





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

Ca

14
16
18
20
22
25
28
32
36

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**

10



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions

Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

1980

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata
slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to
ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement
obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure,
etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à
obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Library of the Public
Archives of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

La bibliothèque des Archives
publiques du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

rrata
o

pelure,
à



32X

The Record of the Two Political Parties.

THE LIBERALS IN OFFICE

Decline to Support Motions Looking to Prohibitory Legislation.

Conservatives the Authors of the First Temperance Law.

It has been so frequently and widely reported in the Opposition press and by Opposition speakers that all temperance legislation worth anything has been given to Canada by the Reform party that it might not be without advantage to investigate the whole question and see what has been done by each of the great parties in the Dominion.

The claim above referred to may be stated in the words of a Mr. McLean, of Toronto, who is thus reported in the *Globe*. "He believed in the Reform party because that party had given them everything in the way of temperance legislation that they had ever got. The Liberal Government gave them their prohibitory act that had been proposed in any part of the British possessions. Mr. Mackenzie gave them the Northwest prohibitory liquor law, and the present Dominion Government was granting 'permits' to sell liquor in this prohibitory territory, provided they sold it moderately."

In this claim good, and are the statements correct? Let us see.

The first prohibitory liquor law passed in British North America was that introduced and carried through the Legislature of New Brunswick by Sir Leonard Tilley.

Sir Leonard does not belong to the Reform party.

The first local option prohibitory law which had force in Ontario and Quebec was the Dunkin' act passed in 1854.

In 1871 the House of Commons passed a resolution as follows:—"That an order be issued by the Speaker to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within the precincts of the house."

This was done when the Liberal-Conservative party commanded a majority of the house.

In 1876 a resolution was struck to report upon the annexed petitions which had been presented in favor of the passage of a prohibitory law, and to collect information respecting the workings of prohibition. Mr. Bowell was appointed chairman of this committee.

In 1876 the Northwest Prohibitory Act was introduced into Parliament by Sir Charles Tupper, and became law on the 12th May, 1877.

This disposal of the claim that Mr. Mackenzie gave the country the Northwest Prohibitory liquor law.

In 1878 the Northwest legislation was consolidated by Mr. Mackenzie, and consolidated with the very same "permit clause" which exists to-day, the section with reference to liquors reading as follows:—"Intoxicating liquors and other intoxicants are prohibited to be manufactured, imported, sold, or to be imported or to be brought into the same from any portion of Canada or elsewhere, or to be sold, exchanged, traded, or bartered except by special permission in writing of the Lieutenant-Governor of the said territories."

This law remained unchanged until 1880, when the consolidation took place, the only change being that a return of liquors sold under permission of the Lieutenant-Governor was to be made each year to Parliament. It will be seen, therefore, that so far from the Reform party being the authors of the Northwest prohibitory law, it was introduced by a Liberal-Conservative minister; that so far as the "permit" system is concerned it was incorporated by Mr. Mackenzie into his consolidation of 1878, exactly as it remains to-day, and there is no record that at that time, nor any time since, any member of the Reform party in Parliament made any move towards changing the law in this respect.

TEMPERANCE LEGISLATION SINCE 1874.

Let us now look for a moment at temperance legislation from 1874 up to the present day and with special reference to what the Reform party, while in power, with an overwhelming majority, has done.

In 1874, a committee, similar to that which had been appointed in 1873, was named, of which Mr. Ross was chairman. On the 9th May that committee reported in favor of appointing a commission to examine into and report upon the working of prohibitory laws in Canada, the United States and elsewhere. Mr. Ross gave his reasons for favoring the commission rather than attempting to pass a prohibitory law, as follows:—(Speaking in 1876, I did not believe then 1874, or now 1876), that they could at this very moment sustain a prohibitory law in the Dominion."

In 1878 the commission reported strongly favoring the enactment of a prohibitory law. What was done upon this

recommendation? Was any move made towards giving effect to the wishes of the people, as shown in numberless petitions presented to Parliament or to the recommendation of the commission? No. Ross moved the house into committee of the whole to consider the following resolution:—"That having regard to the beneficial effect arising from prohibitory liquor laws in those states of the American Union where the same are fully carried out, this house is of opinion that the most effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance would be to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors." This it will be seen, was a mere abstract resolution affirming an opinion, but giving no indication of any practical attempt to embody that opinion in law and even amongst members of the Reform party the mildness of the action drew forth expressions of surprise.

Mr. Dymond, among others, criticized the speech and resolution of Mr. Ross, as having no appearance of earnestness and declared that this must not be repeated, that this was the last time they must be content with empty declaration, but must test the sentiment of the house by an act of legislation.

To the resolution of Mr. Ross Dr. Schults moved an amendment as follows:—"That in opinion of this House a prohibitory liquor law is the only effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance, and that it is the duty of the Government to submit such a measure for the approval of Parliament at the earliest moment practicable." This brought matters to a point where

SOMEONE HAD TO DO SOMETHING

It was evidently not the purpose of the Reform party to do anything or to allow itself to be put on record. Accordingly Mr. Ross immediately moved the adjournment of the debate, and his motion having been carried out order by the Speaker, Mr. Mackenzie moved and at once carried the "Journal" of the debate. Mr. Ross gave as his reason that he did not ask the house to cast the responsibility of such a measure upon the Government. On March 18, when the session came up again, in order to avoid the difficulty presented in being obliged to vote upon the amendment of Dr. Schults, Mr. Olivier, Reformer, moved in amendment to the amendment:—"That the house do forthwith resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider the means best calculated to diminish the evils of intemperance." This was carried. The house went into committee, and when Mr. Ross moved his resolution, the same in substance as introduced into the house on March 18, Mr. Ross moved in amendment to the amendment to add:—"And that it is the duty of the Government to prepare a measure as early as day as possible to carry the principle of prohibition into effect." Whereupon Mr. Holtin immediately moved that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

On the 2nd April, the House again went into committee of the whole upon Mr. Ross' resolution. Having, in the meantime, considered the matter, the Reform party had made up their minds as to what should be done. Mr. Ross, in speaking, argued against Mr. Bowell's amendment, declaring that it did not add to the value of the motion, that temperance advocates desired to advance step by step, that his object this year was simply to get the opinion of the house, that the Government could then consider the expediency of introducing a measure, and that if they did not do so, it would be his duty to introduce such a measure himself. Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's contention was that the local Legislature had the power to prohibit, and that as yet no people were not ready for a prohibitory law. Mr. Powell's amendment was lost by a decisive vote, every Liberal in the house voting against it. The committee then rose and reported, when Mr. Bowell moved:—"That the resolution be referred back to the committee to add, 'that it is the duty of the Government to prepare a measure as early as day as possible to carry the principle of prohibition into effect.'"

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie at once moved the adjournment of the house, and the house was never asked to concur in the resolution reported from the committee. The reason, of course, was plain. In committee of the whole the votes are not recorded. A vote taken in the house on Mr. Bowell's amendment would have made it necessary for each member to have put himself upon record, and for this the Reform party was evidently not prepared. In 1878 the Government did not introduce a prohibition measure, nor did Mr. Ross, in pursuance of his promise, introduce such a measure. He contented himself with allowing the session to slip by until two days before prorogation, when he moved an address to His Excellency for certain correspondence between the Government and Lieutenant-governors of the provinces, together with any decision of courts bearing on the matter, and asked that the whole question should be referred by the governor in council to the Supreme court.

Mr. Blake, as minister of justice, refused to submit the question to the Supreme court, saying that such a course would come directly before the Superior court. This ended the matter for that session, the house proroguing on April 13. The session of 1877 came, and had nearly passed, and there was

NO PROHIBITION MEASURE POSTPONED

on the part of the Government, or of Mr. Ross, when, on April 4, Dr. Schults moved, "That in the opinion of this house a prohibitory liquor law is the only effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance and that it is the duty of the Government to submit such a measure at the earliest moment practicable." Mr. Ross had been asked to move the resolution, and had also been asked to second it, but declined doing either, saying he did not think it would be in the interests of temperance at the present juncture. To Dr. Schults' motion Mr. Ross moved in amendment "That this house, while not receding from any previous declaration as to the importance of a prohibitory liquor law, deems it inexpedient at present to express any opinion as to the action to be taken by the Government in dealing with this question." Mr. Mackenzie held that public opinion was not ripe for the passage of the law, and that a serious difficulty was presented with reference to the revenue. Mr. Ross' amendment was carried by 104 to 89, the Liberal members in a body voting against Dr. Schults' motion. In 1877 pressure was brought to bear upon Mr. Mackenzie's Government to pass a prohibitory law. He compromised by promising a local option measure. When the Dominion alliance was formed at the opening of the session of 1878 the promised measure was not ready. The whole power of the alliance was, however, brought to bear in a way which, as it was hinted, would seriously affect the party at the coming elections. Yielding to the pressure Mr. Mackenzie had

THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT

drafted. It was introduced and passed, the only serious opposition to it coming from Mr. Anglin (Reform), who was at that time Speaker of the House, and the late chief Justice. It was a violent assault against the proposed legislation. Whatever credit may be attached to Mr. Mackenzie and his party for that act must be estimated in the light of preceding facts. This act was defective in that it provided no machinery for its enforcement, and it looked up all funds derived from its enforcement in the hands of the Receiver General. It was an act which simply relegated the power of prohibiting to counties and cities, and was free from all the knotty difficulties surrounding the passage of an absolute prohibitory law.

The next important temperance legislation was the General Licensing act introduced in 1883, the purpose of which was to replace provincial license laws, which were supposed to be a mere shadow of the local Legislatures, by a Dominion license law, which was to be enforced within the power of the Federal Legislature. This assumption was based upon a decision of the Privy Council in the case of *Russell vs. the Queen*, from which decision the Dominion seemed plain that the licensing power did not belong to local legislatures, and that the later a decision of the Privy Council in the case of *Hodge vs. the Queen* put the matter in a different and most contradictory light. These two decisions with their inconsistencies were not recognized by the Privy Council in their later decision on the constitutionality of the Dominion License act. Indeed it was admitted that they could not be reconciled. To the Dominion License act of 1883 the Reform party objected solely on the ground of provincial rights. They contended with the Liberal-Conservatives making the act as perfect as possible. The act in itself was far in advance of the previous provincial legislation and was admitted to be one of the strongest license acts ever adopted by any great country. It struck at once the very life of the liquor traffic in Canada. It instituted strong machinery for its proper enforcement, interfered with no rights guaranteed under the Canada Temperance act, but went even farther in the line of local option and delegation of power to the municipalities by making it possible for any parish or municipality less than a county or city to veto the issuing of licenses by direct vote, and gave to any community less than a municipality the power by petition to rid itself of any or all obnoxious licenses. There was added to this act a special classing giving machinery for the enforcement of the Canada Temperance act, wherever this had been or should be adopted, and this machinery was of an effective and non-partisan character, consisting of the Judge of the county court, the mayor or warden responsible to the people, and one appointee on behalf of the Government. This board had the absolute right of appointing its inspectors and absolute control of all fines and fees resulting from the act.

THE MACHINERY IS IN MARKED CONTRAST

to that provided by the Ontario Government, which is partisan throughout, the Government having the appointments; first, of its commissioners and, second, of the inspectors and sub-inspectors, who shall act under those commissions. In 1884 a prohibition resolution prepared by the Dominion alliance was introduced into Parliament by Mr. Foster, which read as follows:—"That this house is of opinion that the right and most effectual remedy for the evils of intemperance is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes."

To which was added in the amendment of Mr. White:

"That this house is prepared so soon as public opinion will effectually sustain stringent measures to provide such legislation as far as the same is within the competency of the Parliament of Canada."

This amendment was agreed to by the leaders of the temperance party on both sides of the house, and the resolution as amended, passed by a majority of 123 to 40. The large vote shows the position of the Liberal-Conservatives on the question of prohibition, and although Mr. Blake was not present in the house to cast his vote (though in the city at the time), it will be found on reading his late address on the question of prohibition, that the resolution coincided exactly with his opinion as therein expressed. It affirms, as Mr. Blake affirms, a belief in the efficiency of prohibition, and it declares, as Mr. Blake declares, that prohibition should be enacted in law as soon as public opinion will effectually sustain it.

Mr. Robertson, of Shelburne, moved as an amendment to the resolution, "That this house is of opinion that the public sentiment of the people of Canada calls for immediate legislation to that effect."

This received but a small vote, the general opinion of Parliament being that the sentiment of the people of Canada was not sufficiently strong or at least had not given sufficiently strong expression to warrant the house in passing immediate prohibition. In 1889 the Dominion Government passed a bill for the disposal of fines in certain cases. The fines levied under the Canada Temperance act came under the provision of this act, and by order-in-council they have been placed in the disposal of the municipal authorities of counties, cities and incorporated villages, to be used for the purposes of the act. Some reference has been made as to

THE MOTION OF OBTAIN TEMPERANCE MEN

in Parliament with regard to a motion made by Mr. Blain on the 13th July, 1888. It is claimed that the vote voted against a motion which, if carried, would have had the effect of amending the Canada Temperance act. The facts of the case are these: The Government had decided to place a British Columbia bill on the list of Government orders, the Minister of Justice moved that the bill be so placed. To this Mr. Blake moved as an amendment that the Canada Temperance Act Amendment bill be added to this. This Mr. Blake, as leader of the Opposition, moved to amend a Government motion which could not be opposed by the Government, as no Government would allow its order of business to be interfered with, or one of its motions to be superseded or amended by the Opposition. Against Mr. Blake's motion several well known temperance men and supporters of the Government voted. The motion was simply a catch motion. Mr. Jameson had the Canadian Temperance Act amendment bill in his charge. It had been placed in his charge by the Dominion alliance. He was in the house that day and sitting next to Mr. Blake for some time before the latter's motion was made. Mr. Blake, without consulting with Mr. Jameson, took the bill out of his hands, and moved it as an amendment to the Government order, well knowing that the Government would be obliged to vote it down, and his friends endeavor to make capital in his favor, and against the Liberal-Conservatives in consequence. If Mr. Blake had really wished to amend the Government motion he moved as any time that it should take precedence, and he would then have had a vote or treaty outside of party lines and entirely in the interests of the bill. This he did not choose to do.

It has been urged against the Liberal-Conservative Government that they have refused to amend the Canada Temperance act. It is true that they have not, as a Government measure, proposed to amend the act. They have left that to the Parliament itself, and have only been divided upon the vote when it came up. It will be well, however, to examine as to

WHAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WERE

as to whether they were of paramount importance, and essential to the proper working of the act. Take, for instance, the bill introduced last year.

Section 1 provides that in any county where there is more than one registry of deputy officers it shall be sufficient to deposit the notice that the petition is on view in either one of them. Sections 2, 3 and 4 interpret the word "county," and define the electoral districts in British Columbia, and the provisional electoral districts of Ontario.

Section 5 provides that druggists may sell, on medical certificates, less than one pint at a time.

Sections 6 and 7 make unimportant amendments with reference to penalties.

Sections 8, 9 and 10 amend clerical errors in the 108, 109, and 119 sections of the act.

Section 10 provides for a schedule of forms. Section 13 provides that a penalty, recovered under the act, shall be in part paid to the prosecutor or complainant. It will be noted from a careful examination of the above, that the amendments considered necessary and embodied in the bill presented last year are all of a trivial character, and the lack of them does not, to any appreciable extent, hinder the enforcement of the act where adopted in the older provinces.

