great political parties represented by our membership; that each of them sends its strong and faithful temperance men to take part in deliberation, and that it would be to the last degree fatal to the success of our Alliance work if the union and harmony so essential should be broken by indiscreet allusions, ill-considered utterances, or any other development of that party spirit which has no legitimate or useful place in an organization like ours. Hitherto we have been very successful in maintaining that united and harmonious spirit, and I make these remarks, not in any way to reflect upon the past, but rather as an added caution for the future. Prohibition is getting farther and farther into politics; the sentiment is getting stronger and stronger in the country.

It may very well be that the temptation to designing politicians to make a stepping-stone of it for party interest will develop also. Our cause is too sacred, and has too great issues hanging upon it, to be allowed to become a football for party purposes.

4. *Distinctive Work.*—I believe the time has come when we need and should have a secretary of our own; not one who has the secretarial work of any other Alliance to perform, or who lives in some city remote from the capital of the country, but one who lives at Ottawa, and whose services are at the disposal of the Council for special lines of Dominion work.

His duty would be in the first place to do the secretarial work of the Council under the direction of the Executive; to advise with Alliances in the Provinces as to general lines of work; and, as being near the seat of government, to carry their representations to, and obtain information from, the proper departments. The counties and cities which are working for the adoption of the C. T. Act could send all petitions to him, and thus save a great deal of trouble and expense. He could see that these petitions were placed in the hands of the department, and could watch, probably facilitate, their progress through the initial stages, so important, and every step of which causes so much anxiety to the associations remote from the capital.

Many points will arise also in the enforcement of the Act in various counties, and these could be pressed to a conclusion by one upon the ground and authorized to represent the Alliance. He could also, if thought necessary, attend the various Provincial Alliance meetings to gain, as well as impart, very much useful information. I hope the Council will see its way clear to the selection of such an officer.

5. It should be the policy of the Alliance for the coming year to resist all encroachments upon the spirit or letter of the C. T. Act, and to press for the amendments thought necessary for its effective working. A lame Act is next to no Act at all. We are strong enough, and fortified with reason and justice, to demand that the Act be made thoroughly workable. And I do not think Parliament will refuse a request so reasonable and so evidently in the direction of good order and the execution of the public will.

Whatever assistance this Council can give, in the direction of enforcement of the law in the several counties and cities in which it either is or will be in force during the year, should be given. Upon the Provincial Alliances this duty will mainly fall, outside of the work of the authorities themselves; but by its influence of representation or protest, this Council may essentially aid the necessary and important work.

The policy inaugurated last year, and so successfully carried out, of polling all possible constituencies upon the Act, should be persevered in. Let us keep all we have gained, enforce the law wherever adopted, and wrest all possible territory from the traffic.

Mr. J. R. Dougall, Mr. W. G. Fee, and Rev. W. Scott, took part in the discussion that followed.

It was moved by Mr. Fee, seconded by Rev. W. Scott,

“That the suggestions made by Prof. Foster *in re* Alliance Work be submitted to the Special Committee appointed to consider, and report on the enforcement of the Scott Act, and that said Committee report to the Council this afternoon.”
Carried.

On motion the names of W. G. Fee, S. A. Fisher, M.P., and J. R. Dougall were added to the above-mentioned Special Committee.

Prof. Foster presented the Report of the Committee on Legislation, which was as follows:—

The Committee on Legislation beg leave to report,

“That in view of the recent decisions of the Supreme Courts *in re* The Liquor Cense Act, 1883, maintaining the constitutionality of those clauses which look to

the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, this Alliance would strongly urge upon the Government the necessity of having the Act strictly and impartially enforced."

"That the Alliance desires to impress upon the Government the advisability of having all officers, whose duty it is to look after the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act, persons whose sympathies shall be in favor rather than against the principle and methods of the Act."

"That it is the opinion of the Alliance that in the consolidation of the Dominion Laws now going on the clauses of the Liquor License Act, 1883, which relate to the enforcement of The Canada Temperance Act, 1878, ought to be consolidated with and embodied in the said Canada Temperance Act, 1878."

"That certain amendments, as outlined, are considered necessary for the perfect working of the Canada Temperance Act, and that these and whatever we consider necessary be referred to the Committee on Legislation, which shall continue to act with full power during the session of Parliament, that this Committee take measures to have them incorporated into the Canada Temperance Act."

"That we recognize with great satisfaction the success which attended the policy last year inaugurated by this Alliance of instituting a vigorous campaign for the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act in all parts of the Dominion, and we reiterate and re-affirm our convictions that for the present year this same policy be vigorously carried out. Let our motto for the year be 'A poll for the Canada Temperance Act in every possible constituency of Canada.'"

The Report was on motion adopted.

The Report of the Committee on the "State of the Work" was read by Rev. D. V. Lucas, and on motion adopted.

The Report was as follows:—

1. The Committee is gratified in being able to report encouragingly from every part of the Dominion. The wonderful progress made since our last council meeting is known to all temperance workers. The Province of Ontario has carried the Canada Temperance Act in 15 counties and one city. The Act will be on the 1st of May next in force in 9 counties. The Act has been and continues to be most thoroughly enforced in the county of Halton. In all those counties in which the Act will come into force in May, the temperance people seem to be fully alive to the necessity of its proper enforcement. With only a few exceptions all those counties in the Province where the Act has not been carried, are taking steps towards securing its adoption. The Province has never been so fully alive as now to the work of prohibiting the liquor traffic.

In Quebec the Act has been adopted in three counties, and will come into force in all three in May next. Five counties are now preparing for submitting the Act to the electors. The Catholic population are beginning to take hold of the work. Some of the French papers give expressions of their delight whenever a Scott Act victory is announced. The growth of public sentiment may be seen in the County of Stanstead, where the Act was lost three years ago by 200, but now during the past year was adopted by 325 of a majority.

The Province of British Columbia desires to join fully and heartily in the great prohibitory movement of the day, but has been hindered by the fact that the province is divided into electoral districts and not counties. An amendment to the Act will be sought during the present sitting of Parliament, and it is hoped that our Pacific Province may then take an honorable place among her sister provinces in this national movement.

Manitoba is moving onward. The Act is shortly to be submitted to the electors of the city of Winnipeg, and to those counties which have not yet adopted it.

The Maritime Provinces, which took the lead in the adoption of the Canada Temperance Act, have labored under the difficulty of having had in that part of the Dominion, the constitutionality of the Act questioned, which rendered it difficult to enforce for some time. The friends of the Act, however, have manifested their utmost confidence in the Act, as seen especially by their efforts to prevent its repeal, in every instance being successful.

We are glad to learn that the temperance friends of the Maritime Provinces are taking steps to secure the enforcement of the Act.

We would recommend to all the Provinces the appointment of agents who can give their time exclusively to the work of the Alliance.

We would also repeat the recommendation of last year, to hold Conventions and picnics in various parts of the several Provinces for the purpose of keeping up the agitation now going on with an ultimate view of securing total prohibition.

The meeting then adjourned.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

The Council re-assembled at 2.30 p.m. The minutes of the morning session were read and confirmed.

Prof. Foster reported on behalf of the Special Committee to take into consideration suggestions made regarding "the Enforcement of the Scott Act," and "Alliance work." The following is the report which, considered clause by clause, was adopted :

Your committee appointed to take into consideration and report upon the suggestions made by Mr. McLaren with regard to Scott Act enforcement, and by Prof. Foster upon Alliance work, beg leave to report.

1. That these gentlemen be requested to prepare a summary of their addresses for publication in the Year Book.

2. That with reference to the former we recommend :

(a) That the people have a right to expect that the machinery appointed under the provisions of the law be strictly and impartially applied, and made to prove equal to its full and efficient enforcement, and that by representation and remonstrance they seek to remedy any laxity or failure that may take place in the same.

(b) That the Temperance people co-operate in every possible way with the officers appointed to carry out the provisions of the Act.

(c) That to this end in every county or city which has adopted the Act, an active and thorough organization be maintained, with strong central power, and effective vigilance committees for the double purpose of securing informations against offenders, and keeping watch over the proper enforcements of the Act.

(d) That in the event in any locality of non-enforcement of the law, private enforcements shall be resorted to, and these be made as efficient as means and wisdom can make it.

(e) That in all counties and cities, the Associations interested avail themselves of the best possible legal talent.

3. With reference to the second, we recommend :

(a) That an Alliance supper and re-union be held on the evening of the first day's session of each annual meeting.

(b) That a public Alliance Demonstration be held on the evening before the day of the first session of the Alliance.

(c) That the first business meeting of the Alliance take place at 9 a. m.

(d) That the Corresponding Secretary shall in addition to his secretarial duties be constituted the Ottawa Agent of Dominion Alliance work, and that his duties in general be: To supervise, publish and distribute the Year Book; to carry out in conjunction with the Executive Committee the resolutions of the Alliance and the interim work of the same. To make full arrangements for the annual meeting, notify all delegates specially and the public generally of the date, sessions and business programme of the annual meeting, invite all members of Parliament in sympathy with our aims to take part in our deliberations, and in general to so arrange that the annual meeting shall be a successful and useful one. To take charge of all Scott Act petitions which may be forwarded to Ottawa, and watch their progress to completion. To be the medium by which all points of dispute in reference to the Canada Temperance Act be brought to the attention of the Government. That the salary for this year be put at \$— and that the Executive Committee be charged with the duty of raising the same.

On motion it was voted to reconsider the resolution passed at the morning session instructing the Executive to arrange in future for a public meeting on the evening of the second day of the Council's session.

F. S. Spence moved, seconded by Rev. J. Wood, the adoption of the following resolutions:—

Resolved,—1. That while this Alliance believes that the carrying out of the various recommendations made at this meeting would materially tend to the effectiveness of existing legislation, this Convention emphatically re-affirms its confidence in total prohibition as the only right means of dealing with the liquor traffic;

2. That the time has come when Parliament ought to pass such legislation;

3. That this Convention heartily thanks the members of Parliament who so ably supported the policy of prohibition at the last session;

4. That this Alliance looks to the members of Parliament who have already so loyally stood by the cause of prohibition to take whatever steps may seem to them most wise to bring about the result aimed at as soon as possible.

These resolutions were laid on the table to be considered later in the session.

On motion Rev. B. B. Keefer was appointed convener of the Committee on Resolutions.

The business of the Alliance was suspended for a short time for the purpose of receiving the representatives of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. The Chairman introduced Mrs. Youmans, President of the W. C. T. Union, and Mrs. Buell, Corresponding Secretary of the National W. C. T. Union of the United States, who both gave short addresses. On motion of Prof. Foster it was

Resolved—“That we reciprocate the sentiments of the W. C. T. Union expressed through their representatives, and thank them cordially for their kindly visit.”

The Committee on Finance rendered their report which was laid on the table for consideration later on.

Mr. S. A. Fisher, M.P., delivered the following address on

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION.

In introducing the question of Additional Legislation for discussion, the report of the Legislative Committee has already opened the discussion to such an extent that I find some difficulty.

The subject, however, is necessarily divided into two main branches, one under the head of amendments to present laws to make them perfect, and the other, any new or novel proposals for Legislation. We find ourselves to-day in a far different position to that occupied a year ago. The county has been appealed to and has spoken. As we look around this Hall and see the many shields bearing the names of the Scott Act victories with the almost always large majorities, we may be tempted to congratulate ourselves and think of resting on our laurels. But such should not be the case; our work is only just well begun. More and greater Scott Act Victories must be won, and besides we have a graver responsibility on our shoulders, namely, to enforce the law we have asked the people to adopt. We have held out great inducements of benefits to accrue to the community in which the Scott Act is adopted, but if the law is not made effective, these benefits will not be found to result. Not only will the Scott Act be discredited, but total prohibition will be greatly retarded, and the people will prefer the old License system to nominal prohibition, but practical illicit sale. Now I believe it is the especial duty of the Alliance Council to assist in this enforcement of the Scott Act, by making the Scott Act as perfect as possible, and for this purpose amendments have been proposed, endorsed by this Legislative Committee and by our Solicitor, Mr. MacLarn.

Fortunately I believe that the House of Commons is to-day in a mood to pass such a measure. The situation in the House has changed since last year as much perhaps as outside. There are many members who would last year have voted against any Temperance Legislation, who to-day will have the fear of the general election before their eyes, and seeing the force and rapid progress of the Temperance movement, will think it prudent to vote on our side. I think, therefore, it is both our duty and our policy to boldly demand what we consider to be necessary for the proper perfection of the Scott Act, and I have no doubt but that we shall obtain it from the House of Commons. If the Senate refuses us this reasonable and just demand,—so much the worse will it be for the Senate.

I will not enter into the details of those amendments which are left to the Legislative Committee of the Alliance.

Then I come to the question of novel legislation and I find a proposition has been made to bring about a "plebiscite." I may say at once that I am totally opposed to this. Such action is not provided for in our system of Government. In asking this we would be asking an innovation on our Constitutional procedure and would consequently arouse and give good excuse for much opposition. Further, I do not consider that there is any necessity for any such innovation. We have in our Constitution every facility to pass a Prohibitory law and until every present constitutional method has been exhausted to bring this about and has failed I see no reason for proposing such new procedure. Moreover as a citizen of Canada, I am proud of and have every confidence in our present form of government, and I am loath to start any such change as this would be, knowing, that when such innovation had been adopted on this occasion, it would necessarily be available for other occasions, and might, and I believe would bring, about a very undesirable state of things in the Dominion.

I was glad to see that this proposition for a "plebiscite" when introduced at the meeting of the Provincial Alliance in Toronto, by Mr. Foster, was voted down, and I trust that the Council of the Dominion Alliance will also have none of it.

I will just add a few words as to the question of renewing in the House of Commons this Session, the Resolution in favor of Total Prohibition. I do not think it best to do so for these reasons: Last year the House of Commons affirmed the principle and it would do no good to reaffirm the same this year. I think it very necessary that we Temperance people should not place ourselves in danger of an accusation that

we are unnecessarily occupying the time and attention of the House on what will do no practical good, especially as we intend to do a good deal in what we think necessary work. Then I wish, when we next move such a resolution, that the result may be quite assured. Although I am quite sure the County wants Prohibition, and although we have a good deal of strong proof to that effect, enough to convince unprejudiced people, still there may not be enough to overwhelm opposition, and therefore we might not be able to enforce our proposition. But I believe that next year this Scott Act movement will have so advanced as to be a convincing proof of our position, and I trust that before that time some cities will have adopted and enforced the Act so that we may have the great additional force which their example will give to us. The result then will not be doubtful, and will rebound much more to the credit of the Temperance cause.

The resolutions of Mr. Spence, laid on the table, were then brought up for consideration and action. The first was adopted. Mr. G. M. Rose moved the adjournment of the debate on the second.

The Council adjourned to meet at 7.30 p.m.

FRIDAY EVENING.

The Council reassembled at 7.45 o'clock. The minutes of the afternoon session were read and confirmed.

After a lengthened debate on the second of Mr. Spence's resolutions, Rev. W. Scott moved the previous question which was carried. The main motion was then put which was carried, the yeas numbering 13 and the nays 9. The third was put and carried. The fourth was also adopted. Mr. F. S. Spence presented the following memorial from the Ontario Provincial Branch, which was on motion referred to the Committee on Legislation:—

Resolved,—"That this Convention expresses great satisfaction with the success of Northwest Territories Act, in promoting sobriety, prosperity and a regard for law and order; that we view with alarm the petition of the Northwest Council praying for an amendment by Parliament to permit the introduction of a license law; that we enter an earnest and decided protest against any impairment or mutilation of the present excellent Act which prohibits the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors in the broad territories of the new Northwest; that we memorialize the Dominion Alliance to take active steps to oppose in Parliament any effort to introduce the license system into the Northwest."

The Nominating Committee presented the following report, which was on motion adopted:—

We beg to nominate the following list of officers and executive for the year 1885-86:—

PRESIDENT:

Hon. Alexander Vidal, Senator, Sarnia, Ont.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

Hon. S. H. Blake, Q.C., Toronto.
Right Rev. Bishop Bond, Montreal.
Right Rev. Bishop Baldwin, London, Ont.
Sir S. L. Tilley, M.P., Ottawa.
Sir A. T. Galt, Montreal.

Hon. James Ferrier, Senator, Montreal.
Hon. R. W. Scott, Senator, Ottawa.
Hon. M. A. Girard, Senator, St. Boni-
face, Manitoba.

Hon. A.

Hon. D.

Hon. T.

Hon. S.

Hon. J.

Hon. G.

Lieut.-

Hon. A.

Hon. V.

A. H.

W. Mc

J. Scri

J. Jam

C. Bur

G. G. I

T. Rob

James

W. H.

David

Prof. F

N. Sha

S. A. I

M. Au

John A

A. W.

A. C. M

J. R. F

Dr. Fe

J. T. F

Judge

Judge

Ch

So

T

Co

Re

Co

of the

J. G. F

Abbott

to add

T

table

Y

was a

And in

To the

To the

VICE-PRESIDENTS—Continued.

Hon. A. R. McClellan, Senator, Hopewell, N.B.	E. McLeod, M.P.P., St. John, N.B.
Hon. D. Wark, Senator, Fredericton, N.B.	Rev. Dr. Dewart, Toronto.
Hon. T. R. McLanes, Senator, New Westminster, B.C.	Rev. Dr. Moore, Ottawa.
Hon. S. Creelman, M.L.C., Halifax, N.S.	Rev. A. A. Cameron, Winnipeg, Man.
Hon. J. W. Sifton, Brandon, Man.	Rev. Dr. Clark, Toronto.
Hon. G. W. Ross, M.P.P., Toronto.	Rev. Jos. McLeod, Fredericton, N.B.
Lieut.-Governor J. C. Aikins, Winnipeg, Man.	Rev. E. Robson, New Westminster, B.C.
Hon. A. Gayton, Argyle, N.S.	Rev. D. Frazer, Victoria, B.C.
Hon. Wilfred Laurier, Quebec.	Rev. J. M. Cameron, Toronto.
A. H. Gillmor, M.P., St. George, N.B.	Rev. John Shaw, Peterboro', Ont.
W. McCraney, M.P., Oakville, Ont.	Rev. W. Scott, Ottawa.
J. Scriver, M.P., Hemmingford, Que.	Rev. Dr. Burns, Halifax, N.S.
J. Jamieson, M.P., Almonte, Ont.	Rev. J. L. McFarland, St. John, N.B.
C. Burpee, M.P., Sheffield, N.B.	Rev. G. W. Hodgson, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
G. G. King, M.P., Chipman, N.B.	Rev. N. McKay, Summerside, P.E.I.
T. Robertson, M.P., Barrington, N.S.	Rev. D. L. Brethour, Milton, Ont.
James Reid, M.P., Cariboo, B.C.	Rev. Archdeacon Lindsay, Waterloo, Que.
W. H. Allison, M.P., Newport, N.S.	Rev. Dr. Potts, Montreal.
David Irvine, M.P., Wicklow, N.B.	Rev. E. W. Sibbald, Belleville, Ont.
Prof. Foster, M.P., Apohaqui, N.B.	T. S. Brown, Montreal.
N. Shakespeare, M.P., Victoria, B.C.	F. W. Hales, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
S. A. Fisher, M.P., Knowlton, Que.	Jos. Burrell, Yarmouth, N.S.
M. Auger, M.P., Roxton, Que.	W. H. Howland, Toronto.
John A. Kirk, M.P., Gleneig, N.S.	J. R. Dougall, Montreal.
A. W. Ross, M.P., Winnipeg, Man.	J. H. Flagg, Mitchell, Ont.
A. C. Macdonald, M.P., Montague Bridge, P.E.I.	J. W. Manning, Almonte, Ont.
J. R. Kinney, M.P., Yarmouth, N.S.	W. H. Lambly, Inverness, Que.
Dr. Ferguson, M.P., Kemptville, Ont.	G. M. Rose, Toronto.
J. T. Forbes, M.P., Liverpool, N.S.	J. T. Moore, Toronto.
Judge Jones, Brantford, Ont.	Andrew Cushing, St. John, N.B.
Judge Macdonald, Brockville, Ont.	J. Parsons, Halifax, N.S.
	Patrick Monaghan, Halifax, N.S.
	Richard Snelling, Toronto.
	Jas. Dobson, Toronto.
	John Macdonald, Toronto.

Chairman of Executive—Prof. G. E. Foster, M.P., Apohaqui, N.B.

Solicitor—J. J. McLaren, Q.C., Toronto.

Treasurer—George May, Ottawa.

Corresponding Secretary and Parliamentary Agent—Rev. John Wood, Ottawa.

Recording Secretary—Rev. A. P. McDiarmid, M.A., Ottawa.

Committee—The members of the Executives of the General Provincial Branches of the Alliance, with the Rev. F. W. Farries, Rev. Dr. Moore; Messrs. E. Storr, J. G. Howe, J. K. Stewart, J. B. Halkett, G. Hay, H. Alexander, T. B. Smith, S. A. Abbott, E. Botterell, J. M. T. Hannum, and John Lamb, all of Ottawa, with power to add to their number.

The following report of the Finance Committee which was laid on the table was then taken up for consideration:—

Your Committee on Finance beg to submit that on the 31st Jan., 1884, there was a balance due to the Treasurer of.....\$ 3 67
 And in addition there have been since incurred liabilities as follows, viz:
 To the Secretary for postage, etc..... 10 00
 To the Citizen Publishing Co. for printing, circulars, Petitions, etc..... 300 75

Making in all the sum of \$314.42 due by the Alliance; in addition to which the current expenses of the year should be provided for.

We find that no funds have been received by the Treasurer since our last meeting here on 31st January, 1884; and consequently, under the old system, the various Provincial branches might be called upon to contribute their proportion of the amount of money that is required. We therefore recommend that an assessment be made as follows:—

Ontario Branch.....	\$150 00
Quebec Branch.....	112 50
New Brunswick Branch.....	60 00
Nova Scotia Branch.....	60 00
Prince Edward Island Branch.....	30 00
Manitoba Branch.....	30 00
British Columbia Branch.....	30 00
	<hr/>
	\$472 50

But it may well be questioned, whether this be the best way of carrying on the work; and whether some plan should not be adopted of adding in another way to the sinews of war at our command.

We find at page 84, of the Alliance Year Book, for 1883, some remarks on this very point; and we respectfully recommend that the whole question should be carefully and thoroughly considered.

If an amendment were made to our Constitution, so that individuals might become life-members, by payment of a sum to be agreed upon; and if, in consequence, a number of life members could be got, this would likely result in giving a permanence and cohesiveness to our organization, which would be very desirable and which could not easily be attained in any other way.

Also it might be considered advisable to provide that the responsibility of seeing that the various Provincial assessments be regularly paid to the Treasurer, shall be laid on the Vice-Presidents of each Branch, so that the Executive should not be troubled about ways and means; and that the work laid upon the Executive may not be hampered.

The whole is respectfully submitted.

Ottawa
6th Feb., 1885. }

GEO. MACLEAN ROSE, *Chairman.*
J. M. M. DUFF, *Secretary.*

It was on motion adopted, and referred to the Executive Committee.

The Committee on Resolutions presented the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That we rejoice in the wonderful growth of the Temperance and Prohibition sentiment in this Dominion, as evidenced by the general submission of the Scott Act, and its almost invariable adoption by very substantial majorities. While recognizing the very valuable aid rendered the cause by the various Temperance organizations throughout the Dominion, this Alliance would place on record their obligation to the women of this country, who through the Women's Christian Temperance Unions in the several Provinces, and by individual effort, have contributed so largely to securing these triumphs, and would specially commend the W. C. T. U. to the sympathy and support of the various branch Alliances throughout the Provinces, and respectfully urge upon the Executive having charge of respective campaigns, the advisability of seeking the co-operation of the W. C. T. U. in conducting such contests.

This Alliance heartily congratulate the W. C. T. U. upon the formation of a Union for the Dominion, and accept the same as a prophecy of their extended and growing influence.

2. *Resolved*.—"That the thanks of the Alliance be presented Mr. F. S. Spence, of Toronto, for his valuable services as Corresponding Secretary of the Alliance, and

that Mr.
to Parliam
session."

3. T
that the
ance Ref
ministers
Sabbath

4. T
the City
its most
City Cle
is also d
Carried.

5. T
facilities

6. T
John W
in which

Al
respon

Th

Th
Coven

Th
year, an
was dec

Du
attitud

been so
without

speak r
There n

the slu
reasons

the pro
this ter

months
Licen
doubt,
enforc

I
genuit
cult at

after,
in this
had ti

If
in Ont
carrie

that Mr. Spence be requested to continue to act as agent for forwarding the petitions to Parliament respecting amendments to the Canada Temperance Act for the present session."—Carried.

3. That as it is of vast importance in the interest of religion and public morality that the Churches of Canada should manifest increasing favor toward the Temperance Reformation, the Council of the Alliance respectfully and earnestly request the ministers of all denominations to preach a sermon on this grave subject on the second Sabbath in December of the present year.—Carried.

4. The Council of the Alliance having again the satisfaction of meeting in the City Hall, of Ottawa, for the transaction of its annual business, desires to return its most sincere thanks for the accommodation afforded, and to W. P. Lett, Esq., City Clerk, for his attention to the convenience of the members assembled, who is also desired to convey our thanks to the City Council at its next meeting.—Carried.

5. The thanks of the Alliance are hereby tendered the various railways for the facilities granted the delegates in attendance at this Council.—Carried.

6. This Council desires to place on record its deep sense of gratitude to the Rev. John Wood, for valuable services rendered the Council, as Recording Secretary, in which capacity he has gratuitously served the Council for several years.—Carried.

All unfinished business, including the fixing of the salary of the Corresponding Secretary, was on motion referred to the Executive Committee.

The Council then adjourned.

A. P. McDIARMID,
Recording Secretary.

The following Reports were received too late for presentation to the Convention :—

REPORT OF THE NEW BRUNSWICK BRANCH.

The New Brunswick Branch of the Alliance has not been in active operation this year, and I have no report to make. At an informal meeting held here last week, it was decided to get to work again during the coming summer.

During the year the Scott Act has not been thoroughly enforced owing to the attitude taken by the Supreme Court of this Province. In some places liquor has been sold openly in defiance of the law. This is not the fault of the law, which, even without the machinery provided by the License law, is not difficult to enforce. I speak now from experience gained during the first year of the operation of the law. There need be no difficulty experienced in any community in driving the traffic into the slums; but you will readily understand that when the court is astute to discover reasons why convictions should be quashed, or at least their legality enquired into, the prosecution of offenders should be abandoned. Upon the Supreme Court paper of this term are 52 cases in which enforcement of convictions has been suspended for six months and more, pending the decision of the Constitutional question involved in the License Act. If the difficulties in the way are once removed—and they will, no doubt, soon be disposed of—I see no reason why the Scott Act should not be as well enforced as any other law.

I do not look for the absolute suppression of the sale of liquor—for human ingenuity cannot devise a law which cannot be evaded—but it can be made very difficult and disreputable. Before the Constitutional question was raised, and for a time after, the Scott Act was sustained by the Privy Council, liquor could not be purchased in this city except under circumstances almost equivalent to total prohibition. If I had time I could give you instances which would show this.

If I could say something which would reach the ears of all the temperance men in Ontario, it would be this? Do not relax your efforts because the Act has been carried. You should, if anything, redouble them. The fight is against an untiring

enemy ; and if you do not advance you must retreat ; standing still is an impossibility. My own view, and it will be corroborated by all who have had experience with the working of the law here, is that the Scott Act, and the License Law provisions respecting it, form together a very complete and workable law, and requires no material amendments.

Yours truly,

CHAS. H. LUGRIN.

Fredericton, N.B., February 3rd, 1885.

REPORT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA BRANCH.

Nanaima, B. C., Jan, 26, 1885.

TO THE COR. SEC'Y DOMINION ALLIANCE.

DEAR SIR,—Some years ago, at the request of the General Council, I called a convention and assisted in the organization of a Branch of the Alliance for British Columbia.

The committee of the Branch requested the Council to secure an amendment to the Canada Temperance Act, so as to extend its provisions to British Columbia, substituting our provincial electoral districts for the counties specified in the Act, as we have no township or county municipalities as in Ontario. As this has never been done, we have not been able to invoke the provisions of that Act.

Failing this, the officers of the Branch have given their attention to the subject of Sunday closing, restriction of the issue of licenses, and the enlistment of the clergy of different denominations in temperance work.

There has been no meeting of the Branch for some time past, and it is practically extinct.

Do not suppose from the above statement that no temperance work is being done. The Independent Order of Good Templars, Blue Ribbon Army, Women's Christian Temperance Union, and Royal Templars of Temperance, are all doing a good work in the Province.

Some of us think that if the Canada Temperance Act were available, it could be carried in a few of our electoral districts.

If an amendment is secured for British Columbia, it should be made to constitute our *Provincial* electoral districts, the basis of action. The districts, as established for Dominion elections, are much larger, and would be more difficult of management.

This Province is, I am sorry to say, far behind her sister provinces of the Dominion. There is no legal limit to the number of licenses that may be issued. All the bars are open on Sunday as on other days. A very large amount of liquor is consumed.

Hoping that you may have a good meeting of the General Council,

I am,

Yours very truly,

EBENEZER ROBSON.

REPORT OF THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND BRANCH.

During the past year two elections have been held in this Province, both being on petition to revoke the operation of the Canada Temperance Act. The votes were as follows :—

	For Petition.	Against Petition.
Prince County.....	1065.	2936.
Charlottetown.....	715.	755.

With reference to these figures, it is observable that the vote in both elections was very large. That cast in Prince County is larger than has ever been given at a Dominion election.

It is not easy to make an exact comparison in the case of Charlottetown, as there is a number of "royalty" and "special" voters, who vote in the Charlottetown constituency for a member of Parliament, but who do not vote on a matter concerning the City only; and as there is in this Province no registration of votes, it is difficult to get their exact number. But it may safely be said that the vote given in the City was nearly, if no quite as large as that given at the last Dominion election.

It is also worth noticing that at these two elections the liquor party exerted themselves to the utmost. Three years before they let the elections go by default, saying that the Scott Act would not do anything. At the last elections, both in Prince County and Charlottetown, they quite threw off their inactivity, and exerted themselves with all their force to induce the people to reject the Act, giving the curious reason "that there was more liquor sold than ever." The people gave more weight to their actions than to their words, and being unable to believe that the liquor sellers would spend time, effort and money to repeal a law which increased the sale of liquor, concluded that their energetic action against the law was due to the fact that the law pinched them, and so they voted down their petition.

In Prince County, nearly 900 more votes in favor of the Scott Act were cast in 1884 than in 1878. In Charlottetown, 72 less,—but the enforcement of the law is much more difficult in town than in the county, and difficulties about the enforcement discouraged some of our friends in town.

We have not been without legal difficulties during the past year. Complications arose from an apparent conflict of the Liquor License and the Canada Temperance Act, but since the Supreme Court has declared the unconstitutionality of most of the former Act, we have got to work again, and though it cannot be said that the sale of liquor has been suppressed, there is far less drunkenness to be seen. The Judges from the Bench have remarked upon the great diminution in crime, and have attributed it to the decreased facilities for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and the traffic has been driven from its position of legality and respectability into such holes and corners, that a man must part with his self-respect before he goes into them.

GEO. B. HONGSON, Secretary P.E.I. Branch.



HOW TO SECURE THE ADOPTION OF THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

BY PROF. FOSTER, M.P.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.—
the form
tion and
points.

TH
for hold
in the c

5.—
in Cou
ture ag
momer

O
ing tha
his vot
home,
that in

A

sured
test ov
longer

S
contes
able r

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

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

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

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

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

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



ORDER IN COUNCIL.

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

REGULATIONS

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

I.

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

Petition as per Schedule A of Act.

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

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

II.

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

(a.)

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

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

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

A. B.

Declared before me at _____
 of _____ in the county _____
 of _____ this _____ day of _____
 _____ 188____.

C. D.

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

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

(b.)

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

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

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

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

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

Where a difference in spelling or otherwise exists between the signature

as on the Petition and the name as on the Voters' List which it is desired to explain, a special declaration in explanation should be given.

(c.)

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

(d.)

A copy of the Revised Voters' List in force in the county or city at the time of the deposit of the Petition with the Sheriff or Registrar of Deeds.

(e.)

A declaration or certificate by the Sheriff or Registrar of Deeds of or in the county or city named in the Petition as to the date of the deposit of the Petition and the time it remained in his office for public examination by any persons.

(f.)

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

(True copy).

J. O. COTE,

Clerk Privy Council

M
whole
" "
import
should
brewer
real p
M
T
its ste
prohib
purpos
tion to
law."
T
Kings
M
attem
judic
happ
scope
this
mon
as th
000-
will
they
men
pre
tion
Tha
mar
Eve
mea
stit
any

THE DEBATE ON COMPENSATION

ON THE 25th FEBRUARY, 1891

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. KRANZ, M.P., for North Riding of Waterloo, moved for a Committee of the whole to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient whenever Parliament decides that a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquor for beverage purposes should be enacted, that equitable provision should be made for the compensation of brewers, distillers, and maltsters, so far as respects the diminution in the value of the real property, premises, and plant owned and used by them in their business.”

Mr. FISHER, M.P., for Brome, moved in amendment:—

That all after the word “that” be struck out, and the following be inserted in its stead: “That the time when Parliament proceeds to discuss the details of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation 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 a law.”

The following is the principal portion of the speeches of Prof. Foster, M. P., for Kings, N.B., and others, on the question thus brought before the House:—

Mr. FOSTER said: What is this resolution? It is nothing more or less than an attempt, in a time when there is a want of knowledge on the subject, in a time of prejudice, to bind the hands of the future by a resolution contingent on something else happening. And if I mistake not, although this resolution may have within its scope the compensation of brewers and distillers, it will have the effect—whether this is its motive or not—it will have this consequence: It will raise up a sum of money anywhere from \$12,000,000, which has been spoken of by my hon. friend as the capital invested in the brewing business to-day, up to \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000—it will raise that sum up as the probable sum which the people of this country will invite to fall upon their shoulders, and be laid as a burden on their backs if they pass a prohibitory law. Sir, I do not think it is the usual course for a parliamentary or deliberative assembly to proceed in that way.

Then, again, I think this resolution, as my friend on the other side has stated, is premature. Has it been discussed in the country? It may be said that the prohibition resolution last year was premature. But, I reply, there is a great difference. That question has been before the country for fifty years; it has been steadily marching forward towards its solution. Every year it has been increasing in strength. Every year the influences behind it have been augmented. This question has permeated every nook and corner of the land; it has gone into the centre of every constituency, it has been talked of at every fireside; and this Parliament last year, or any year within the last fifteen years, has had the data at hand to give a vote on that

principle, feeling certain that those who voted upon it would represent the aggregate feeling of their constituents. But where has this question of compensation been argued? In what constituency, in what nook or corner has it been raised? Is there a single representative here who can say: I can vote for this question, for or against, feeling that I know what the sentiments of my constituents are, and that by my vote I am representing them here.

(An hon. MEMBER. Yes.)

The hon. gentleman says he can. He then is one of the favored few, but I think the large majority of this House will feel that they cannot. Well, Sir, following that out, I do not think this House is in the position, in its representative capacity, to decide this question for or against compensation; because, whether this House does possess the knowledge of its constituencies far enough and wide enough to make a fair decision in this matter—even if they do not, yet the opinion will go out from this House, if it be taken in the affirmative or negative, the opinion will go out, that this Parliament of Canada, representing the people of Canada, would make this decision, when I hold that that would not be the case, but that it will be the gentlemen who are sitting in the Parliament of Canada, who have expressed their collective or aggregate opinion on this question.

Do not imagine that I wish to say that we should not discuss manfully and fairly and squarely the whole issue, and nothing else. I think we should; but I think we should reserve our opinion as a solemn declaration until we find out where our constituents are on this question. At least, that is my private opinion, guiding my own conduct and speaking for myself. Has this question come up on the ground of petition? Has there been a single petition put before Parliament asking that compensation should be given to the brewers and distillers and maltsters? Is there one from all this country—from the Island of Cape Breton to the Pacific ocean? Can there be produced on the Table of the House a single petition coming from the people asking that compensation be granted? I think not. And we are a representative body; we represent the people in this House. This is a large matter, involving at least \$12,000,000, according to what my hon. friend, the mover of this resolution, has stated to be the capital employed in breweries and distilleries. I say that, under the circumstance, as no voice of the people has asked for this action, it is too great a burden for us to resolve should be placed on them without consulting our constituents. It may be stated that a deputation which came to this city not many days ago, presented to the Government a memorial in which they claimed compensation. That may be; but it was not the compensation which is claimed in this resolution. That deputation, if I understood their memorial aright, asked for compensation for the license victuallers, for the coopers, for the employees, and for the cigar manufacturers. This, then, is not their resolution; it is not founded on their presentment of the case. This is somebody else's resolution, and is founded upon somebody else's presentment of the case, because the brewers and distillers are the only people included in it. Then I say that from the sovereign people of the country, in the exercise of their right of petition, there has not come a single voice to this Parliament asking that compensation shall be granted. So much, Sir, with reference to that point.

But this resolution is also, to my mind, one which we ought not to take into consideration, so far as to decide in favor of it, for another reason, and that is this: It

is a reso
the peop
which i
necessit
which t
argumen
the only
facturer
cigar m
the gro
records
the Do
sort of
the ope
argume
we find
the pou
in cons
being t
ment t
the dec
show v
Scott a
argum

W
I am
approa
prohib
be affe
provid
have n
have r
tion o
be ap
taken
they a
traff
regar
shoul

I
v
I
ing t
also
reme

is a resolution which, besides embodying something which has not been asked for by the people, besides tying the hands of the people in the way I have stated, is one which is not backed up by that amount of argument necessary to show that the necessity for it exists. I may just refer, in passing, to the kind of argument with which this demand is sometimes backed up. For instance, I think the only financial argument which was used by the deputation which came to Ottawa a few days ago the only argument which condescended to figures, was that used by the cigar manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen who have read their memorial will remember that the cigar manufacturers started out by arguing that they should have compensation on the ground that the Scott Act was injuring them; and they showed, from official records, a diminution of \$449,000 in the amount paid by the cigar manufacturers into the Dominion revenue in 1884, as compared with 1883; and then, by that strange sort of argument which so often prevails, they stated that this diminution was due to the operation of the Scott Act in the different counties. Now, Sir, examine that argument. When we come to look at the returns of the Minister of Inland Revenue, we find that last year the duty on tobacco was reduced from 20 cents to 12 cents on the pound. The Minister calculated that some \$803,000 would be lost to the revenue in consequence of that decrease; but he states in his report that, instead of \$800,000 being the decrease, the decrease was \$449,000. Now, you see what kind of an argument that was. The Minister of Inland Revenue says that the diminution is due to the decrease in the duty; but the memorialists, in order to use it as an argument to show why compensation should be granted to them, say it is due to the effect of the Scott Act on the cigar trade. This is an instance of the curious kind of *non sequitur* argument which is used in favor of compensation.

Well, Sir, I am glad this resolution has been brought forward, for other reasons. I am glad, because it shows that the finality is somewhat near, that the end is approaching, and that there is a feeling not only widespread among the people that prohibition ought to be established, but that there is a feeling amongst those likely to be affected by it financially that it is coming, and that it is an event that ought to be provided for. What does this resolution affirm? It affirms that these petitioners have no legal ground on which to base the continuance of their traffic, — that they have no legal ground on which to ask for compensation. If they had in the constitution of the country, or in the laws of the country, any such ground, they would not be approaching Parliament to-day by a resolution asking that measures should be taken to give them that compensation. They have also abandoned the ground that they are able to go before the country and argue, on the ground of right, that their traffic shall be maintained and their trade carried on. They distrust the people in regard to that; and they come to Parliament and ask that a compensatory resolution should be passed by this House.

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

When the debate was resumed, MR. FOSTER proceeded as follows:—

In the remarks which I was addressing to the House yesterday I was endeavoring to give some reasons why I did not regret the introduction of this resolution, and also some reasons why I should very much regret its passage. I stated, if you will remember, that I did not regret the introduction of the resolution, because it was an

admission of the strength of the Prohibition sentiment outside of this House, — an admission from those to whom the movement is opposed; that, in the second place, it was an admission that, on grounds constitutional and legal, the traffic had no hope of continued existence, or of compensation in the event of its existence being destroyed. I also said that I was glad the matter had been brought up for discussion in the House, as it was a question of very great importance to the country, and one upon which the mind of the country had not yet been very much exercised. When I had stated these reasons, I had stated all the reasons I had for not regretting that the resolution was introduced; but against the passage of the resolution there were several reasons which I urged. One was the unusual character of the resolution itself; the other was, that I thought an expression of opinion by this House — binding, as it would to some extent, the country; standing, as it would to some extent, for an expression of opinion of the country — would be premature, because the question had not been sufficiently discussed to allow us to get at what would probably be the sentiment of the country upon it. I also stated that I would be sorry to see it pass, because it was not based upon any popular demand, — because there was not a single public deputation, nor a single petition sent in from the country, upon which to base this demand for compensation to the brewers and distillers. I may state, in addition, that the resolution is not a logical one, because it is of a kind that we may call a class resolution. Heretofore the contention has been by the brewers and distillers that their business did not stand alone, but that other great interests were dependent upon it; that by its destruction other great correlative industries would suffer to a large extent; and if any plea has gone forth through the country as to why the brewing and distilling business should not be interfered with, it has heretofore been the plea that the destruction of other interests would be involved in the destruction of the brewing and distilling interest. But, in the face of all that, we find this resolution introduced into this House, and an attempt made to get the authoritative decision of this Parliament — upon what? Upon a proposition which includes but one hundred and thirty men in the Dominion, — a proposition which includes but the brewers and distillers nominally, which leaves entirely out of sight all those correlative industries and employments which we have heretofore been led to consider as depending upon and liable to be greatly injured if the business of brewing and distilling were interfered with.

There is another reason why I should not like to see the resolution adopted, and that is this — that it is a very unguarded resolution. A Prohibitory law may not be brought before the people for ultimate decision for one year, or three years, or five years, or even for ten years; but the very moment this resolution is passed, what happens? If there were no vested interests before, there will be vested interests after the passing of this resolution. It is now a moot question as to whether there may be vested interests or not. Some claim that there are, or ought to be; others, there are not. But from the moment this resolution is passed, it is a declaration that hereafter all those interests are vested interests, and must be considered in any attempt to legislate with reference to this traffic. I do not think so unguarded a resolution as this — one so liable to be followed by such consequences, financially, to this country — ought to be passed by this House. More than that, in all the years which may intervene, be they few or many, between the passage of this resolution

and the p
position to
the gain v
have not
chance of
arrives, h
furthest c
penation.
in that po

Again I s
is the pri
distilling
preventin
engaged i
not go far
the corner
who spok
fully and
prohibito
principle
compensa
posed to
without
further;
harder in
distilling
be taken
which h
and sows
or brewer
ple who
the prod
who wor
men who
while th
the men
twelve,
their con
inevitab
gentlemen
or distill
at all, it
poorer n
and dist
acted ju
at all, it

and the passage of a complete Prohibitory law, all brewers and distillers will be in a position to add to their business. They will be in a position to say, Let us make all the gain we can out of it; let us enlarge our places of business. And those who have not invested in it will say, Let us also invest our property in it; there is a chance of making money out of it until prohibition comes, and when that period arrives, here is a resolution which binds Parliament, and which will be pressed to its furthest consideration — that our interests will not be sacrificed without money compensation. I do not think it would be wise for us to put Parliament and the country in that position.

NOT A LOGICAL RESOLUTION.

Again I say that this resolution either goes too far or does not go far enough. What is the principle affirmed in it? It is this simple principle, that if the brewing and distilling traffic be interfered with by law to its injury, either by restricting it or by preventing it entirely, a money compensation should be given to those who are engaged in it. That is the principle. Now, I say, if that principle be true, it does not go far enough. I heard a good deal said yesterday about justice, about its being the corner-stone of good government; and I think quite a number of hon. gentlemen who spoke thought the ends of justice would not be met, nor the sentiment of justice fully and completely respected, unless this compensatory principle were added to the prohibitory principle whenever the latter should be affirmed. Sir, if it be true, as a principle, that if you interfere with the brewers and distillers' interest you should compensate them, where is the sense of justice, where is the broad principle supposed to be embodied in this resolution, that we should not prejudice any interests without full compensation, if it only includes brewers and distillers, and does not go further; if it does not include those who need compensation more, who have labored harder in this general traffic, and without whose labor there would be no brewing or distilling interests in this country to-day, no accumulated capital, and no profits to be taken from the capital? I say it does not go far enough to meet the idea of justice which has been urged by those in favor of compensation. The farmer who ploughs and sows his land, and brings the grain to market which is to be used in the distillery or brewery, the employé who works there, the railways which carry the grain, the people who distribute it, and the ten thousand or more who are the agents to distribute the production of the brewery and distillery to the consumers, — these are the men who work the hardest, who have, in the aggregate, the most at stake; these are the men who must get up early in the morning, and have their shutters off at six o'clock, while the rich brewer or distiller is quietly enjoying his morning's snooze; these are the men who must do the sweeping and scouring, who must stand behind the bars twelve, thirteen, or more hours a day; these are the men who must compromise with their conscience, and stifle its voice, as they see the misery which is connected, and inevitably connected, with their traffic, — yet these are all lost sight of by those hon. gentlemen whose sense of justice is so great that they could not allow the rich brewer or distiller to go without compensation. If we admit the principle of compensation at all, it is impossible for Parliament not to compensate that other and larger and poorer number who will be disturbed by the taking away of the traffic of the brewers and distillers. It will be impossible to look them in the face and say that we have acted justly and fairly. Either the principle should not be adopted, or, if adopted at all, it should be extended further than this resolution extends it.

I will proceed now for a moment, with the kind forbearance of this House, to discuss the question of compensation itself. That is the question which is before the House—if prohibition, then compensation. We are all under a debt of gratitude, I know, to the learned doctor who gave us such a disquisition upon the medical and other advantages of alcoholic stimulants yesterday. We were all interested in that touching case in which a woman was kept alive a whole year by a peculiar process of administering milk and whiskey; and we have all been left in a delightful state of uncertainty to know what it was that kept her alive—the milk or the whiskey. But the medical use of alcoholic liquors is not meant to be prohibited by any prohibitory law that I know of. The question is, Compensation or not?

THE VOICE OF PRECEDENT.

We have first to learn from the voice of precedent,—from the voice of related precedent. In all the legislation which has taken place with reference to the liquor traffic, have we any precedent for the compensatory principle or for the application of money by way of reparation for any restrictions or prohibitions? I think I can stand before this House, and, looking back through history, can challenge any one to present a case in the legislation which has taken place for the last hundred years in Anglo-Saxon countries in which a single penny has been paid for damage or loss which has come to the traffic, either from certain mild restrictions placed upon it or from the more drastic measure of complete and total prohibition. If we go back to English history, and to the history of legislation from the first, restrictions were placed upon it, which became greater in magnitude and power, and which must have interfered with the gains and must have curtailed the profits of the traffic; but not a single case can be found in which any one of these restrictions had attached to it the principle of compensation. You may take the year 1736 in the British House of Parliament, when, driven almost to desperation by the multiplied and constant evils which arose from the gin traffic, the House of Parliament in Great Britain passed the Gin Act, which was virtually prohibition; and yet that House of Parliament, noted for its conservatism, noted for its eminent sense of fairness, attached no compensation to it all. Following that up, you find another instance where, about the year 1742, the distillation from grain or flour or malt was distinctly prohibited. Well, as a result of that prohibition, what followed? Whereas in the year 1742 the consumption of alcoholic spirits was 19,000,000 gallons a year, from 1760 to 1782 the average yearly consumption had fallen to 4,000,000. There was a reduction from 19,000,000 to 4,000,000 of a yearly sale. Does not any one see that that interfered seriously with the profits and with the gains of the traffic? And yet that drastic measure was brought in and kept upon the statute-book, and not a penny of compensation was given. The Beer Bill was brought in in 1830. It was antagonized by the whole of the licensed victuallers' interest. You will see in the debates the petitions which were presented against it, and you will see that the most determined onset was made against the Beer Bill by the licensed victuallers and by the great brewers, because, they said, it threatened their entire trade; that their vested interests were to be injured; and that the families who depended upon that trade, that numbers of persons variously estimated at from 50,000 to 70,000 would be ruined by the measure; and the plea for compensation was put in. But the Beer Bill of 1830 was passed, and

those ve
sation ;
that, al
called u
Act wa
in intox
damagi
of alco
traffic i
was no
Sunday
Britain
with an
tory of
and res
of com
Su
The ol
stance
counti
gave n
Bruns
to it.
althou
Quebe
was a
Hous
away
and y
intell
comp
the li
If wo
State
leries
sweep
was
ten c
ple o
whic
1,86
atta
brew
larg
bein
tion

those vested interests were interfered with, and yet there was no mention of compensation; but in the debates those who were in favor of the Bill pressed the ground that, although these interests might be interfered with, the public had no right to be called upon to pay for any damage that might arise. In 1854 the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was passed in the Parliament of Great Britain, which did away with the trade in intoxicating liquors in Scotland for every Sabbath day in the year. That had a damaging effect upon the traffic. It took 2,000,000 gallons off from the consumption of alcoholic spirits, and one-third or a little less of the whole of the aggregate of the traffic in that kind of liquors. It was a serious detriment to the traffic, and yet there was no compensation given. We might cite the Irish Sunday-Closing Act, the Welsh Sunday-Closing Act; we might cite the fact that, upon the great estates in Great Britain, by prohibitory power vested in the landowner, these interests are interfered with and driven out, and the traffic to that extent curtailed. Looking over the history of liquor legislation in Great Britain, we find a constant series of prohibitory and restrictive measures, injuring the trade in every instance, without the principle of compensation being at all admitted.

Suppose we come to Canada, and ask what has been the course of legislation here. The old license legislation, such as existed in the province of Nova Scotia, for instance, which brought about virtually a prohibition in three-fourths or more of the counties in that Province, which absolutely forbade the trade being carried on, yet gave no compensation, even though it was asked. In 1855, the Province of New Brunswick passed a prohibitory law, which had no principle of compensation attached to it. In 1864, the Dunkin Act was passed in the old Parliament of Canada, and, although that was sufficiently elastic to be applied to every county and town in Quebec and Ontario, and so interfered materially with the traffic, no compensation was allowed. In 1878, the Canada Temperance Act was passed, both sides of the House agreeing to it, by which every county and city in Canada might entirely do away with the retail traffic and so might do away with the wholesale traffic as well; and yet the legislators of that day, who may be considered to have been as honest and intelligent, or nearly so, as the legislators of to-day, did not attach the principle of compensation to their law. So, if we take the precedents in Canada in reference to the liquor legislation, we find nothing which goes to support the idea of compensation. If we pass over to the United States of America, the ground is still stronger. The State of Maine in 1851, passed a prohibitory law. Breweries and distilleries—distilleries which had a capacity of more than one million gallons a year—were entirely swept away. There is not one there to-day; and yet the principle of compensation was not introduced or embodied in the law. Prohibitory laws have been passed in ten or twelve of the United States of America, and in no one of them has the principle of compensation been affirmed. In Kansas, in 1880, a prohibitory law was passed which immediately set itself to destroy thirty-nine breweries and two distilleries and 1,862 wholesale and retail liquor shops, and yet the principle of compensation was not attached to that law. In Iowa a prohibitory liquor law passed in 1882, by which 132 breweries, with a capital of \$2,000,000, and thirteen distilleries with a corresponding large capital, were shut, so far as the provisions of the law are concerned, and are being closed out in accordance with that law. Yet, Sir, there has been no compensation embodied in that law. And so with all these precedents before us of laws, vary-

ing from the restriction of the liquor traffic, through local option, to complete prohibition, we find Anglo-Saxon legislators, presumably with as much intelligence as we have ourselves, — presumably with just as great a sense of what is honest and just, — we find them legislating upon this matter without introducing, in any single instance, the principle of compensation. I think it will require a very strong argument to induce this House, or any other Legislature in the Dominion of Canada, to be the first to break this long array, and to adopt the principle of compensation in any prohibitory measure which they may enact and complete.

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 l
grasp, an
a time, t
lustered
people ov
for those
abuse, ev
with by
them off
politic.

It w
to take a
have am
West Te
of course
there wa
that new
world n
Congo s
and imp
was ma
drew fo
world, t
made th
entirely
a new
people,

Me
There i
evil wh
warnin
ago, an
ance m
tion of
ture.
the Le
Edwar
liamer
notice
gone c
upon t
shall
and t
are st

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 snuffed 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: Whenever 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 whenever 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
has been
from w
quanti
Sir, in
death,
commu

By
From t
tend t
is labo
which
is no p
ration
second
beer a
result
compa
been o
was d
produ
which
about
est fo
nothi
only
of th
the a
that
the t
lost t
is in
the g
cours
pose
prol
sons,
wort
\$2,00
labor
vital
scier
beca
'Cane
thes

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 \$36,000,000 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 illeness 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 criticise 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 \$136,520. 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. JAMIESON 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 Bromie (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. Possibly 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 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,	Melsaac,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	McLean,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fleming,	McMullen,
Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Mills,
Barnard,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bécharde,	Gagné,	Mulock,
Bill,	Geoffron,	Painé,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gilmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gordon,	Rav,
Bonleau,	Gunn,	Reid,
Bourassa,	Hackett,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Harcy,	Riopet,
Bryson,	Hay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hickey,	Scriven,
Cameron (Huron),	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Taylor,
Casey,	Jameson,	Temple,
Catudal,	Jenkins,	Townshend,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Trow,
Cochrane,	King,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Cook,	Landry (Kent)*	Watson,
Droust,	Langelier,	White (Renfrew);
Dives,	Laurier,	Wigle,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Wilson, and
Dickinson,	Macdonald (King's),	Yeo.—105.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbot,	Girouard,	Orton,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Guilbault,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Hall,	Pope,
Billy,	Hesson,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Irvine,	Rykert,
Burns,	Kranz,	Scott,
Caron,	Landerkir,	Small,

Chaple
Costig
Cough
Course
Curran
Cuthb
Dawso
Desaul
Desau
Desjar
Dodd,
Dugas
Fergu
Fortin
Feude

T

T

NAYS.—*Continued.*

Messieurs

Chapleau,	Landry (Montmagny),	Springer,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Sproulc,
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,	McDougall (Cape Breton),	Wells,
Dodd,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McNeill,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,	Williams,
Fortin,	Moffatt,	Wood (Brockville).—74.
Feudet,	O'Brien,	

The amendment was agreed to.

The main motion, as amended, was agreed to.

—*Official Report.*



THE RECORD OF THE C. T. ACT.

BY PROF. FOSTER, M.P.

The Act was passed and received the assent of the Governor-General in May, 1878.

It was first adopted in the City of Fredericton, October 31st, 1878. It went into force in the same city, May 1st, 1879.

It was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick in August, 1879.

On appeal, it was declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada in April, 1880.

On appeal, its constitutionality was sustained by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain, June 22nd, 1882. Machinery rites enforcement was incorporated in the Liquor License Act of 1883, passed by the Dominion Parliament in that year.

This was declared constitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada, in February 1885.

Appended is a table giving a complete record of the voting upon the Act up to April 3rd, 1885, showing the names of the constituencies, the total number of votes on the Roll, the total number of votes cast at last preceding general election for members of Parliament, the total number of votes cast at the C. T. Act election, the votes for and against, and the population of the constituencies adopting and rejecting the Act. There is also a column showing the representatives in Parliament for counties and cities adopting and rejecting the Act respectively.

THE RECORD OF THE C. T. ACT.

Representatives in Parliament.	NAME OF COUNTY OR CITY.	Total Number Voters on the Roll.	Total Vote Cast at General Election.	Total Vote C. T. Act.	Vote for C. T. Act.	Vote against C. T. Act.	Population of Constituencies.	Population of Anti-C. T. Act Constituencies.
1	Frederickton, N. B.	788	580	606	403	203	30397	
	" " 2nd Vote.	788	580	545	252	214		
	York, N. B.	4144	3221	1443	1229	655		
	" " 2nd Vote.	4144	3221	1845	1178	971		
2	Prince, P. E. I.	No registration.		2033	1762	1075	34817	
	" " 2nd Vote.	No registration.		4014	2939	149		
1	Charlotte, N. B.	4220	2802	1016	867	69	26087	
1	Charleton, N. B.	3913	3465	1284	1215	253	23365	
	Charlottetown, P. E. I.	No registration.		1190	827	715	11485	
	" " 2nd Vote.	No registration.		1470	755	114	12329	
1	Albert, N. B.	2300	1507	832	718	59	26435	
2	Kings, P. E. I.	7921	6268	1135	1076	2352	42616	
2	Lambton, Ont.	7695	6268	4949	2367	2982		
	" " 2nd Vote.	9993	6268	5819	2887	1546		
	" " 3rd Vote.	10500	6268	6004	4458	245	25617	
1	King's, N. B.	4499	3001	1043	798	181	14017	
1	Queen's, N. B.	2579	1970	496	315	299	37719	
1	Westmorland, N. B.	5754	4808	1381	1082	1701	25109	
1	" " 2nd Vote.	5754	4808	3475	1774	841		
1	Megantic, Que.	3321	2289	1213	875	673	15550	
1	Northumberland, N. B.	3267	2321	1701	760	941	36626	
1	" " 2nd Vote.	3267	2321	2752	1300	975	19446	
2	Queen's, P. E. I.	12165	6351	1416	1317	195	19881	
1	Marquette, Man.	4600	1960	807	612	42	10577	
1	Digby, N. B.	2802	1994	986	944	85	6651	
1	Queen's, N. S.	1574	1232	848	763	41	14910	
1	Shamrock, N. B.	1369	1155	917	176	807	5786	
1	Sheburne, N. S.	2266	1689	661	554	127		
1	Lisgar, Man.	2163	1480	374	247			

19056

Representatives in Parliament.	NAME OF COUNTY OR CITY.	Total Number Voters on the Roll.	Total Vote Cast at General Election.	Total Vote C. T. Act.	Vote for C. T. Act.	Vote against C. T. Act.	Population C. T. Act Constituencies.	Population of C. T. Act Constituencies.
—2	Hamilton, Ont.....	9618	7593	4472	1661	2811	23409	35961
1—	King's, N. S.....	3431	3064	1586	1478	108	21919	
1—	Hatton, Ont.....	4664	3561	2883	1483	1402	20598	
1—	" 2nd Vote.....	6049	3561	3714	1947	1767		
1—	Annapolis, N. S.....	3205	2705	1225	1111	1114	26720	31537
1—	Wentworth, Ont.....	6896	5045	3820	1611	2209	31258	
1—	Colchester, N. S.....	4147	3339	1602	1418	184	23359	
2—	Cape Breton, N. S.....	5605	3656	955	739	216		
1—	Hants, N. S.....	3642	2728	1174	1082	92	25651	26152
1—	Welland, Ont.....	7064	3798	3988	1610	2378	35585	
1—	Inverness, N. S.....	3546	2974	1098	980	106		
2—	Pictou, N. S.....	10107	5780	5008	1555	453	27368	26127
1—	St. John, N. B.....	3062	2439	2150	1074	1076	21284	
1—	Cumberland, N. S.....	4653	3498	1822	1360	96	49168	
2—	Yarmouth, N. S.....	3361	2107	1383	1287	262		
1—	Oxford, Ont.....	11327	6397	7371	4073	3298	37360	
1—	Arthabaska... } Que	6317	4232	3082	{ 1487	235		
1—	Drummond... }	13832	8774	10241	{ 1190	170	47515	
3—	Simcoe, Ont.....				5712	4529		
3—	Dundas... } Ont.	13057	9813	7474	4590	2884	66017	
3—	Stormont... }							
1—	Glenarry... } Peel, Ont.....	8017	4209	3804	1805	1999	65788	26175
1—	Bruce, Ont.....	12160	7941	7690	5957	4304	17168	
3—	Huron, Ont.....	13810	9250	3013	1904	1109		
3—	Dufferin, Ont.....	3697	2319	3013	1528	1653	21044	
1—	Prince Edward, Ont.....	5144	3869	3181	1748	1018	40125	
1—	Renfrew, Ont.....	5676	3751	2766	2781	1694	39952	
2—	Norfolk, Ont.....	7005	6596	4475	2781	1694		
2—	Compton, Ont.....	4265	2435	2752	1132	1620		

25338

1088 812

1690

2778

3567

5770

12789

19681

1620

1132

2152

2435

4255

Compton, Ont

2-1

2-	Braut, Ont.....	5770	3567	2778	1690	1088	25338	12789
	Brautford, Ont.....	2434	1456	1468	646	812	34639	
3-	Leeds and Grenville, Ont.....	14503	10503	9442	5058	4384	29194	
1-	Kent, Ont.....	6422	4289	6343	4368	1975	37800	
2-	Lenark, Ont.....	6936	4707	4480	2433	2027	39784	
1-	Lennox and Addington, Ont.....	5989	5595	4058	2047	2011	15827	
1-	Brome, Que.....	3431	2639	1963	1224	739	9890	
1-	Guelph, Ont.....	1550	1155	1220	694	526	18777	
1-	Carleton, Ont.....	7513	2431	4187	2440	1747	75549	
4-	Northumberland..... } On	16934	12235	9913	6050	3863	49228	17784
	Durham.....	1893	1211	1497	754	743		
2-	(St. Thomas, Ont.....	9970	6522	4814	3335	1479	64589	
	Elgin, Ont.....	4063	2660	2309	1142	1167		
1-	Missisquoi, Ont.....	14912	9452	7602	4516	3086		
3-	Wellington, Ont.....							

Total Population of Constituencies which have Adopted the Act.....1,525,663
 Total Vote Cast for Act..... 84,325
 Total Vote Cast Against..... 56,363
 Total Majority for the Act..... 74
 Number of Representatives in Dominion Parliament from C. T. Act Counties..... 74

It is to be borne in mind that C. T. Act Constituencies and Counties and Cities are not in all cases the same. There is, therefore, a difference between the total number of Constituencies (52) which have carried the Act, and the total number of Counties and Cities which have adopted it (57).

72	Whole Number of Contests.....	62
60	Whole Number of Victories.....	60
12	Whole Number of Defeats.....	12
63	Separate Scott Act Constituencies Voted.....	63
52	Separate Scott Act Constituencies Carried.....	52
6	Total Number Repeal Votes.....	6
6	Total Repeal Votes Defeated.....	6
53	Total Counties Adopting Act.....	53
4	Total Cities Adopting Act.....	4
42	Total Counties and Cities under the Operation of the Act, May 1st, 1885.....	42

LIST OF OFFICERS OF THE PROVINCIAL BRANCHES

1884-5.

Ontario Branch.

President, Hon. S. H. Blake ; Vice-Presidents, all Presidents of County and City Scott Act Associations ; Treasurer, H. O'Hara ; Secretary, F. S. Spence.

EXECUTIVE.—Rev. Jno. Smith, W. H. Howland, Thos. Bengough, J. J. McLaren, Q.C., G. M. Rose, Ald. Jno. McMillan, ex-Ald. Jno. T. Moore, Wm. Burgess, Rev. R. Wallace, Jas. Dobson, Jacob Spence, W. H. Orr, R. McLean, John Macdonald, W. W. Buchanan, Wm. Muuns, Robt. Rae, Jno. Middleton, W. H. Young, Robt. Fleming, Wm. Houston, Hon. G. W. Ross, Rev. B. B. Keefer, Rev. J. S. Ross, Rev. A. M. Phillips.

Quebec Branch.

President, J. R. Dougall, Esq.
Vice-Presidents, His Lordship Bishop Bond ; Mr. T.S. Brown ; Hon. Jas. Ferrier ; Rev. Wm. Galbraith, LL.B. ; Ven. Archdeacon Lindsay, of Waterloo ; Mr. J. S. Hall and Dr. Wm. Marsden, of Quebec ; Mr. W. H. Lambly, of Inverness, P. Q. ; Dr. Christie, of Lachute ; Lieut.-Col. Dyer, of Sutton ; A. A. Ayer ; Rev. Dr. Potts ; Rev. A. A. Upham ; Rev. Geo. Jamieson, of Aylmer, Mr. Wm. McNaughton, of Orms-town.
Secretary, Rev. D. V. Lucas.
Recording-Secretary, Rev. James Kines.
Treasurer, John M. M. Duff.
COMMITTEE.—Messrs. D. Bently, S. A. Abbott, J. H. Cayford, Wm. Drysdale,

James Baylis, F. E. Grafton, R. Irwin, S. A. Lebourveau, Henry Morton, N. R. Mudge, Walter Paul, David Lees, C. L. Williams, J. A. Matthewson, Edward Murphy, J. B. Rolland, Thos. Aikin, D. McDonald ; M. B. Jewell, of East Farnham ; John Gough, of Belford ; A. S. Walbridge, of Mystic ; S. F. Morey and H. A. Elkins, of Sherbrooke ; Abel Waters, of Hull ; U. S. McLaren and David Boyd, of Huntingdon ; C. G. Fleet, Alderman Grenier, R. C. Smith, of Montreal ; H. L. Robinson, of Waterloo ; Revs. J. H. Dickson, E. M. Hill, Robt. Lindsay, James McCaul, J. H. Newnham, J. Scrimger, A. B. Chambers, LL.B., G. H. Wells, and Alex. Campbell.

LOCAL COMMITTEES FOR THE YEAR.

Literature.—T. S. Brown, Rev. J. McCaul, Rev. R. Lindsay, Mr. F. E. Grafton, Mr. Robt. Irwin. *Finance.*—Mr. J. Fleet, J. M. M. Duff, Wm. Drysdale, David Lees, Rev. J. Kines, Robt. Irwin. *Legislation.*—Hon. Jas. Ferrier, J. R. Dougall, H. C. Smith, S. H. Cayford, S. A. Abbott.

Committee on Work in Montreal.—Dr. Potts, Revs. J. Dickson, J. A. Newnham, E. M. Hill, G. H. Wells, R. Lindsay, J. Kines, Messrs. D. Bently, J. M. M. Duff, Henry Morton, Walter Paul, C. J. Fleet, R. C. Smith.

New Brunswick Branch.

President, Rev. Jos. McLeod, Fredericton.
 Secretary, Chas. H. Lugin, Fredericton.
 Treasurer, G. N. Babbell, Fredericton.
 Vice-Presidents, Hon. A. R. McLellan,
 Senator, Hopewell; Hon. D. Wark,
 Senator, Fredericton; C. Burpee, M.P.,
 Sheffield; G. G. King, M.P., Chipman;

A. H. Gillmore, M.P., St. George;
 David Irwin, M.P., Wicklow; E. Mc-
 Leod, M.P.P., St. John; Rev. J. L.
 McFarland, St. John; Prof. G. E.
 Fotsler, Apohaqui; Andre Cushing,
 St. John.

Nova Scotia Branch.

President, Hon. Samuel Creelman, M.L.
 C., Upper Stewiacke.
 Vice-Presidents, Rev. R. Alder Temple,
 Hollis St., Halifax; Joseph Burrell,
 Yarmouth; Rev. J. Murray, Sydney,
 Cape Breton County.
 Secretary, Patrick Monaghan, Willow
 Park, (or Box 379, P.O.) Halifax.
 Treasurer, Wm. C. Silver, George St.,
 Halifax.
 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—J. F. L. Par-
 sons, Bedford Row, Halifax; Rev. R.
 F. Burns, D.D., Hollis St., Halifax;

John T. Bulmer, Hollis St., Halifax;
 H. A. Taylor, Barrington St., Halifax;
 James A. Holiday, Dartmouth; Rev.
 George Christie, Bedford; Walter Mills,
 Granville Ferry, Annapolis Co.; C. A.
 Black, Amherst; Bowman Corning,
 Yarmouth; Robert J. Wilson, High
 School Building, Halifax; J. E. Lock-
 wood, Cornwallis; J. N. Freeman,
 Liverpool; Norman J. Layton, Truro;
 Samuel Archibald, Waterville, Pictou
 Co.; John A. McDonald, Sherbrooke,
 Guysboro' Co.

Prince Edward Island Branch.

President, F. W. Hales, Esq.
 Vice-President, Rev. John Burnash, P. R.
 Bowers, Donald Farquharson, M.P.P.
 General Secretary, Rev. George W.
 Hodgson.
 Recording Secretary, J. J. Chappell.
 Treasurer, H. J. Cundall.

COMMITTEE.—G. W. Millner, Rev. E.
 Whitman, John A. Lawson, Rev. Wil-
 liam Phaelan, P.P., G. W. Bentley,
 M.P.P., Wm. Laird, J. C. Underhay,
 Rev. D. J. Gillis, P.P., Edward Lane,
 Rev. Neil McKay, Daniel Stewart,
 Hon. Benj. Rogers.

Manitoba Branch.

President, Hon. J. W. Sifton, Brandon.
 Vice-Presidents, Duncan McArthur, Rev.
 O. Forten, Thos. Nixon, Hon. Senator
 Girard, Rev. G. Young, D.D., Rev. J.
 Scott, Rev. Prof. Bryce, Rev. W. R.
 Morrison, Rev. C. Bandin, Rev. A. La-
 combe, J. S. Aiken, A. W. Ross, M.P.,
 F. W. Lipsitt, M.P.P., S. Greenway,
 M.P.P., Archdeacon Pinkham, Rev. T.
 Argus, C. E. Hamilton, W. Leggo,
 Hon. A. A. C. LaRiviere.
 Secretary, C. M. Copeland, Winnipeg.
 Treasurer, E. Thomson, Winnipeg.
 COMMITTEE.—All Clergymen of the Pro-
 vince, *ex-officio*, Hon. W. N. Kennedy,

Hon. S. C. Biggs, W. F. Luxton, Capt.
 L. M. Lewis, T. H. Schneider, J. H.
 Ashdown, J. A. M. Aikins, J. Villiers,
 Dr. O'Donnell, J. Ward, D. D. Aitkin,
 J. W. Phillips, M.D., J. Sutherland,
 N. Henderson, D. Fraser, G. Sellar, W.
 Taylor, J. B. More, N. McLean, G.
 Guthrie, T. Jasper, M. Laporte, John
 Hall, P. Campbell, J. Thompson, N.
 Germain, A. L. Sifton, J. E. McKill-
 igan, Hector McLean, Jos. Greenfield,
 Jos. Amos, J. W. Wellband, Alf. Pier-
 son, W. H. Lyon, H. Wilson, W. Red-
 ford Mulock, J. C. Thompson, W. H.
 Hughan.

British Columbia Branch.

President, Rev. E. Robson, New West-
 minster.
 Secretary, J. B. Kennedy, New West-
 minster.

Treasurer, John C. Brown, New West-
 minster.

cers of the Dominion W. C. T. Union.

President, Mrs. Youmans.

Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Chisholm, Ontario;
Mrs. Middleton, Quebec; Mrs. Dr.
Todd, St. Stephen; Mrs. Pollard, Brit-
tish Columbia.

Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Dalkin,
Quebec.

Recording Secretary, Miss Orchard, Galt.

Treasurer, Mrs. Turnbull, St. John, N.B.

SUPERINTENDENTS —

(1.) Dominion Organizer, Mrs. Youmans.

(2.) Preventive, Heredity and Hygiene,
Mrs. D. V. Lucas, 182 Mountain Street,
Montreal.

(3.) Educational: (a.) Scientific Instruc-
tion, Mrs. Morton, 48 St. Mark Street,
Montreal.

(b.) Lecture Department, Mrs. Chisholm,
81 Albert Street, Ottawa.

(c.) Sunday School Work, Mrs. Coates,
Prescott, Ontario.

(d.) Juvenile Work, Miss Tilley, 290
Cooper Street, Ottawa.

(4.) Evangelistic: (a.) Work among Rail-
way Men, Mrs. Letitia Youmans.

(b.) Work among Soldiers and Sailors,
Mrs. W. B. Colby, Stanstead, Quebec.

(c.) Work in Prisons and Police Stations,
Miss Barber, 108 Mansfield Street,
Montreal.

(d.) Work among the Germans, Hon. Mrs.
Lambert, New Edinburgh, Ontario.

(e.) Work among the Indians, Mrs. Rev.
Pollard, Victoria, B. C.

(f.) Work among Colored People, Mrs.
Dr. Youmans, St. Catherines, Ontario.

(g.) Work among Raftsmen and Lumber-
men, Mrs. Randolph, Fredericton, N.B.

(5.) Social: (a.) W. C. T. Unions, Miss
Johnston, 531 Rideau Street, Ottawa.

(b.) Kitchen Garden, Miss Steele, Grand
Union, Ottawa.

(c.) Flower Mission, Miss A. Johnston,
531 Rideau Street, Ottawa.

(d.) Parlor Meetings, Mrs. Cruikshank,
St. John, N. B.

(e.) Dominion and Provincial Exhibitions
and Fairs, Mrs. Britton, Gananoque,
Ontario.

(6.) Legislation, Mrs. Alexander, 186
Queen Street, Ottawa.

Officers of the Ontario W. C. T. Union.

President, Mrs. Addie Chisholm, Ottawa.

Ex-Pres., Mrs. Letitia Youmans, Picton.

First Vice-Pres., Mrs. Tilton, Ottawa.

Second Vice-Pres., Mrs. Cowan, Toronto.

Rec. Sec., Miss A. Orchard, Galt.

Cor. Sec., Mrs. Fawcett, Maple.

Treasurer, Mrs. Brethour, Milton.

LIST OF BOOKS FOR SALE

At the Office of the Canada Citizen, 8 King Street East
Toronto.

Any of these will be sent, post free, to any address, on receipt of price.

THE PEOPLE VS. THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.—This is a Canadian edition of the great speeches of the Hon. J. B. Finch, and is pronounced by competent critics to be one of the most masterly arraignments of the drink system that has ever been made. This Canadian edition has been specially revised and corrected by Mr. Finch. It contains eight lectures reported in full, and should be in the hands of every temperance and Prohibition worker. It is sold at a reduced rate through the kindness of the R. W. G. Lodge, I.O.G.T. Paper covers, 166 pages, with portrait. Price, 25 cents.

CANADIAN PROHIBITION RECITER.—Edited by Jas. L. Hughes, Public School Inspector of Toronto; specially prepared for use in Lodges, Divisions, and at temperance entertainments. It contains seventeen dialogues and twenty-three readings and recitations; neatly gotten up on good paper, handsomely designed paper covers, 180 pages. Price, 30 cents.

THE PROHIBITION CONTROVERSY.—This work consists of the Alliance Year Books for 1884 and 1885, bound together. It gives full reports of proceedings at the two annual meetings of the Council of the Dominion Alliance; it contains full Hansard reports of the great debates in the House of Commons upon Prohibition (in 1884) and Compensation (in 1885). These debates alone cover over 80 pages, and the book contains much other invaluable information. 16mo., paper covers, fine paper, 160 pages. Price, 20 cents.

SELECT SOCIAL READINGS.—Edited by Jacob Spence, contains a large number of carefully edited selections, adapted for public entertainments; more than one hundred pieces, many of them never published before. Tastefully bound, paper covers, 126 pages. Price, 25 cents.

CANADA TEMPERANCE MANUAL AND PROHIBITIONISTS' HANDBOOK.—By Professor George E. Foster, M.P. The very best epitome of information in reference to the Scott Act and the working of Prohibition that has ever been published; full of valuable facts and statistics, condensed into the smallest possible space; an invaluable work for everyone who wants to be posted on the present condition of the great Canadian prohibition campaign, and who wants to know how to answer every argument that is offered by the liquor party. Bound in paper covers, 116 pages. Price, 20 cents.

CANADIAN HUMOROUS RECITER.—Edited by James L. Hughes, Public School Inspector of Toronto. Specially adapted for providing really good, amusing selections for popular entertainments. There are in this book seventeen dialogues and twelve readings and recitations, every one of which is full of fun, and of suitable length. It is handsomely bound in designed colored paper covers, 180 pages. Price, 30 cents.

DANGER.—By T. S. Arthur. A thrilling temperance tale, 230 pages, paper covers. 15 cents.

THE ALLIANCE YEAR BOOK, 1884.—Full of valuable information; very nicely printed; contains House of Commons debate on Prohibition, in full. 10 cents.

SCOTT ACT PACKET I., containing the Scott Act in full, with all amendments, 40 pages; An Appeal for the Scott Act, by Rev. W. A. McKay, 32 pages; Alliance Year Book, 1884, 112 pages; The Nation's Curse, by Archdeacon Farrar, 16 pages; and 50 pages of assorted tracts and leaflets. Price, 25 cents.

Our Great Prohibition Paper.

THE CANADA CITIZEN

AND TEMPERANCE HERALD.

**A Journal Devoted to the Advocacy of Prohibition, and the Promotion
of Social Progress and Moral Reform.**

NO one can overestimate the value of the weekly visit to the domestic circle of a fresh, clean, inspiring journal of progress and reform. That the people of Canada are prepared to appreciate and sustain a paper of this character, we have the strongest proof, in the kind reception and support that have been accorded to THE CANADA CITIZEN. From all quarters come encouraging words of endorsement and approval. Our efforts to supply what temperance workers in Canada felt was an absolute necessity to our cause, have been crowned with the most gratifying success; of this, our rapidly increasing subscription list is only one of many evidences, and we now confidently appeal to the public for an extension of this welcome support.

THE CANADA CITIZEN we believe to be the cheapest Temperance paper in the world, and we ask you to judge for yourself as to the character and tone of the matter it contains.

We are at a crisis in the Temperance history of Canada, and no person who wants to be abreast of popular opinion on this great question, can afford to be without the journal that gives the fullest information in reference to every phase of the work, and that is the recognized organ and advocate of Temperance and Prohibition.

During the Scott Act campaign, our columns will be of special interest, containing comprehensive accounts of what our friends and foes are doing in every part of the country. In addition to this we will furnish our readers, both editorially and in carefully selected articles, with the fullest and strongest facts and arguments in support of our movement. We will also have departments of the purest and best family literature, including tales, sketches, illustrated biographies of our prominent temperance workers, choice poetry, a casket of literary gems of beauty, worth and fun, and a summary of the most important items of general news.

SIXTEEN PAGES, WEEKLY, ON FINE TONED PAPER.

Terms—ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR, in advance.

ADDRESS—

THE CITIZEN PUBLISHING COMPANY,
8 King Street East, TORONTO.